

Planning (Trees) and Conservation Comments Rebuttal

331 Shawclough Road

Rochdale

OL12 7HL

23/00669/HOUS | Two storey side extension including front and rear dormer and rear balcony extension following demolition of existing detached garage, single storey rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory, garage conversion including alteration to existing garage door, and addition of gable wall to first floor front elevation.

October 2022

Produced by: Mubeen Patel BA (Hons) MTPI MRTPI

Planning

The following Planning officer (Sam Yuen) comments have been received (a rebuttal/agreement is provided categorically under each comment);

- *Firstly, please can you give agreement to the following amended proposal description:*

“Two storey side extension including front and rear dormer and rear balcony extension following demolition of existing detached garage, single storey rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory, garage conversion including alteration to existing garage door, and addition of gable wall to first floor front elevation.”

In relation to the above change of description, this is considered acceptable and is agreed by the applicant.

- *Secondly, please can you verify the room annotations on the proposed first floor plan (drawing no. A102) and amend the plans where appropriate.*

Amended plans have now been submitted which are annotated to identify each room within the dwelling and extension where appropriate.

- *Finally, I appreciate my colleague at Validation has already been in discussion with you regarding this, however, given the proposed two-storey extension would be constructed close to the two existing trees within the curtilage of the property, a Tree Survey is required to assess any potential impacts of the proposal on the trees. This is a requirement as stated in our [Local List](#) and does not only apply to trees protected under Tree Preservation Orders. As such, the current application would be invalid until the Tree Survey is submitted.*

In response to the above comment. A tree survey has now been submitted to clarify the concerns raised and impact of the extension on the mentioned trees.

It should be noted that the proposed extension would be positioned in proximity to only one tree (T2). The other tree (T1) is positioned close to the front entrance of the dwelling and would not be impacted by the proposed extension.

In relation to T2, as identified on the image below, this would be closest to the extension. However, the tree survey has described this tree as an 'Unremarkable specimen showing signs of die back in crown, plus large wound in stem 2' from ground'.

In addition to the above description, the tree is positioned on higher ground level, whilst a retaining wall is positioned within the site to contain the soil and roots that surround the tree. Nevertheless, it is understood that roots can be found deep into the ground. However, in this instance, the tree survey has identified that the trees and roots are outside of the proposed footprint of the new extension. As such, no damage would be caused to the tree.

Furthermore, advice has also been provided from the arboricultural consultant to consider the removal of T2 due to the scarring of the tree and dying branches. However, this is not the intention as part of this application. The applicant currently holds value to the tree and the amenity it brings to the setting of the area and privacy for his dwelling. The applicant understands that the tree does not have a formal TPO and nor is it positioned within a Conservation Area, and therefore has no formal protection.



Image above clearly shows the distance between the proposed extension and T2. It should be acknowledged that the extension would be set back from the original front elevation of the dwelling. The proposed extension would also be positioned on the existing hardstanding of the driveway which is on a much lower ground level which leads to the detached garage.

The Tree Survey by 'Tree Link' and the justification provided above clearly provide sufficient information to consider that the proposed extension would have minimal impact on T2 with no impact on T1.

Conservation

The following Conservation officer comments have been received and a rebuttal is provided below;

Significance Assessment

The application site is across from and direct view of the Grade II listed Duffins Cottage. The Historic England listing reads:

"House. 1717 on tablet above former door. Coursed watershot stonework with stone slate roof and brick chimney stacks. 2-unit 2-storey plan with door openings to each unit (one blocked up) and a small C20 lean-to extension to the rear. Stone plinth and drip mould; 2 windows to each floor: 5-light recessed flush-faced mullion window to housepart, otherwise the mullions have been removed and a C20 porch added to the right unit."

The proposal is for a two storey side extension with garage to the front, and balcony to the rear at first floor level. The front elevation of the extension will also have a new dormer, and extend the boundaries of the building to just within the bounds of the holding.

The proposed features at the rear of the property would not have a direct effect on the significance of the heritage asset, Duffins Cottage, as it would not be directly facing the listed building and would be obscured from view at the surrounding streets - provided that the existing landscaping remains intact.

The front elevation, however, directly faces the listed building and has a direct impact on the significance of it. The overall scale and width of the extension is overbearing to the rest of the property and would create an imposing front elevation directly in the setting of the listed building, resulting in less than substantial harm. Therefore, it is proposed that the width is decreased to create a more subservient addition, which would read more clearly as an extension in width, height and scale. Resubmitted plans to this end are required prior to any recommendation for approval.

Certain features as proposed on the front elevation presently contribute to the imposing nature of the extension. The dormer dwarfs the present right side of the structure by mirroring the left gable end of the original structure. It occupies a large proportion of the roof space and is quite wide. It is therefore proposed that this dormer is decreased slightly in overall scale; plans to this end are required for resubmission prior to any recommendation for approval.

