

APPLICATION NUMBER: 23/00821/HOUS

Application Number:	23/00821/HOUS
Location:	5 Beaumonts Meadowcroft Lane Rochdale OL11 5HN
Proposal:	Single storey front porch
Applicant:	Peter Harris
Case Officer:	Chelsea Petrillo
Recommendation:	Grant subject to conditions

DELEGATION	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	NO
	Contrary to previous decision?	NO
	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	NO

COMMENTS	Planning Panel comments received?	NO
	Neighbour comments received?	YES

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	NO
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N/A

Location

5 Beaumonts is a two storey residence forming 1/5th of the sub-divided units which collectively form the historic 19th century Beaumonts estate. The estate itself is located on a private road off Meadowcroft Lane to the north of Bury Road and is of Gothic style with traditional historic qualities which still form part of the buildings fabric and architectural interest today. The industrialist villa is listed on the Heritage Environment Record and is subsequently identified as a Non-Designated Heritage Asset by Rochdale Council, wholly within the defined urban area, as allocated under UDP policy G/D/1.

The units feature a variation in orientations with the principal elevation of no.5 facing north, previously the rear of Beaumonts. The front elevation of no.5 features stone-built twin-gables and is sited directly adjacent to the previous coach house, now residential units.

Owing to its rear location of Beaumonts, no.5 is heavily shielded from public viewpoints along both Bury Road and Meadowcroft Lane to which substantial foliage runs along the boundary, protected by a blanket TPO (113). Parking is informally facilitated to the front of the property with additional parking available within the grounds of the shared courtyard.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a stone-built front porch hosting a pitched roof and a projection of 2.3m. The proposed width of the porch would be 2.8m and hosts a

vertical window to the western elevation with a maximum height of 3.5m. Plans indicate the existing door is to be retained and relocated to the front of the porch and the existing canopy is to be omitted from the house.

Relevant History

<u>91/D26843</u>	Change of use from elderly person's home to residential Granted July 1991
<u>91/D26844</u>	Change of use from elderly persons home to offices Withdrawn May 1993
<u>91/D26845</u>	Change of use from elderly persons home to single dwelling Granted July 1991
<u>91/D26846</u>	Change of use from elderly persons home to single dwelling Granted July 1997
<u>91/D26848</u>	Change of use from elderly persons home to nursery Withdrawn May 1993
<u>92/D28638</u>	Demolition of the dwelling and the redevelopment if the site with six dwellinghouses Refused February 1993 1. The proposed development involves the demolition of a large, stone-built, detached building which stands in its own grounds of mature landscape, and the redevelopment of the site with six dwellinghouses. The loss of this building and the subsequent redevelopment would destroy the historical link which the building has with the area; would result in the loss of a building which contributes to the appearance and character of the area; would severely affect the open break afforded by the attractive landscaped gardens; and would generally detract from the amenity of the area
<u>93/D29266</u>	Two storey extensions to rear and side of dwelling Granted August 1993
<u>94/D31040</u>	Variation of condition 03 on planning permission D26843 to allow conversion of property to 5 dwelling units (previously maximum of 4 dwelling units) and formation of new access from Bury Road Granted October 1994
<u>94/D30921</u>	Renewal of decision D26843 to use property as residential flats Granted November 1994
<u>95/31838</u>	Conservatory and two storey extension to dwelling including demolition of existing single storey building Granted May 1995

Township/Member comments

None Applicable

Consultee responses

Conservation and Design

It is noted the Conservation Officer has been consulted on various occasions throughout the process of obtaining an acceptable set of amended plans.

25-09-2023

Beaumonts is registered on the Historic Environment Record and has been identified as a non-designated heritage asset. Beaumonts is depicted on the 1890s OS map:

Earlier maps show another structure on the site. It is not clear whether the existing building incorporates an earlier structure.

In order to meet the requirements of NPPF para 194 a heritage statement is required. As a minimum the historic environment record should be consulted and the statement should be written by a suitably qualified and experienced heritage professional.

This is required, so that the impact of the development can be properly assessed. Once received, please re-consult.

