

Application Number:	23/00556/HOUS
Location:	Fold Cottage Ashworth Road Heywood Rochdale OL11 5UP
Proposal:	Installation of an Air Source Heat Pump to the rear ground floor elevation
Applicant:	Ms Kate Scott C/o Easybuild Solutions
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?	NO

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

Location

Fold Cottage is a late 1800's two storey detached residence sited within a small agricultural hamlet along with the grade II listed pig sties which adjoins to the property's western elevation and is within the cottage's ownership. The cottage is located within the Ashworth Fold Conservation Area and designated Green Belt land. There are a number of designated heritage assets located in proximity to Fold Cottage along Ashworth Road. A blanket TPO (TPO 010) covers a large expanse of the area however, historic TPO surveys reveals this blanket TPO relates to individual trees and not all trees in the area.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for the installation of an air source heat pump to the rear elevation of the property. The placement will be to the right hand side of the rear elevation next to the ground floor patio doors.

The Air Source Heat Pump specifications are as follows:

Samsung AE080RXYDGG

Dimensions: 1m (Height) x 1m (Length) x 0.4m (Depth)

Relevant History

85/D17952

Alterations to outbuildings to form garage and garden store/workshop

Withdrawn October 1985

88/D21791

New garage to replace existing

Granted August 1988

90/D25484 Front porch to dwellinghouse
Granted February 1991

95/D32272 Conservatory to rear of cottage
Refuse November 1995
(Cannot locate original decision notice)

95/D32273 Conservatory to rear of listed building
Not Development 1995

00/D38149 Conservatory extension to dwelling
Withdrawn November 2000

04/D43864 Erection of detached garage / carport structure
Refuse August 2004

1. *Policy EN/32 (Tree Preservation Orders) of the adopted UDP states that – No work of any nature should be carried out within the crown spread of a tree affected by a Tree Preservation Order, which could possibly affect the trees health. Part of the proposed garage/car port would be underneath the crown spread of T191 of TPO 010 and therefore this would put the protected trees in danger of being damaged. The construction of the detached garage/car port in this position would not constitute good arboricultural practice and would unacceptably harm the trees health. The proposed development is therefore contrary to the provisions of Policies EN/40 and EN/32 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan.*

04/D44610 Erection of detached garage / carport structure (Resubmission of D43864)
Granted January 2001

PREAPP/00007/20 Pre-application advice for various proposed alterations, cladding and single or two storey rear extensions to existing dwelling.
Closed Aug 2020

Township/Member comments

None Applicable

Consultee responses

Tree Officer

No response received at time of writing

Environmental Health

I've found some other bits with the specific sound power levels on that I needed, I've done some calculations and we would have no concerns from a noise point of view.

Conservation and Design

The application site consists of Fold Cottage and the grade II listed pig sties which lie within the cottage's ownership. The site is within the Ashworth Fold Conservation

Area. Given the location and the proximity of a number of designated heritage assets, the proposal has the potential to impact on their significance.

Where development has the potential to affect the significance of a heritage asset, a heritage statement is required (NPPF paragraph 194). The application is accompanied by a heritage statement. This refers to the Conservation Area, but makes no mention of the adjacent listed buildings, including the pig sties, which are within the site's red line boundary. There is also no evidence that the historic environment record has been consulted, which is a minimum requirement for heritage statements. An updated heritage statement is needed, which meets the requirements of NPPF paragraph 194.

The proposal is for the installation of a new air source heat pump along the rear elevation of the building. Air source heat pumps tend to be utilitarian in appearance and can have a visual impact on the setting of heritage assets. However, in this case, the pump would be discreetly positioned, would be a relatively small size and would not be readily visible from public viewpoints. For these reasons, the proposed location is considered to be acceptable.

Fold Cottage adjoins the grade II listed pig sties and are within the same ownership. The extent of any new services and wiring for the pump needs to be clarified. If any services would affect the listed pig sties, then listed building consent is likely to be required.

This needs to be clarified before final comments can be provided. However, if no works are proposed to the pig sties, then any harm to the significance of the designated heritage assets would be at the lower end of less than substantial, due to the very minor visual impact. The provision of renewable energy provides clear public benefits, which would outweigh the level of less than substantial harm identified.

Subject to the above comments and further details, the proposal is likely to be acceptable.

Officer Note: Following clarification from the agent via an updated heritage statement, the Conservation Officer was re-consulted to which the below response was received:

It has been sufficiently clarified that no wiring/services for the pump will directly affect the listed pig sties, therefore this proposal is acceptable.

Representations

Letters of representation were sent to surrounding properties. A site notice was also posted in close proximity to the property. No public comments were received.

Policy **National**

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Local

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:
G/D/2 Green Belt

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016:

The Rochdale Core Strategy was adopted on 19th October 2016. The following policies are relevant:

SD1	Delivering Sustainable Development
DM1	General Development Requirements
P2	Protecting and enhancing character, landscape and heritage
P3	Improving Design of New Development

SO3 To improve design, image and quality of place

SO4 Promoting a greener environment

G1	Tackling and adapting to climate change
G2	Energy and new development
G3	Renewable and low carbon energy development
G4	Protecting Green Belt
G7	Increasing the Value of biodiversity

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD): Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016).

Amendments

Aforementioned above, an updated heritage statement was obtained from the agent in order to satisfy the consultation from the Conservation Officer to clarify no work is proposed to the adjoining listed pig sties which would therefore warrant an alternative application for Listed Building Consent (LBC).

Assessment

Principle of Development

Paragraph 152 of the NPPF sets out that the planning system should support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate by shaping places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and encouraging the reuse of existing resources, including the conversion of existing buildings.