There are concerns, as well, relating to the appearance and material of the proposed garage door. It should be ensured that the garage door is in timber, and that any glazing patterns and overall detailing are chosen to be in keeping with external timber design features to properties in the area. The details of the garage door should be conditioned for approval prior to instatement.

The proposed materials of the extension are agreeable in principle. However, it should be required that all details of the stone to clad the exteriors and roofing material are submitted to and agreed upon with the LPA prior to instatement; any new materials should be chosen to be in keeping with materials to the rest of the property and the surrounding area. Additionally, cross-sectional detailing and product specifications of any and all new windows should be submitted to and agreed upon with the LPA prior to instatement.

There are concerns regarding the proposed width of the extension in relation to the landscaping of the property in general. The proposed extension would be in close proximity to the edge of the property, where there are presently 2 no. mature trees and a mature hedgerow. Both of these aspects of the property's landscaping contributes to the significance of the listed building directly across the street. Mature trees and hedgerows are characteristic of the listed asset's surroundings, therefore the loss of these would result in less than substantial harm to the building. There has been no explicit mention of the loss of the trees/hedgerow; clarification on this point is required. Further comment should be sought on the receipt of this information.

Additionally, there has been no mention of any changes or proposed materials to the surface treatments of the property; any new material should be in keeping with the surface treatments to the property at present and to the area generally. A landscaping plan is required to provide clarification on these points; further comment should be sought on the receipt of this information.

With respect to the proposed demolition of the present detached garage, no demolition plans have been provided, and the effect on any hedgerows/trees is not known. A demolition plan and further information to this end is required for submission prior to instatement; additional comments should be sought on the receipt of this information.

In relation to the observations and assessments made by the Conservation Officer. The officer states that the application site is in direct view of the Grade II listed Duffins Cottage. However, this loose comment is vague, please see below;



The above image shows that the two properties are clearly separated by Shawclough Road and therefore on opposite sides and where a distance of at least 41m is retained. Both the properties are set considerably back from the highway and positioned within their own respective settings, and within their own grounds. A number of trees/hedges/gates and boundary treatments along the highway limit views into these sites.

In addition to the above, Duffins Cottage has its gable facing the application site, whilst its main front elevation faces the adjacent property No. 258 Shawclough Road. Therefore, given the above, the relationship between the listed heritage asset and the application property is limited. It is also noted that the application property is not located within a Conservation Area.

Moving to the position, size, and design of the proposed extension to the side of the dwelling. In terms of the width of the extension, this would not extend beyond the outer footprint of the existing detached garage at the site. The proposed extension would not be overly large and dominant given the original size of the dwelling, and would be much smaller than half the width of the original

dwelling. The extension would be set back from the front elevation and would appear subordinate to the original dwelling and therefore well designed.

Also, the proposed extension given land levels would be positioned on ground lower than that of Throughbeck Way, whilst the hedge along this highway would be retained. In order to further reduce the extensions dominance and mass, the dormer has been reduced in size and set up from the eaves where the actual roof slope would be more evident.



The photo above shows the view from the application site towards the gable of the Listed Building Duffins Cottage. This shows that the Cottage is positioned set back and within its own grounds.

Please see image below which shows that the front elevation of Duffins Cottage faces directly No.258 Shawclough Road which has a similar designed large dormer extension on its roof.



Therefore, as evidenced, the proposed extensions and amended features to the side of the property would not have a direct effect on the significance of the heritage asset, Duffins Cottage, as it would be clearly separated whilst the Cottage itself would not be directly facing the application site and would be obscured from view by trees and landscaping which would be retained.

As such, the proportionately designed extension would not result in the direct impact on the significance of the listed building as stated within the Conservation officer's comments. The proposed width of the extension would not be overbearing given its positioning within the grounds of this substantial property. Also, the distance from the extension to the Listed Building is such that it cannot be read as imposing, the extension would not extend any further forwards of the front elevation, it would set back and set down so that it appears subordinate.

It should be acknowledged that the dormer element to the front has been decreased in overall scale.

In relation to the garage door and exact materials of the proposed extension, these can be conditioned as part of any approval, and further details can be provided as part of a conditions discharge application.

In relation to the trees and hedgerow. As stated above, both trees would be retained. In addition, the hedgerow would also be retained. The applicant values his garden and the amenity it provides including privacy. Nevertheless, the hedge can be removed separately without requiring planning approval if the applicant wishes.

In terms of the surface treatment within the property, this would remain unchanged (tarmac). A landscaping plan is not required or necessary given small scale extension and limited changes on site.

The demolition the existing garage does not on its own right require planning permission.

In light of the above, the proposal would result in no undue harm to visual amenity and would be acceptable to the overall character and appearance of the area and the street scene. The application would therefore accord in this regard with policies DM1 and P2, and the NPPF where it would have a neutral impact with no harm to the significance of the mentioned designated heritage asset Duffin Cottage.

Your Sincerely,

Mubeen Patel BA (Hons) MTPI MRTPI.