

Application Number:	23/00506/HOUS
Location:	2 Belfield Lawn, Milnrow, Rochdale, OL16 3AN
Proposal:	First floor extension to create two storey dwelling, including application of render and Juliette balcony to the rear elevation and the insertion of 2 new velux roof lights to existing rear ground floor elevation - Resubmission of 22/00699/HOUS
Applicant:	MR KIRK
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
Recommendation:	Grant subject to conditions

DELEGATION	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	N
	Contrary to previous decision?	N
	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	N

COMMENTS	Planning Panel comments received?	N
	Neighbour comments received?	Y

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	Y
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	Y

Location

The application relates to no. 2 Belfield Lawn, an end-terrace dwelling in Belfield. The dwelling is adjoined by no. 4 Belfield Lawn to the north-east and faces the highway to the north. The rear boundary of the curtilage borders the rear curtilage of no. 1 Dobfield Road.

Along with nos. 4-6 Belfield Lawn, the dwelling forms part of a set of pre-1851 vernacular cottages which were later converted to residential dwellings. The dwelling has been subject to numerous alterations and extensions and comprises of sections constructed from stone, brickwork and render.

The host dwelling is identified as a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA), together with adjoined no. 4. There are also numerous heritage assets within the immediate vicinity of the host property, namely:

- ② Belfield Bridge – a Grade-II listed structure

- ☐ Rochdale Canal – a non-designated heritage asset
- ☐ Belfield Mill – a non-designated heritage asset
- ☐ Ashworth House – a non-designated heritage asset

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a first-floor extension which projects 6.81m from the side elevation of the existing north-eastern element above the main dwelling and 2m from the rear elevation of the dwelling, above the existing single-storey rear extension. It is characterised by a cross gabled roof with matching ridge and eaves height.

The proposed extension comprises an assortment of fenestration, including a roof light on the front roof slope and a Juliet balcony on the first-floor rear elevation. The submitted plans also indicate the addition of two roof lights on the rear roof slope of the existing single-storey rear extension.

The proposals would be constructed from materials matching the host dwelling.

The application is a resubmission of a previous application 22/00699/HOUS with amendments made to reduce the projection by 3.1m from the side and 1m from the rear, alongside the addition of two roof lights on the existing single-storey rear extension. The existing end chimney would also be retained.

Relevant History

77/D05098 - Upgrading of the rating of this bridge together with widening adjacent to the N.E wing wall - Grant subject to conditions

94/D31022 – First floor extension to existing dwelling including increase in height of roof - Grant subject to conditions

20/00686/FUL - Erection of detached bungalow - Withdrawn

22/00699/HOUS - First floor side and rear extension – Refuse

Officer's Comments

1. By virtue of its scale, form, massing, and design, the proposed first-floor extension would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of Belfield Bridge, a listed building, through harm to its setting. Furthermore, the proposals would also result in less than substantial harm to the significance of no. 2-4 Belfield Lawn, identified as a non-designated heritage asset, through detracting from its appearance. No public benefits exist that would outweigh the identified harm. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies DM1, P2 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

As with the previous application for this site (22/00699) the main highways concern regarding this application is parking provision.

Belfield Mill Lane has a very narrow carriageway, no segregated footways and a narrow railway bridge which further restricts access. This Lane is also the main vehicular access to the industrial units at Belfield Mill, therefore taking this into account, Highways would not support any application that increases on-street parking on the Lane because of the restricted access and type of vehicle movements.

The extended property should provide two off-street parking spaces to meet current Council standards and taking into account the issues outlined above Highways would ask that these spaces are provided.

The current servicing arrangements should not be affected by the development.

If the parking issue can be resolved Highways would not expect that there would be any detrimental impact on road safety or highway capacity as a result of development.

In conclusion, Highways would not object to this application if the applicant can include two viable off-street parking spaces.

Conservation and Design

The application site is an end-terrace property on Belfield Lawn in Milnrow. The cottage and the adjoining properties are shown on the first edition OS map dating from 1851.

The terrace appears to have undergone a number of alterations and extensions, but some historic features remain evident. It was also possibly the toll house associated with the Grade-II listed Belfield Bridge. Given the age of the terrace, the possible former use as a toll house, and the retention of some historic features, it is considered to be of some architectural and historic interest. It meets the criteria for consideration as a non-designated heritage asset.

To the west of the site is Belfield Bridge. This bridge over the Rochdale Canal was constructed between 1794 and 1804 by the engineer, William Jessop. This skew bridge, which is constructed of roughly coursed stone, is listed at Grade-II for its special architectural and historic interest.

Rochdale Canal is also a non-designated heritage asset, and provides important visual evidence of the role the industrial revolution played in the development and landscape of the region.

To the north east of the site is the Belfield Mill complex. This was also present on the first edition OS map, noted as a cotton waste and woollen mill. The fulling mill appears to partially survive, while the woollen mill was largely rebuilt during the early 20th century. The site is a non-designated heritage asset due to its architectural and historic interest.

In accordance with the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the local planning authority must have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification (NPPF Paragraph 200). Where a development would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal (NPPF Paragraph 202).

The impact of a development on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset is also a material planning consideration. A balanced judgement should be had, having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset (NPPF Paragraph 203).