06-11-2023

In terms of the scale of the overall extension, location and effect on the building at large, the proposed porch extension would have some negative impact on the significance of the NDHA, and on the basis of paragraph 203 of the NPPF, the local authority has a duty to take a balanced judgement on the scale of any harm to or loss of significance.

As mentioned in the heritage statement appended, the rear of the building was remodelled sometime before 1928. This means that any extant fabric is of a significant age and presents a key insight into the structure's historical development. The addition of the proposed would serve to obscure the building's fabric and create an odd relationship with the windows at either side. A porch in this position is, therefore, not agreeable.

27-11-2023

The plans indicate that the rainwater pipe will be shortened to accommodate the new porch. They need to specify that on the plans and also specify the material of any new/replacement water goods they are going to instate to the roof of the porch. We will need to condition a method statement for the RWP's shortening but its overall retention.

They need to specify either cast iron or powder coated aluminum rainwater goods for any that need to be instated.

In terms of the reduction in size- that's ok. We can condition all materials of the extension stating that they need to put natural locally sourced yorkstone on and the roof needs to be slate detailed with lead. We can condition details of the window but should specify that it's timber framed.

In terms of the door, I'm happy for them to remove the door from its present location to the front of the porch, but this may be a bit of a nonsense as they will then need to put a new door in place of the present one. So- if they would rather come up with a design for a new external door it needs to be in timber and of a similar style to its surroundings. Alternatively, if they do want to put the new door in the place of the old one, we can ask that this also be in timber and to provide details via condition.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding neighbours and a site notice was posted on entrance to the Beaumonds vicinity. Two letters of objection were received.

Objection Letters

- Scale of porch disproportionate to size of existing unit
- Porch projection too long

Officer Response The design of the proposal is considered under the “Design” section of the report. Any unacceptable design concerns which were considered to impact upon the visual amenity of both the dwelling and setting have been addressed with the agent prior to writing this report

- Loss of light
- Reduced sunlight
- Tunneling effect
- Overshadowing of neighbouring properties
- Porch would alter surrounding properties view of courtyard

Officer Response Impact to residential amenity is considered under the ‘Amenity’ section of the report

- Presence of porch would force parked cars to encroach the shared courtyard

Officer Response Impact to the highways and any existing parking arrangements are considered under the “Highways” section of the report

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

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:

P2 Protecting and Enhancing Character, Landscape and Heritage

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

The proposed development has been amended a number of times as a result of a lengthy period of negotiation between the agent and case officer.

Notably, the amendments made have been regarding unsympathetic additions where it was considered certain design elements were not appropriate in this particular setting given the presence of the Heritage asset and its historic significance. The projection distance of the porch has also been reduced as the initial projection was

considered disproportionate to the scale of the existing unit and Beaumonts as a collective.

Further details regarding the retaining of the existing cast iron RWP pipe, along with details of a new door in place of the existing were requested however, these will be provided via condition to be submitted at a later date.

Assessment

Design and Heritage: DM1, P2 and P3

Policies DM1 and P3 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy requires development proposals to demonstrate high quality design and enhance the boroughs 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;

Paragraph 205 of the NPPF states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

Paragraph 48 of the National Design Guide states well designed places and buildings are influenced positively by the significance and setting of heritage assets and any other specific features that merit conserving and enhancing.

It is considered that the proposed porch has been designed as such to principally respect the scale, design and form of the wider Beaumonts estate with regards to projection distances which are proportionally in keeping with the scale of the existing villa. When assessed in isolation, the porch is not considered to present any harm to the singular unit itself and does not seek to diminish the desirability and character of the residence. It is noted that whilst the off center siting of the porch is not preferable, on balance it is not considered to present such additional harm given the current siting of the existing door. Further to this, the impact of relocating the porch so it centrally aligns with the twin gables is considered to impact upon internal arrangements and the functionality of the space.

Aforementioned above, the unit is wholly screened from public viewpoints, including those along Bury Road which is considered to be the most prominent viewpoint to the front of the estate where the significance of the Heritage Asset is primarily captured therefore the addition of a porch to the rear is not considered to present any harm to the street scene given Beaumonts is located off a small private road. Whilst the porch would be visible upon entrance to the shared courtyard for residents residing in both Beaumonts and the adjacent Coach House, the presence of the porch is not considered to be one of which would raise concern and warrant further investigation given its sensible scale and siting relative to the wider estate.

