

Planning Department
Rochdale Borough Council
Floor 3 Number One Riverside
Smith Street
Rochdale OL16 1XU

Our Ref: d392 letter cl 250409
9th April 2025

Dear Sam

Re: 24/00522/HOUS Dean Cottage, Dean Bank Drive, Rochdale

Further to your letter and comments received from the Urban Design Consultation we have now had the opportunity to review the scheme with the client and produce the Heritage Statement requested following your proposal to spot list it on to your local register.

We would welcome your further feedback on the revised drawings and can amend elevations as required until we meet with your approval.

Excessive scale

- The proposed footprint of the building has been reduced by omitting a first-floor bedroom and reducing the width of the remaining rooms. This has reduced the length of the building by 2600mm.
- Width of the property is based on the required length of the vehicle using the garage which is designed based on the disability access requirements and cannot be reduced further.
- The gross internal footprint of the ground floor has been reduced from 157sq.m to 142.9sq.m. The gross internal footprint at first floor has been reduced from 112sq.m to 97.7sq.m.
- We have also provided a new drawing showing the existing and proposed elevation in context with the front elevation of Dean Cottage/Dean House. As acknowledged the visible part of the extension is 18m further back from the front of the house. As suggested, we have provided some landscape screening to help form a visual break between the elevation in the foreground and that in the background.
- Incidentally, the overlaid sketch added to the Urban Design report was incorrectly positioned and showed the extension some 3m further east than it should be. The section through the kitchen should not be visible on this elevation.

Detailing of elevation

The proposed single storey link that accommodates the kitchen has received little comment. The roof of this single storey element was dictated by the relatively low first floor windows of Dean Cottage (they are to rooms accessed off the half landing of the existing stair). This resulted in the eaves level of the single storey building being quite low. The kitchen window cill level is dictated by the height of worktops so in order to keep similar proportions to the existing fenestration windows were taken to eaves level and paired so as

to keep the verticality to the windows. This meant that no curved heads or feature lintels were provided to the link building. We were also aware of the two-storey element needing to look subservient and tried to keep the height as low as we could.

However, we have taken on board the comments of your Urban Design colleague and have amended the elevations as follows

- We have elevated the eaves by approximately 300mm in order to achieve better proportioned windows with the addition of curved heads and feature curved stone lintels.
- The ridge height has also been raised as a result of this
- The painted timber fascia boards have been removed and replaced with stone copings
- Stone quoins have been provided to the external corners of each of the three exposed gables.
- The rendered, square bay windows of the front of the original building have been borrowed for the projecting bay window to the new sitting room and bedroom2
- Curved window heads have been provided to all windows with stone arch lintels as the windows to the rear of Dean Cottage.
- Feature windows heads have been provided to the north facing and east facing gables
- The positions of some windows have altered in the two-storey extension following the removal of the bedroom.
- Omission of the roof lights to the west facing side of the kitchen extension

We hope this now achieves a more sensitive design that compliments the existing building but, we are more than happy to make further adjustments to the elevations if required to meet with the approval of your Urban Design team.

Green Belt

- We note your comment regarding the extension encroaching on to Green Belt land and the client has spoken to length to one of your colleagues regarding how to best detail this and we make the following argument
- The green bely boundary passes through the residential curtilage of the existing dwelling and we feel this has been arbitrarily drawn from a lesser scaled map and should have followed the existing site boundary
- The green belt policy came into effect around the 1980s and the owners have enjoyed the privileges of their residential curtilage since the property was built
- The part of the proposed extension that projects into the green belt is constructed on the existing line of the previous part demolished building that was on site. This building existed up until 2008 when severe weather damage led to a Section 77 (structures) Order being served by RMBC reference DB/08/641 dated 28/07/08. The existing substructure wall are still present and clearly visible on site.

Non- designated Heritage Asset

The client has appointed Ian Rowan to carry out a Heritage Impact Assessment which we have attached hereto.

Yours sincerely

Mike Wakeman

designworks