

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/01281/FUL

DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.	CASE OFFICER	DATE
24/01281/FUL	Bob Melling	29 August 2025

DETERMINATION DATE
05 September 2025 (EoT)

Address: 9 Taylor Street, Heywood, OL10 1EF

Proposal: Conversion of mixed use building to form 4 self-contained apartments including alterations to fenestration on side and rear elevations and demolition of part of existing flat roof extension to allow for the formation of one detached dwelling to rear of site.

PUBLICITY	Weekly list expired?	Y	Site notice expired?	Y
	Neighbour letters expired?	Y	Press Notice expired?	N/A

DELEGATION	Significant departure from local plan?	N	Contrary to national policy?	N
	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	N	Contrary to previous decision?	N
	Major with 10 or more objections and recommending approval?	N	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	N

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

EIA	Screening opinion completed and saved to Onbase?	N/A
-----	--	-----

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

RECOMMENDATION	GRANT SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS
----------------	-----------------------------

CHECKED AND SIGNED OFF BY: RK

DATE: 05/09/2025

SITE

The application relates to a two storey, symmetrical, red brick building of neoclassical design dating to 1933 and located on the eastern side of Taylor Street. The application site is on the edge of Heywood Town Centre and is flanked by a nursery to the north and the Grade II Listed St Joseph's Church to the south. Across Taylor Street to the west are residential dwellings and the Heywood Jobcentre. The rear boundary of the application site borders the former police station on Hind Hill Street, which is locally listed and comprises office space. There is a large retaining wall to the rear of the application site as the former police station is on higher ground.

The ground floor of the application property comprises commercial space while the first floor provides residential accommodation. The building is set back approximately 12m from the pavement, with parking provided to the front. Although the fenestration of the building has been modernised, the overall rhythm and proportions of the original design are retained. It is unclear when the building was extended, although there is a large flat roofed single storey extension which projects beyond the side and rear elevations at the southeastern corner of the site.

PROPOSAL

Permission is sought for the change of use of the original building to create four self-contained flats (3 x 2-bed and 1 x 3-bed). The existing single storey extension would be partially demolished to enable the construction of a detached bungalow with 3 bedrooms. The bungalow would occupy the southeastern corner of the plot, and would be characterised by a steeply pitched, gable roof. A total of 9 off-street parking spaces would be provided and a bin store would be located to the rear. The existing vehicular access would be widened, and the bungalow would be provided with a fenced off private garden space. Minor alterations would be made to the existing front boundary, and a landscaped strip would be planted behind the front boundary treatment.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Regional

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE):

JP-S1	Sustainable Development
JP-S4	Flood Risk and the Water Environment
JP-H1	Scale, Distribution and Phasing of New Housing Development
JP-H3	Type, Size and Design and New Housing
JP-H4	Density of New Housing
JP-P1	Sustainable Places
JP-P2	Heritage
JP-C5	Streets for All
JP-C6	Walking and Cycling
JP-C8	Transport Requirements of New Development

Local

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS):

DM1	General development requirements
C1	Delivering the right amount of housing in the right places
C3	Delivering the right type of housing
P1	Improving Image
P2	Protecting and enhancing character, landscape and heritage
P3	Improving design of new development
T2	Improving accessibility

Unitary Development Plan (UDP):

G/D/1	Defined Urban Area
G/R/1	Physical Regeneration

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):

Supplementary Planning Guidance note 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016).

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

Application Reference	Description	Decision / Date
17/00731/FUL	Change of use from Funeral Directors to dog grooming/boarding (sui generis)	Approved August 2017
11/D55076	Change Of Use To Funeral Directors (Class A1), Bereavement Counselling Centre (Class D1) Together With Ancillary Retail Sales Of Donated Goods And The Formation Of A First Floor Flat To Be Occupied By The Proprietors Of The Building	Approved February 2012
11/D54047	Change Of Use From Health Clinic(D1 Use) To Residential Care Home (C2 Use)	Approved February 2011
10/D52842	Change Of Use From Former Health Clinic (Class D1) To Office (Class B1)	Withdrawn February 2010

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Highways and Engineering
(Summary) No objections.

The Coal Authority
(Summary) No objections. Informative recommended.

REPRESENTATIONS

Letters of notification were sent to the occupiers of surrounding buildings on 21 July 2025. In addition, a site notice was displayed adjacent to the application site on 25 July 2025 and a notice was published in the local newspaper on 31 July 2025. No representations were received.