The submitted planning application states the proposed material palette is to match that on the existing dwelling. However, in ensuring the external appearance is not compromised through the use of inappropriate materials and to ensure the external appearance seeks to not diminish the existing fabric of the building, a condition has been attached to the decision notice requiring details to be agreed by the LPA prior to the implementation of any work.

The design of the proposal is, on balance, an acceptable addition to the estate and would seeks to create a positive relationship between the buildings heritage and new development which is sympathetic to the external fabric of the building. The proposal

therefore accords with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

Residential amenity is considered under policy DM1 of the Core Strategy and the SPD. Policy DM1 states development proposals will be expected to demonstrate that they do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy;

In relation to surrounding occupiers, the adjoining unit to the east, no.4 Beaumonts, hosts the same principal elevation orientation as the application property. Where no.4 hosts its primary entrance to the property slightly east of the primary entrance of no.5 as well as a balcony above, the porch is not considered to be sited in such proximity it would create an overbearing impact by virtue of the 1.8m separation distance away from the eastern boundary. It is noted no.4 hosts a small window next to the front entrance door serving a kitchen however, given this is not a principal window as a set of large glazed double doors also serve this room to the east where it is considered this room would receive much of its light, the porch is not considered to be a concern in this regard. The internal floor layout at no.4 is also relatively open-plan on the ground floor therefore affords extra light from windows in surrounding rooms.

There is not considered to be any significant amenity impacts to the adjacent occupiers residing in the coach house by virtue of a 16.2m separation distance from the front elevation of the porch as well as those residing elsewhere in the Beaumonts vicinity.

Proposed floor plans indicate the porch would not impact upon occupier amenity given all habitable rooms would retain adequate light and outlook. The porch itself does not warrant amenity protection given it is not deemed a habitable room. Nonetheless, the porch hosts a window to the western elevation where natural light will be received.

Whilst it is acknowledged the porch would impede onto the units only outdoor amenity space, the space is of a sufficient size to be considered a functional amenity space noting the presence of the porch.

The proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

Appendix 5 of the adopted Core Strategy requires a maximum of two spaces per dwelling for 2+ bed dwellings outside of the town centre.

As of current, the existing parking arrangements at no.5 are informally facilitated to the front of the dwelling in the units only serving outdoor amenity space of which it does not accord with Core Strategy minimum parking dimensions. The presence of the porch is considered to impact upon this arrangement however, given the existing arrangement does not meet Council Standards, it is considered prudent to refuse the application on these grounds.

The application site lies on a relatively quiet residential estate with no through access to surrounding highways therefore it is not considered for the porch to present any undue impacts to public or highway safety.

The proposed block plan does not indicate the porch would encroach onto the shared courtyard and will remain wholly within the outdoor garden space at no.5.

The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1.

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 and documents:-

- Location Plan
- 23.3160.2B Existing and Proposed Block Plans
- 23.3160.1D Existing and Proposed Details

and the development shall be carried out in complete 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, the saved Rochdale Unitary 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 specification of materials to be used externally on the building(s) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include the type, colour and texture of the materials. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and they shall be retained as approved thereafter.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. Should the central rainwater downpipe need to be altered to accommodate the proposed porch, a method statement shall be submitted in writing to and approved in writing by the LPA prior to the commencement of these works.

This statement should include the tools to be used, qualifications of those undertaking the work, and measures to ensure no undue damage will be incurred on historical fabric. The person(s) employed should be a suitably qualified blacksmith or heritage professional with experience working with cast iron; this person should also be commissioned to write the required statement. The works shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved method statement.

Reason: In order to preserve the historic fabric and architectural quality of the Non-Designated Heritage asset in accordance with policies P2, P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the National Planning Policy Framework.

Article 35 Statement

The Local Planning Authority worked proactively with the applicant to identify various solutions during the application process to ensure that the proposal comprised sustainable development and would improve the economic, social and environmental

conditions of the area and would accord with the development plan. These were incorporated into the scheme and/or have been secured by planning condition.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	19.01.2024	Signed: CPetrillo
Authorisation	23.01.2024	Signed: L.Ashworth

Report Author Chelsea Petrillo