

Application Number:	25/00202/HOUS
Location:	24 Hillcrest Avenue, Heywood, OL10 4RL
Proposal:	Part two storey, part single-storey side and rear extension including raised terrace, alteration to fenestration and landscaping works to rear
Applicant:	Mrs Emma Hayes
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
DETERMINATION DATE 06.05.2025	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 a detached, split-level bungalow occupying a corner plot at the junction of Hillcrest Avenue and Summit Street, Heywood. The property is set at an angle to the street and, owing to a steep east-west fall in ground level across the site, incorporates an integral garage at basement level to the west side. Externally, the bungalow is finished in dark red brick and concrete tiles. The adjacent, detached dwelling to the east (no. 22) is a former bungalow which has been converted to a two storey house pursuant to planning permission 88/D22624. Number 22 is set at an angle to the street and occupies a recessed position with its northwest elevation set back some 9 metres of the application property. The adjacent property to the north (no. 71 Summit Street) is a detached, two storey dwellinghouse orientated at right angles and set at a lower level in relation to the application property. Number 71 has benefited from a single storey rear extension and a large outbuilding within the rear garden.

The application property occupies a substantial plot with garden areas to the front, west side and rear. An elongated driveway emerges from Hillcrest Avenue to the southwest corner of the curtilage and runs towards the front of the dwellinghouse, providing two off-street parking spaces. Ground levels fall steeply in a westerly direction across the plot towards the site boundary with Summit Street. The front

garden is enclosed by a combination low-level fencing and a brick wall backed by hedging, whereas the rear garden boundary treatments are formed by taller waney-lap fencing supplemented by a number of tall, mature trees which run alongside the western boundary flanking Summit Street. However, the applicant has explained that all of the trees are in the process of being removed,

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a side and rear wraparound extension that would provide a basement extension to the northwest side elevation and a basement and ground floor extension to the rear. The flat roof of the basement extension to the side elevation would be enclosed by a 1.1 metre high balustrade in order to form a roof terrace above set at the ground floor level of the bungalow. The extension would be finished in brickwork to match the existing property and a set of large sliding doors would be installed within the existing northwest side elevation at ground floor level. The proposals would include minor landscaping works within the rear garden including the formation of a raised platform with steps leading down to the garden.

Relevant History

DC00492 Submission Of Details To Comply With Condition 3 On Planning Permission D54089 - **Request Completed, January 2012**

11/D54089 Basement Extension To West Side Of Dwellinghouse Including Formation Of Roof Terrace Above, External Staircase To Front Of Property, Installation Of Raised Decking To Rear And Cladding To External Elevations Of Dwellinghouse – **Granted STC, March 2011**

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Tree Officer – **Summary:** No objections subject to Tree Protection Plan condition.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties and no responses were received in response to the proposed development.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
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 Development

Local

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:

G/D/1 Defined Urban Area

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016:

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

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 and P3

- ☐ Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy 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.'*
- ☐ The proposed development would be compatible with the character of the host property in terms of size, height, massing, layout and design, and would appear subordinate to the scale and proportions of the original dwellinghouse. Owing to the fall in ground level to the west of the site and the angled footprint of the dwellinghouse, the extension would not be prominently in view from surrounding public vantage points and would not dominate the appearance of the property or adversely affect the character of the street scene.
- ☐ Moreover, the extension would be finished in brickwork to match the existing dwellinghouse, which is considered acceptable.
- ☐ The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ❑ Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy 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.'*
- ❑ Section 5.5 of the SPD states *'it is important that single storey extensions are not overbearing and do not result in undue loss of light or privacy for neighbouring occupiers.'*
- ❑ The proposed roof terrace would oppose the side elevation of no. 71 Summit Street located some 9 metres away to the north. The roof terrace would be set at the finished ground floor level of the bungalow and would not afford materially enhanced views towards no. 71 in significant excess of those presently available from the existing habitable room windows in the rear elevation of the dwellinghouse.
- ❑ Owing to the offset position of no. 22 Hillcrest Avenue to the east, the proposed extension is not considered to unduly overlook or overshadow the habitable room windows or rear garden of no. 22.
- ❑ While the proposed extension would reduce the level of separation between the rear elevation of the application property and the rear garden of no. 71 Summit Street, it is not considered to afford materially enhanced views towards the rear garden of no. 71. While the application property is located on higher ground, the rear garden of no. 71 would remain relatively secluded. Moreover, the proposed windows, although closer to the boundary, would still be at ground floor level.
- ❑ All habitable rooms within the application property would receive sufficient natural light and a sufficient garden space of a functional layout would be retained. As such, the proposed works would ensure an acceptable standard of living for existing and future occupiers.
- ❑ The proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties in accordance with policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

- ❑ Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy requires development proposals to *'provide satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking, manoeuvring, and servicing arrangements taking into account of the proposed use and location.'*
- ❑ The proposal would retain sufficient space for two off-street parking spaces on the driveway in accordance with policy T2 and appendix 5 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy.

Ecology

- ❑ The Greater Manchester Ecology Unit (GMEU) was consulted on the proposals and advised that it ought to be possible to implement the proposed development without significant tree loss. However, it was confirmed by the applicant during the determination of the application that the trees on the site are in the process of being removed as none of the trees are protected by a

TPO. Therefore, it is not considered necessary to apply a condition requiring a tree protection plan.

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 permission relates to the following plans:

Existing Plans. Dwg no. 988-25-01. Rev B

Proposed Plans. Dwg no. 988-25-02. Rev B

Existing & Proposed Site Plans. Dwg no. 988-25-03. Rev B

and the development shall be carried out in accordance with these drawings 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 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. The materials used in the construction of the development hereby permitted shall be in accordance with the details contained within the planning application form unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with policies P2, P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the 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	15/04/2025	Signed: BM
Authorisation	06/05/2025	Signed: TH

Report Author Bob Melling