ANALYSIS

Principle of Development

The application seeks permission for the conversion of the existing building to form four self-contained flats and one detached dwelling. The site lies within the Defined Urban Area (saved UDP Policy G/D/1) and a Physical Regeneration Area (saved UDP Policy G/R/1). Policy G/D/1 seeks to concentrate new development within the urban area while Policy G/R/1 aims, amongst other things, to promote the regeneration and redevelopment of key sites within or adjacent to town centres.

Places for Everyone establishes the need for at least 616 net additional dwellings per year in Rochdale to meet the housing needs of the borough. CS Policy C1 seeks to focus housing development on previously developed sites within the urban area, setting a target of 80% of new housing on previously developed land.

CS Policy C3 states that higher density development (residential) should be focused around Rochdale, Middleton and Heywood town centres.

Paragraph 124 of the NPPF sets out that *‘Planning policies and decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses.’*

Paragraph 125 of the NPPF advises that *‘Planning policies and decisions should promote and support the development of under-utilised land and buildings especially if this would help to meet identified needs for housing.’*

PfE Policy JP-S 1 sets out that development should seek to maximise economic, social and environmental benefits. Preference should be given to previously developed (brownfield) land. PfE Policy JP-H2 states that there should be a significant increase in the supply of new housing, including, specifically, the supply of low-cost market housing. Furthermore, as set out in PfE Policy JP-H4, new housing should be delivered at a density appropriate for the location and taking into account the site’s accessibility.

In this instance, it is considered that the proposal would lead to the provision of five residential units in a sustainable location. The proposed dwellings would assist the Council in meeting its housing requirements with the proposed development being built to an appropriate density on an edge of town centre, brownfield site.

As such, the proposal is acceptable in principle and accords with CS Policies C1 and C3, PfE Policies JP-S1, JP-H2 and JP-H4, and the NPPF.

Design and Heritage

The application site does not lie within a Conservation Area but is sited around 20-25m north of the Grade II listed St Joseph’s RC Church. As the application property lies within the setting of the listed building, regard must be given to Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) which states that when considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority (LPA) shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

‘Significance’ with regard to heritage assets is defined by the NPPF as:

The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. The interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance

derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting.

The setting of a listed building is defined by the NPPF as:

The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral.

Paragraph 210 of the NPPF states that in determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- a) *the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;*
- b) *the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and*
- c) *the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.*

Paragraph 212 of the NPPF states:

When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

Paragraph 213 of the NPPF sets out the following:

Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.

Paragraph 215 of the NPPF explains that where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. The Court of Appeal decision in the case of *Barnwell vs East Northamptonshire DC* [2014] (2) clarified that decision makers should give 'considerable importance and weight' to the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings when carrying out the balancing exercise.

The application site is located 20-25m north of the Grade II listed St Joseph's RC Church (the Church hereafter). The listing text of this building reads:

*The Roman Catholic church of St Joseph and associated presbytery, Heywood, of 1913-16 by Henry Oswald Hill, with later additions, is listed at Grade II for the following principal reasons: * Artistic interest: the apsidal sanctuary dominates with an impressive scheme of mosaic designed by Eric Newton of Ludwig Oppenheimer Ltd, a specialist mosaic company, which demonstrate a knowledge and understanding of the use of mosaic in the designs, and high degree of craftsmanship and use of high-quality materials in their construction; * Architectural interest: as an urban Catholic church designed in a Romanesque style representative of the interest in early*

*Christian architecture in the late C19 and early C20 and particularly successful in the harmonious use of internal space; * Architect: Henry Oswald Hill was a promising architect with a clear interest in contemporary church-building trends, as shown by his Byzantine design for the listed St John the Baptist, Rochdale, who was tragically killed in action in the First World War * Group value: the presbytery has functional group value with the church and both were designed by Hill, who achieved a visual unity through the use of the same materials while choosing a more domestic Queen Anne style for the presbytery.*

The Church attributes much of its significance to internal artistic features in addition to its external architecture. The property is best viewed from Mary Street to the west, which leads directly to the front entrance. The property is certainly appreciated from Taylor Street to the north, where it is possible to experience the full side profile of the Church, in addition to the later added northern transept. Due to the siting of buildings on the eastern side of Taylor Street, such views are only possible up to the main entrance of the application site.

