

APPLICATION NUMBER: 25/00624/HOUS

Application Number:	25/00624/HOUS
Location:	61 Argyle Street, Heywood, OL10 3DQ
Proposal:	Two storey side extension
Applicant:	Ms Michelle Smyth
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
DETERMINATION DATE 23.09.2025	EXT OF TIME N/A
RECOMMENDATION:	Grant subject to conditions

DELEGATION	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	N
	Contrary to previous decision?	N
	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	N

COMMENTS	Planning Panel comments received?	N
	Neighbour comments received?	N

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	N
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N/A

Location

The application relates to no. 61 Argyle Street, a two-storey, end-of-terrace dwelling located in a residential area of Heywood. It faces the highway to the north and is adjoined by no. 59 Argyle Street to the east. Immediately to the west is an unadopted road which is used for parking and access to both Unity Crescent and the rear alleyway. The gated alleyway provides space for both off-street parking and bin storage. No. 63 Argyle Street is located across the unadopted road to the west with further residential development along Unity Crescent to the south.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a two-storey side extension that would project approximately 2.61 metres from the existing side elevation and would be set back approximately 0.5 metres from the existing front elevation at first floor level. The extension would be constructed in materials to match those use in the exterior of the existing building.

Relevant History

24/01027/HOUS Two storey side extension

Refused (December 2024). Appeal Dismissed (May 2025)

Refused for the following reason:

By virtue of its scale and design, the proposed extension would constitute a disproportionate and obtrusive addition to the host dwelling that would harmfully alter the appearance and character of the street scene through the significant erosion of space on a corner plot. The proposed extension would fail to demonstrate subservience to the host dwelling and the use of different widths would result in an unacceptably poor standard of design in a prominent location. The proposed development therefore fails to improve the character and quality of the host dwelling and the area, contrary to policies DM1, P1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' and the National Planning Policy Framework

92/D28495 Private Detached Garage.
Approved (September 1992)

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

N/A

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties. No representations were received in response to the proposed development.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – December 2024
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

The Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan was adopted and became part of the statutory development plan for each of the 9 authorities covered by the plan on 21st March 2024. The following policies are relevant:

JP-P1 Sustainable Places

Local

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016:

The Rochdale Core Strategy was adopted on 19th October 2016. The following policies are relevant:

P1	Improving image
P3	Improving Design of New Development
DM1	General Development Requirements
T2	Improving Accessibility
Appendix 5	Schedule of Parking Standards

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD): Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016).

Amendments

N/A

Assessment

Design: DM1, P1 and P3

PfE Policy JP-P1 requires new development to be distinctive with a clear identify that: 'Respects and acknowledges the character and identity of the locality in terms of design, siting, size, scale and materials used.'

CS Policies DM1, P1 and P3 require development proposals to be 'of high quality design and take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area' and to 'enhance the borough's identity and sense of place, by respecting context where it is positive and having regard to the scale, density, massing, height, layout, landscape, materials and access of surrounding buildings and areas in general.' In addition, Section 5.1 of the SPD states development proposals should be 'in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.'

Argyle Street lies within an established residential area where the prevailing character is traditional brick terraced houses of broadly uniform scale and appearance. The dwellings present either a front or side elevation to the road. Those facing the street are typically set back behind modest front gardens and low boundary walls/fences, forming a reasonably consistent building line. Corner properties typically incorporate a garden to the side. These factors combine to give an order and consistency to the pattern of development along the street, which adds positively and distinctively to the character and appearance of the area.

Section 5.14 of the SPD provides guidance on side extensions to dwellings on a corner plot: 'Extensions to houses on corner plots can have an unacceptable impact on the street scene by eroding the space around buildings and presenting a hard edge to the public highway. Therefore, planning permission will not normally be

granted for a single or two-storey extension to a dwelling on a corner plot unless it maintains sufficient space between the boundary or back of service strip and the nearest part of the extension.'

To overcome the previous reason for refusal, the applicant has incorporated the amendments recommended by the Case Officer under application reference 24/01027/HOUS. The proposed extension has been reduced in width and set back from the existing front elevation at first floor level, with the ridge line set down accordingly. Therefore, the extension now reads as a sympathetic, proportionate and subservient addition to the host property.

Although the extension would still result in the erosion of space between the gable end and the side boundary, it is now considered that sufficient space would be retained in order to ensure that the open character of the street scene would not be unduly harmed.

As such the proposal is considered to overcome the previous reason for refusal and would accord with PfE Policy JP-P1, CS Policies DM1, P1 and P3, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

CS Policy DM1 states development proposals should ensure they 'do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.'

The proposed extension would comply with the minimum separation distances outlined in Section 4.1 of the SPD and therefore it is not considered to result in an undue loss of light, outlook or privacy for any neighbouring properties.

The submitted plans indicate the provision of natural light to all habitable rooms and that sufficient private garden space of a functional layout would be retained.

The proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties in accordance with CS Policy DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Recommendation: Grant subject to the following conditions -

1. The development must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason. Required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

2. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents hereby approved unless otherwise required by the conditions below:

Sheet no. 001. Rev 1. Location Plan and Proposed Site Plan.

Sheet no. 002. Existing Plans and Elevations.

Sheet no. 003. Rev 1. Proposed Plans and Elevations.
Sheet no. 301. Rev 1. Existing and Proposed Block Plans

Reason for the avoidance of doubt and to ensure a satisfactory development in accordance with the policies within the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan, the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. The materials used in the construction of the exterior of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the construction of the exterior of the existing building in colour, form, type, size and texture.

Reason: In the interests of ensuring a satisfactory visual appearance to the development and in accordance with Policies P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Article 35 Statement

The proposal complies with the development plan and would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. It therefore comprises sustainable development and the Local Planning Authority worked proactively to issue the decision without delay.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	03/09/2025	Signed: BM
Authorisation	18/09/2025	Signed: RC

Report Author Bob Melling