

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/01093/FUL

DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.	CASE OFFICER	DATE
24/01093/FUL	Bob Melling	7 January 2025

Address: 61 Church Street, Heywood, OL10 1LJ

Proposal: Front and rear dormers and increase in ridge height to provide commercial space (Use Class E(c)(iii)) at first floor level, conversion of roof over existing rear extension and alterations to existing frontage including formation of separate entrance.

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
-----	--	---

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

RECOMMENDATION	Grant Subject to Conditions
----------------	-----------------------------

CHECKED AND SIGNED OFF BY: RC

DATE: 15.01.24

SITE

The application relates to no. 61 Church Street, a vacant, single-storey building which was last used as a restaurant. The application site is adjacent to the Heywood Telephone Exchange to the west and a block of flats (nos. 1-29 Temple Street) to the east. To the rear (north) there is a further block of flats (nos. 1-32 Roeacre Court) and across Church Street to the south there are bungalows fronting Bowling Green Street. The site falls within the Central and East Heywood Physical Regeneration Area (Saved UDP Policy G/R/1) and is on the edge of Heywood Town Centre.

PROPOSAL

Permission is sought to increase the overall height of the building by 1m including front and rear dormer extensions in order to create a separate commercial use at first floor level. The pitched roof over the existing rear extension would be replaced by a flat roof and the shop front would be reconfigured to create a separate entrance for the proposed use.

The front roof slope would comprise two front-facing cuckoo dormers with pitched roof forms and to the rear there would be a box-style dormer with a flat roof form. A detailed material specification has not been provided.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

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

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS):

SD1 Delivering sustainable development
DM1 General development requirements

SO1 Delivering a more prosperous economy

E2 Increasing jobs and prosperity

SO3 Improving design, image and quality of place

P1 Improving image

P3 Improving design of new development

SO5 Improving accessibility and delivering sustainable transport

T2 Improving accessibility

Unitary Development Plan (UDP):

G/D/1 Defined Urban Area

G/R/1 Central and East Heywood Physical Regeneration Area

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):

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

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

96/D33242 Single Storey Rear Extension To Restaurant
Granted STC (July 1996)

95/D31963 Conservatory Extension To Rear Of Restaurant
Granted STC (June 1995)

91/D26782 Construction Of Two Tiled Canopies Above Shopfront.
Granted STC (July 1991)

80/D11590 Change Of Use From Betting Office To Shop
Granted STC (November 1980)

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Highways And Engineering - No objections.

Env Health - Noise/Odours - No objections.

REPRESENTATIONS

Letters of notification were sent to all surrounding properties and a notice posted in the vicinity of the site. No responses were received.

ANALYSIS

Principle of Development

The application site is allocated as Defined Urban Area under the Rochdale Unitary Development Plan. Policy G/D/1 is therefore relevant to any applications on the site and in the supporting text to this policy it is established that new development should be located in the urban area, so as to support urban regeneration and to protect the countryside.

Use Class E

Policy E1 of the adopted Core Strategy seeks to focus retail, leisure, cultural, office, residential and other development to promote the viability and vitality of all the borough's town centres to maintain them as thriving and sustainable centres. In considering proposals for main town centre uses, where the application site is not in an existing centre and not in accordance with an up to date development plan, Policy E1 requires the submission of a sequential approach, as out of centre development will only be acceptable when there are no suitable sites in, or on the edge, or well connected to, the town centre, district centres or local centres and to demonstrate that the proposal would cause no significant overall impact on the existing centres vitality and viability.

The site falls outside of the formal Town Centre boundary, as set out under saved UDP Policy G/S/1, which terminates along Hartley Street 55m west of the site, and also falls outside of any local centres also set out under this Policy. The applicant has also not provided a sequential assessment of alternative sites to demonstrate that there are no alternative sites suitable for the commercial element of the proposed development.

However, given the lawful commercial use which the site benefits from and the proximity of the site to the town centre, it is considered that the introduction of an additional commercial use at first floor level would positively impact the overall vitality and viability of Heywood Town Centre, and would accord with the requirements of Policy E1 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Design and Appearance

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF requires new development to be “visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping” in addition to ensuring that development is “sympathetic to local character.”

Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE) requires new development to be distinctive with a clear identity that: “Respects and acknowledges the character and identity of the locality in terms of design, siting, size, scale and materials used.”

Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted 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 host building sits within a varied street scene characterised by a mixture of building heights and architectural styles. Given the variations in building heights it is not considered that the proposed increase in ridge height would result in harm to the character of the street scene.