The application building's contribution to the setting of St Joseph's resides primarily in the external envelope of the 1933 main block, which will remain largely unaltered. The only changes will be rooflights on the rear elevation, of which there will be no views in the public realm, and the alteration of a ground floor window on the south side elevation to a doorway. The changes are focussed mainly upon the low-importance side extension, which will be partly removed and altered to form a separate one-and-a-half storey dwelling detached from and to the rear of the main building, thereby better revealing the original form of the latter. It will still however retain its subservience to the original building. For these reasons, it is considered that the proposal would amount to a neutral impact on the significance of the designated heritage asset.

Also within the vicinity of the application building are the locally designated former public baths on Taylor Street and the former police station on Hind Hill Street. Therefore, regard has been had for paragraph 216 of the NPPF.

The former public baths are currently in mixed use as a place of worship and a HMO, and it is considered that much of the historic significance of the building is derived through its use as a community asset, rather than its architectural quality. Furthermore, the application site is located to the rear of the former police station on Hind Hill Street. The former police station is best viewed from Hind Hill Street and would not be read in conjunction with the application building, which is sited on much lower ground. As such, it is considered that the proposals would result in a neutral impact on the significance of the locally designated assets.

In terms of the impact on the character and appearance of the application building and the wider street scene, it is considered that the detachment of the existing single storey extension from the main building and its conversion to a one-and-a-half storey dwelling would better reveal the main building while remaining subservient in terms of its scale, massing and positioning. It would take design cues from the existing property and use appropriate, high-quality materials including smooth red facing brick, slate roof coverings and stone window and door surrounds.

Subject to the recommended conditions, it is considered that the proposal accords with the requirements of CS Policies DM1, P1, P2 and P3, PfE Policies JP-P1 and JP-P2, and the NPPF.

Residential Amenity

CS Policy DM1 requires that all development proposals are compatible with surrounding land uses, both in terms of its impact upon those uses and the impact of the surrounding land uses upon the amenities of future residents.

Development should not affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy and development should mitigate against any impacts due to noise, dust, light and odour pollution. CS Policy G9 also requires that sensitive new development such as housing are not adversely affected by existing sources of pollution such as roads and certain types of industry.

Similarly, paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Neighbour Amenity

The Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD ('the SPD') sets out minimum space standards that should be applied to all new residential development and development which affects existing residential properties. These are:

- *21m between directly facing principal windows of habitable rooms, at an upper floor level and 10.5m between a principal window at an upper floor level and a directly facing boundary of the curtilage;*
- *14m between a principal window and any directly facing two storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room; and*
- *10m between a principal window and any directly facing single storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room.*

The SPD advises that where these separation distances cannot be achieved, proposals should be '*compatible with the density and character of surrounding development.*'

It is noted that the nearest residential dwellings are located across Taylor Street some 25m away. On this basis, the proposed dwellings would not conflict with the above minimum separation distances and are not considered to result in undue harm towards the living conditions of neighbouring residents.

Occupier Amenity

In terms of occupier amenity, it is noted that PfE Policy JP-H3 requires all new dwellings to comply with the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS). In terms of occupier amenity, the dwellings are compliant with the NDSS when assessed against the proposed floor plans. The table below provides a detailed breakdown:

Residential Unit	Req. GIA (m²)	Actual GIA (m²)	Difference (m²)
Flat 1 (2b 3p) - Bed 1 = 15.8m ² - Bed 2 = 11.14m ²	61	64.6	+ 3.6
Flat 2 (2b 3p) - Bed 1 = 14.43m ² - Bed 2 = 9.18m ²	61	63.5	+ 2.5

Flat 3 (2b 3p) - Bed 1 = 12.88m ² - Bed 2 = 9.67m ²	61	63.7	+ 2.7
Flat 4 (3b 5p) (two storeys) - Bed 1 = 14.09m ² - Bed 2 = 13.10m ² - Bed 3 = 8.96m ²	93	95.5	+ 2.5
Detaching dwelling (3b 4p) (two storeys) - Bed 1 = 12.38m ² - Bed 2 = 10.94m ² - Bed 3 = 8.67m ²	84	120	+ 36

Note - in order to provide 1 bedspace, a single bedroom has a floor area of at least 7.5m² and is at least 2.15m wide and in order to provide 2 bedspaces, a double (or twin bedroom) has a floor area of at least 11.5m². These figures have been used to calculate the number of bedspaces in each dwelling.

The proposed flats would be provided with a shared outdoor amenity space to the rear while the proposed detached dwelling would benefit from its own outdoor amenity space which would comprise a fenced off lawn and patio.

It is considered that all habitable rooms would receive an adequate level of natural light.

Neighbouring land uses include two nurseries, a church, offices and terraced dwellings. It is not considered that any of these surrounding uses, either in isolation or combination, would result in undue noise disturbance for the proposed dwellings. Furthermore, it should be noted that the application building already contains residential accommodation at first floor level.

