



JAMES CAMPBELL ASSOCIATES
CHARTERED ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES
WWW.JAMESCAMPBELLASSOCIATES.CO.UK



Campbell House
173 Rochdale Road
Firgrove
Rochdale
OL16 3BN

Tel: 01706 354888
Mob: 07817623183
email: admin@jamescampbellassociates.co.uk
Web: www.jamescampbellassociates.co.uk

Date: 24th August 2022

Our ref: 21.2445
Your ref:

SITE HISTORY AND PROPOSAL STATEMENT

REGULARISATION OF INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL CHANGES TO PREVIOUSLY APPROVED STABLE AND GARAGE BUILDING TO FORM STORAGE AND GARAGE BUILDING

INTRODUCTION

This document has been completed to support the submission of the Planning Application to regularise the existing building works found at 1 Stoneyhead, Higher Calderbrook Road. This document should be read in conjunction with the submitted plans and other documentation. The aim of this document is to provide a full and clear evaluation of the history of the site following the approved planning application in 2011 (11D54242) including subsequent applications following the approval.

PLANNING HISTORY

2011 – Householder Planning Application – Erection Of Detached Double Garage And 2NO Stables - Grant Subject to Conditions

2016 – Householder Planning Application – Erection of a detached single storey building to form garage and two stables - Grant Subject to Conditions

More recent applications have been submitted relating to the conversion of the existing building to form a dwelling which have been refused. This document and the application supported by this document does not relate to any application following 2016 and therefore does not consider any application following the 2016 approval to be relevant to the existing building.

PROPOSAL/ALTERATIONS TO 2016 APPROVAL DRAWINGS

The previous proposal is for the erection of a double garage structure with attached stable building. The garage structure was proposed to be fitted with a double garage door facing the main site access off Salley Street. The eastern elevation sits close to the site boundary by approx. 3m and does not provide windows or doors throughout the elevation. The north facing elevation provides a single window to the centre of the gable. The western elevation provides 2 windows servicing the garage area with two tall stable doors.

The as built structure, fenestrations and overall design is in line with both 2011 and 2016 approvals with minor differences in ridge height, window heights and design and door location but is principally in line with the approved plans.

Internally the as built structure has been altered from the 2016 approved plans by removing the partition between the stables allowing for a large store room and w.c area. A single stable door has been installed with the second door being installed but blocked up from the inside, this has been completed in order to remain in line with the elevations submitted and approved in 2016. Additionally a small service staircase has been installed within the garage area leading to a large store area over the garage. These

two alterations have been implemented due to the applicant's change in circumstances following the previous approval in 2016 and the store rooms are now required to store gardening equipment and furniture as well as occupational equipment and materials.

Externally, previously approved drawings illustrate a sloping ground level along the western elevation. The sloping ground level has since been levelled in order to provide access to main area of the site. As a result the higher ground level on the site now forms a raised hardstanding area accessed by steps from the main dwelling. Additional external changes include the inclusion of a roller shutter door to the garage area where previous approvals proposed one large garage door.

CONCLUSION

The 2016 application for the erection of the building in question had been submitted in order to address the issues relating to the, at the time, partially built structure not being built in line with the approved drawings from 2011. Case officer at the time Joseph Nanson conducted a site inspection and concluded the following in relation to the issues raised regarding the incomplete building in 2016:

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding neighbours and objections have been received from three individuals at two addresses. A summary of the points raised and the officer's response can be read below:

1. The building is not built in accordance with the original permission.

Officers Response: This is correct, when the matter was raised to the LPA the enforcement service contacted the applicant to advise that a further application was required due to the differences between the building on site and the approved plans. This application now seeks to regularise the alterations from the approved plans of planning application 11/D54242.

2. The application is misleading compared to the building on site, regarding the height/overall size and placement in relation to the adjacent property/trees/land boundaries.

Officers Response: The officer is satisfied that the plans submitted with this application reflect the building currently under construction at the site, and the partially constructed building could be completed in accordance with the plans submitted with this application.

3. The building has increased in height over the previous approval

Officers Response: The plans submitted with this application include an increase in height of the building. On the previously approved plans the building measured 4.6m in height, the plans submitted with this application propose a building measuring 5.1m in height at the east gable end. However the reason for the increase in height of the building is that the previous plans showed the ground which the building would be built upon to be level, whilst this application shows the land on a decline which corresponds with what the officer observed on site. Consequently although the building may be taller it is not actually any higher in relation to adjacent structures. This is evidenced by the fact that the west gable end of the building on the proposed plans and the previously approved plans both measure 4.3m in height and 2.5m to the eaves. Therefore the building does measure taller at the east gable end but is not actually any higher in comparison to adjacent structures than the previously approved building.

4. The new building is overdevelopment of the site coupled with previous alterations to the existing property.

Officers Response: The principle of the development has been established by the grant of the previous permission and that permission remains extant, meaning the applicant could complete construction of the building in accordance with the approved plans of that permission. The current building proposed by this application does not differ significantly in terms of scale, footprint and position. Therefore it would not be reasonable to refuse permission on grounds of overdevelopment as a very similar building has been granted permission and could be constructed under the previous planning permission.