Section 5.16 of the SPD notes “dormer extensions can be visually prominent, particularly where they can be seen from the public highway, and therefore it is important they are carefully designed and sited. Dormers to the front elevation will not normally be permitted. Rear dormers should be modest in size and not occupy a disproportionately large portion of the roof.” Section 5.17 expands on this with the following principles:

- (i) *“They should not exceed the height of the ridge and where possible, should be sited below the ridge line of dwelling;*
- (ii) *They should be set back from the eaves line;*
- (iii) *They should be set in from the party/side walls of the house;*
- (iv) *Dormers with flat roofs should be avoided, unless they are considered to better respect the design of the host building and character of the area;*
- (v) *Dormers which wrap around the side of a hipped roof are not acceptable;*
- (vi) *Dormer windows should normally line up vertically with existing windows and/or be smaller than existing openings and the window design should match the existing window style;*
- (vii) *The materials used in the construction of dormers should match those of the existing roof; and*
- (viii) *Dormer extensions should protect the amenity of neighbouring occupants and should achieve the minimum space standards set out in Section 4. Side facing windows should be obscurely glazed.”*

While the SPD discourages front dormers, the local authority must be mindful of the surrounding context. As noted above, there is a distinct lack of uniformity to development along the street, meaning the proposed dormers would likely appear inconspicuous within their setting. Furthermore, the dormers would comply with the guidance contained within Section 5.17 of the SPD and they would not dominate the front roof slope. While no details have been provided regarding the materials for the dormer walls, a condition is recommended to ensure the submission of a detailed material specification prior to construction.

While the proposed rear dormer would have a flat roof form, it is noted that this aspect would have limited public visibility. Notwithstanding, the rear dormer would set in from the side walls and would have a modest overall scale.

Subject to the submission of satisfactory details regarding materials in accordance with the attached condition, it is considered that the proposed dormers would constitute a satisfactory standard of design that would not unduly harm the character of the host building or the street scene.

The remaining alterations, namely to the existing shop front, are considered to be relatively minor and would not be detrimental to the existing character of the building

In addition to the above, the plans also indicate the installation of signage. Ad

The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with CS Policies DM1 and P3, PfE Policy JP-P1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity Standards and Noise Impacts

Policy DM1 of the adopted Core Strategy requires all development proposals to demonstrate that they will not have a negative impact upon the amenities of existing and future residents and occupiers. As with Policy DM1, PfE Policy JP-P1, the SPD and the NPPF are concerned with high standards of residential amenity and they are relevant to the current proposals.

The proposed dormer extensions would comply with the projection limits for first floor extensions set out in Section 5.9 of the SPD. Therefore, it is not considered that the proposed dormer extensions would result in an undue loss of light or outlook for the adjacent flats. Moreover, the proposed first floor windows are not considered to result in a loss of privacy for any nearby dwellings given the suitable levels of separation.

Further, given the existing lawful use of the site it is not considered that the activity associated with an office use at first floor level would result in harmful levels of noise.

On this basis, it is considered that the proposal would have an acceptable impact on the amenities of existing and future residents and occupiers, in accordance with CS Policy DM1, PfE Policy JP-P1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways

Policy T2 of the adopted Core Strategy seeks to improve accessibility by locating development where good access to public transport is available or can be provided and in all circumstances prioritises the safety, accessibility and amenity of those who live or have business in the area. Policy DM1 also states that all development proposals should provide satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking, manoeuvring, and servicing arrangements taking into account the proposed use and location. Paragraph 116 of the NPPF states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios.

The proposals seek to introduce additional commercial space close to a highly sustainable town centre location, where existence without the use of private vehicles would be very realistic. Accordingly, the absence of any formal parking provision is accepted.

The application has been reviewed by the Council's Highways Engineer who has raised no objections to the proposals.

Accordingly, it is considered that the omission of any formal parking arrangements would not adversely impact public and highway safety and the application would accord with the requirements of CS Policies DM1 and T2 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:

Site Location Plan. Dated 01/11/2024

Existing & Proposed Plans and Elevations. Dwg no. 2891_HEY_01_Planning

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 saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan, the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. Notwithstanding any description of materials in the application no above ground construction works shall take place until samples and / or full specifications of materials to be used externally on the building(s) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. For the avoidance of doubt, such details shall include the type, colour and texture of the materials to be used externally on the building. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and in compliance with policies P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, policy JP-P1 of the 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.

Report Author Bob Melling