Policy G3 of the Core Strategy establishes that the Council will support renewable and low carbon energy developments but establishes that any such proposal must avoid harm to the health and safety of the public. It also requires that any harm to the following must be minimised and appropriately mitigated:

- The visual character and quality of the landscape or townscape and the physical record of the historic and cultural evolution of the landscape.
- The setting of heritage assets
- Local residents and their amenity
- Biodiversity
- The value of the borough's peatlands as an ecological and hydrological resource and as a carbon sink
- The value of the surrounding area for relaxation and recreation
- Water quality
- Land which is used for water catchment purposes
- Highway safety

Paragraph 149 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:

- (a) buildings for agriculture and forestry;

(b) the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;

(c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;

(d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;

(e) limited infilling in villages;

(f) limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exception sites); and

(g) Limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would:

- ❑ not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or
- ❑ not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority

The proposal is considered to be an alteration, as permitted in principle by paragraph c) highlighted above. In terms of proportionality noted in para c), the SPD permits a 35% increase over and above the original dwelling in relation to volume and footprint.

Whilst the dwelling appears to have been previously extended, its original size has not been definitively established. However, with reference to historical mapping it does not appear to have been substantially extended beyond its original size by previous additions. The ASHP is negligible in its overall additional volume in comparison to that already approved and implemented and does therefore not contribute to the Green Belt calculations for this property and in total would not result in disproportionate additions. Further, the development is not considered to compromise the spatial nor visual aspect of the Green Belt and is also not considered to have any negative impact to the openness of the land due to the limited scale and siting on the rear of the dwelling. The heat pump is therefore considered to be an appropriate form of development in the Green Belt.

Paragraph 151 states “When located in the Green Belt, elements of many renewable energy projects will comprise inappropriate development. In such cases developers will need to demonstrate very special circumstances if projects are to proceed. Such very special circumstances may include the wider environmental benefits associated with increased production of energy from renewable sources”

A heat loss report has been submitted alongside the application to illustrate the benefits of the installation of an ASHP in this location therefore the approval of the proposal would go some way in reducing the heat demand of the dwelling by allowing temperature control to be fulfilled with a reduced dependency on externally sourced electricity and gas. Where the report identifies the benefits of the addition of an ASHP, VSC's put forward are considered for the proposal to not be identified as

inappropriate development in relation to paragraph 152 of the NPPF and policy G2 of the Rochdale Core Strategy.

Taking all of the above into consideration in reference to principle of development within a well-defined parcel of the Green Belt, by virtue of the above assessment, the proposal is considered to be compliant with paragraph 149 and 151 of the NPPF as circumstances outlined in supporting reports identify the primary benefits of decreased dependency on external sources for the provision of gas and electric supplied to the dwelling therefore is considered to contribute to national policy, targets and requirements for this type of development and the ASHP is not considered to contribute to disproportionate additions and is therefore acceptable in principle.

Design and Heritage: DM1, P2 and P3

Policies DM1 and P3 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy requires development proposals to adhere to high quality design and 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, paragraphs 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) state that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Paragraph 130 goes on to state that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping and are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change.

Paragraph 199 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.'*

The property lies within Ashworth Fold Conservation Area where a Grade II listed building adjoins to Fold Cottage and is within the same ownership. The ASHP would be modest in scale and discreet in siting given it is to the rear of the dwelling which faces onto open agricultural fields which is not subject to any development therefore not considered to be within any significant public vantage points. The submitted heritage statement clarifies the adjoining pig sites will not be affected by the proposal therefore no concerns are raised in this regard.

The character of the surrounding area, being primarily residential and agricultural use, would be compatible with the proposed ASHP. The scale of the proposed development in the vast context of the dwelling and surrounding land uses would also ensure that the proposal would read as a relatively unobtrusive addition and it is not considered that it would therefore unduly harm the character or appearance of the dwelling or surrounding area and the proposals would comply with Policies DM1, and P3 of the adopted Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

Core Strategy policy DM1 requires all development proposals to demonstrate that they will not have a negative impact upon the amenity of future residents and occupiers. Policy G9 requires that sensitive new developments such as housing are not adversely affected by existing sources of pollution, including noise, from certain types of industry. Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework advises

that planning decisions should result in places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. The Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document '*Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development*' (2016) contains a number of guidelines and requirements for the design and layout of new housing in order to preserve the amenity standards for surrounding residents.

The proposed development is of a siting, scale and design which would not threaten the amenity of surrounding land users by way of overbearing impact, overshadowing or through a loss of privacy.

As identified via a consultation from Environmental Health, by virtue of its modest scale, the ASHP is not considered to present any issues in relation to noise given Fold Cottage is sited within a mixed use hamlet to which residential development is present.

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

Trees: G7

Paragraph 131 of the NPPF states "Trees make an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments, and can also help mitigate and adapt to climate change".

A blanket TPO covers the immediate and wider area. Historical maps, including TPO surveys, indicate this blanket TPO does not relate to all trees in this vicinity and rather individual trees.

An arboricultural method statement has been submitted for review. It states no works to any surrounding trees are required for the installation of the proposal therefore no concern is raised in this regard.

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:-
 - Location Plan
 - FC/PL/23/002 Existing Ground Floor Layout
 - FC/PL/23/001A Proposed Plans and Elevationsand the development shall be carried out in complete accordance with these drawings hereby approved.

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.

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	15.12.2023	Signed: CP
Authorisation	19.12.2023	Signed: TH

Report Author Chelsea Petrillo