The relationship between the proposed flats and the detached one-and-a-half storey dwelling should also be considered. Firstly, it is considered that the arrangement of fenestration would avoid undue harm by way of overlooking between habitable rooms. However, it is noted that the first floor kitchen/living room windows serving flats 3 and 4 would overlook the proposed garden area of the detached dwelling at close proximity. Notwithstanding, it is noted that the only windows that would directly overlook the garden area would be the four small bathroom windows at first floor level. Three of the four habitable room windows at first floor level would only overlook the garden area at oblique angles while the other would only be sited partially in front of the garden area. Moreover, it is not considered that the relationship would detract from the general levels of privacy that can be expected from such a development in an edge of town centre location where each of the flats would overlook the shared outdoor amenity space.

Summary

Overall, the scheme is considered acceptable in terms of residential amenity, in accordance with CS Policies G9 and DM1, PfE and the NPPF.

Landscaping and Biodiversity Net Gain

CS Policy G7 sets out that it is expected that development proposals will protect and include existing biodiversity and take opportunities to promote biodiversity and create

new habitats using landscaping and building and construction features wherever possible. CS Policy G7 requires that no development should result in a net loss of biodiversity and geodiversity.

PfE Policy JP-G9 seeks to deliver a net enhancement of biodiversity resources through a collective of measures which are broadly aligned with the approach to BNG outlined within the Environment Act (2021), the NPPF and supporting guidance documents. The provisions of the Environment Act in respect of BNG are a statutory requirement for planning applications. However, the BNG statement submitted with the application indicates that the development would not affect any onsite priority habitat and would affect less than 25m² of other onsite habitat.

Accordingly, it is not considered that the statutory requirement to provide 10% BNG is applicable here.

Highways

CS Policy T2 requires development to comply with the Council's car parking standards and CS Policy DM1 requires that development provides satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking, manoeuvring and servicing arrangements, taking into account the proposed use and location.

PfE Policy JP-C8 requires new development to be located and designed to enable and encourage walking, cycling and public transport use to reduce the negative effects of car dependency and help deliver high quality, attractive, liveable and sustainable environments.

Highway Services have confirmed that the site is located in a sustainable area within walking distance of Heywood Town Centre. Highways have not identified any new road safety issues as a result of the proposed development and for that reason there are no objections. Moreover, it is noted that the development would provide adequate car parking for the proposed residential dwellings.

The scheme is not considered to have an adverse impact on highway safety and would not generate a level of additional traffic which would have a detrimental impact on the safe and efficient operation of the immediate local highway network, or strategic routes. Highways Services have raised no objections. The development therefore complies with the requirements of CS Policies T1 and T2, PfE Policy JP-C8 and the NPPF.

Conclusion

The application site is located within the defined urban boundary on the edge of Heywood Town Centre. It would result in a net increase of 4 residential units and is considered to make a positive albeit minor contribution to the housing supply and local economy within the borough. The proposals would have a neutral impact on the setting of nearby heritage assets and is not considered to have a detrimental impact on the character of the locality. It is therefore considered that the development as a whole is acceptable in accordance with adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, saved UDP policy G/D/1, PfE 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. This permission relates to the following plans and documents:

- Site Location Plan
- Existing Ground Floor Plan. Dwg no. 24.3420.2
- Existing First Floor And Roof Plan. Dwg no. 24.3420.2
- Existing Sections 1 – 1 & 2 – 2. Dwg no. 24.3420.3
- Existing Elevations. Dwg no. 24.3420.4A
- Existing & Proposed Block Plans. Dwg no. 22.2958.SC2.6A
- Proposed Ground Floor Plan. Dwg no. 24.3420.SC2.1B
- Proposed First Floor Plan. Dwg no. 24.3420.SC2.2A
- Proposed Second Floor Plan. Dwg no. 24.3420.SC2.3
- Proposed Bungalow Elevations. Dwg no. 24.3420.SC2.4A
- Proposed Elevations. Dwg no. 24.3420.SC2.5

and the development shall be carried out in accordance with these details hereby approved unless otherwise required by the conditions below.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure a satisfactory standard of development in accordance with the policies contained within the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan, the 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.

4. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until such time as the bin store as shown on the plan Existing & Proposed Block Plans. Drawing Reference. 22.2958.SC2.6A has been made available for its intended purpose. The bin store shall be retained for its intended purpose thereafter.

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.

Procedure 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.