5. The building is not compatible with the historic rural character of the area.

Officers Response: The officer has agreed materials with the applicant to ensure the building is as compatible as possible with the surrounding area.

6. The internal roof construction is not in accordance with the approved plans, and the revised roof construction could allow the roof space to be used as a second storey to the building.

Officers Response: The roof on southern section had been bordered out so the officer couldn't see construction detail of this section of roof. The northern section was still open and was constructed with trusses as per the section drawing submitted with the current application.

7. The building has a detrimental impact on neighbouring properties (9, 11 and 13 Salley Street) by adding to flood risk and overshadowing of adjacent recreational/agricultural land.

Officers Response: Please see response to point 4, the principle of a building in this location has been established by planning application 11/D54242. Development has commenced under that permission and a building of almost identical scale and position can be constructed under that permission. Consequently it would not be appropriate to refuse this application on the basis of residential amenity or flooding.

8. The roof covering referred to on the plans is second hand blue slate, however the slate used appears to be new slate.

Officers Response: The officer has visited the site and is satisfied the slate used is in accordance with the previous permission. A condition has been added to this permission requiring the use of reclaimed blue slate.

9. The height has not been provided but the objector estimates it to be 5.3m. UK government planning portal website states outbuildings should have a maximum eaves height of 2.5m and maximum overall height of 4m, the objector estimates height of application building to be approximately 6m.

Officers Response: The dimensions which the objector is referring to is the requirements for permitted development under Schedule 2 Part 1 Class E of the GPDO for outbuildings in residential curtilage. These are the requirements which would need to be adhered

to, for a building to qualify as permitted development and not require planning permission. In this case the applicant has applied for planning permission. The plans show the proposed building to be approximately 5.1m in height and the officer is satisfied this is accurate to the building on site.

10. Elements of the construction indicate a residential use is intended in future, which would have additional stresses on amenities and services.

Officers Response: If the applicant sought to use the building for a use which was not ancillary to the main dwellinghouse of the site, planning permission would be required. The Council must determine this application on its merits.

11. The building appears larger than on submitted plans and closer to the boundary with neighbouring land.

Officers Response: Please see response to point 3 regarding the size of the property. The officer is satisfied the proposed plans accurately reflect the position of the building on site.

12. There are many large evergreen trees which aren't accounted for on the application.

Officers Response: There are no tree preservation orders at or adjacent to the application site. When the site was visited there were evergreen trees in place adjacent to the building which appeared unaffected by the building. Again with the officers response to previous points, a building can be constructed of this scale and position under permission 11/D54242 therefore the impact on adjacent trees is not an appropriate reason to refuse this application.

13. External walls and foundations have not been built in accordance with the approved plans, the objector goes on to detail several changes to wall thickness and stonework heights.

Officers Response: The wall construction observed when the officer visited site appeared to be in accordance with the proposed plan, however the officer is not a building surveyor and therefore does not have expertise in this area. Regardless of this planning is primarily concerned with the scale and external appearance of the building, therefore alterations in the internal construction of the walls of the building would not be a reason to refuse planning permission.

14. The construction as a whole has been carried out with residential use in mind.

Officers Response: Please see response to point 10.

From the above it is clear that issues raised by neighbours regarding scale, location and use have been accepted and dealt with under the 2016 Planning Approval. The 2016 Planning Approval included 5 conditions with condition 5 requiring submission of additional details prior to first use of the garage, the additional details required related to drainage and construction / layout of the turning head which were submitted and accepted within application 19/00304/DOC.

Since the 2019 discharge of conditions approval, the construction works have been completed along with the drainage and turning head implemented on site. The regularisation of the building currently on site and the works completed to enable the turning head etc. have been completed in line with the previously approved drawings.

This application therefor seeks approval for the internal and external changes to the previously approved application. The removal of the stable rooms to enable a storage area for gardening equipment and separate W.c is considered appropriate given the location of the applicant's garden in conjunction with the main dwelling and the lack of easily accessible storage to the main garden areas. Additionally the new roof space storage area has been implemented to remove work equipment and materials being stored on site in plain view from the street. The new roof storage area has been installed following the 2016 approval and as such has not had an impact on the building from a scale aspect and therefore is considered to be an appropriate use of the roof space. A roller shutter installed to the garage opening has been implemented to secure the garage and storage areas. Lastly the raised hardstanding area forming level access to the rear storage room is considered appropriate due to the level difference being formed by the natural ground level change. The on-site hardstanding area has not been raised or altered in any way to increase the ground level and instead a retaining wall has been implemented to allow for better access towards the front of the garage building.

Taking the above into consideration, the external and internal changes have had a minimal impact to the original approval in 2011 and the subsequent approval in 2016; fundamentally the use of the building as a garage and store area is in line with acceptable uses for new outbuildings within the green belt.