It is also important to note that sites related to the Borough's engineering heritage, which includes mills and canals are key heritage assets for the purposes of Rochdale CS Policy P2. Amongst other matters, this policy states that the Council will protect the borough's heritage by conserving, enhancing and promoting key heritage assets.

This application follows on from a previously refused scheme for a new extension including the raising of the roof (22/00699/HOUS refers). This previous scheme was refused due to the impact on the identified heritage assets.

The current scheme has been revised and the extent of the new two-storey element has been reduced, so that it no longer extends the full width of the property. Existing chimneys are also shown to be retained.

The reduced width of the extension has resulted in a form which better relates to the proportions of the host dwelling. The new first floor front window still reads appears poorly related, as a result of its horizontal emphasis. This feature needs further work. It is suggested that the window width is reduced to that of the roof light above. One option could be for a window which extends into the roof. The introduction of render on the rear elevation should also be reconsidered and either a brick or stone to match the existing used. New windows should be either timber or aluminium.

The heritage statement refers to reinstating the building to its pre-WW2 height, however, no evidence for this previous height has been provided. It is understood

that there are photos of its previous height and it would be helpful if these could be provided.

Subject to the amendments and clarifications above, it is likely that a neutral impact on the heritage assets could be achieved.

UPDATE:

Following the submission of amended plans, the proposed plans are considered to be an improvement in terms of form and relation to the existing dwelling. Any harm could largely be mitigated through high quality materials and finishes.

The Conservation Officer requests planning conditions requiring samples, details of materials and large scale details of windows and doors on the front elevation, which should be in either timber or aluminium. The roof light should also be in a 'conservation style' and set flush with the roof slope.

Tree Officer

No comments have been received at the time of writing. Notwithstanding, the comments of the original submission (22/00669/HOUS) applies to this current proposal and have been considered in this application:

The Tree Officer accepts that it would be possible to construct the extensions without causing substantive harm to trees, but do not consider the current proposals for tree protection to be specific enough, particularly for the protection of the mature Sycamore at the front entrance.

The Tree Officer would not object to the proposals on arboriculture grounds, but would advise that a more specific/detailed Tree Method Statement/Tree Protection Plan be required to be provided as a Condition of any approval. The Plans should relate specifically to the protection of the mature Sycamore tree at the site entrance, and which will be closest to the works.

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. One objection letter was received with the following concerns:

- ❑ The proposal would destroy the historic fabric of the non-designated heritage asset and cause significant harm to the historic setting;
- ❑ The horizontal emphasis of the proposed front windows relates poorly to the vernacular of the front elevation and are incongruous and out of keeping with the fenestration of the host dwelling and adjoined no. 4;
- ❑ The proposed rear extension would result in significant loss of amenity by means of overbearing and overshadowing impacts to the rear elevation habitable windows of adjoined no. 4;
- ❑ Concerns relating to drainage issues of the proposal;

- ☐ The proposal would overhang onto the neighbouring property and would require a Certificate B; and
- ☐ There is no planning history for the existing single-storey rear extension and its foundations may not be able to support an additional storey above.

Officer's Comments:

- ☐ Concerns relating to the design of the proposal and its impacts on heritage assets are assessed under the 'Design and Heritage' heading of the report.
- ☐ Concerns relating to the amenity impacts of the proposal are assessed under the 'Amenity' heading of the report.
- ☐ Concerns relating to drainage and the structural integrity of the proposal are not material considerations in the determination of planning applications.
- ☐ The Planning Officer has verified the submitted plans relating to ownership and has confirmed the proposal does not overhang onto any adjoining curtilage boundaries. Certificate B is not required in this regard.

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
G6	Enhancing Green Infrastructure
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

Amendments have been made to alter reduce the width of the proposed first-floor front elevation windows to match the proposed roof light above.

Assessment

Design and Heritage: DM1, P2 and P3

- ❑ Paragraph 130 of the NPPF requires new development to be *“visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping”* in addition to ensuring they are *“sympathetic to local character.”*
- ❑ Policy DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy require development proposals to be *“of high quality design and take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area”* and to *“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, Section 5.1 of the SPD states development proposals should be *“in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.”*
- ❑ Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states, *“in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority [...] shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.”*
- ❑ Policy P2 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy strives to *“protect the borough’s heritage by... conserving, enhancing and promoting key heritage assets, both statutory and non-statutory, including consideration of their wider settings.”* Designated assets such as listed buildings and the engineering heritage, including mills and canals are identified as key heritage assets of the borough.
- ❑ Paragraph 197 of the NPPF states, *“in determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:*
 - a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;*
 - b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and*
 - c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.”*
- ❑ Paragraph 199 of the NPPF states, *“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 200 of the NPPF states *“any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.”*
- ❑ Paragraph 202 of the NPPF states, *“where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.”*
- ❑ Paragraph 203 of the NPPF states *“the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.”*

- ❑ Significance, as defined in the NPPF, is:

“The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. The interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting.”

- ❑ The setting of a heritage asset, as defined in the NPPF, is:

“The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral.”

- ❑ The application property lies adjacent to Belfield Bridge, which is identified as a Grade-II listed building due to its architectural and historic interest. The listing details for Belfield Bridge are as follows:

“G.V. Road bridge. Between 1794 and 1804. William Jessop engineer. Roughly coursed stone. Skew elliptical arch with keystone. Parapet walls above a stone band have rounded copings. Grooved for stop planks. One of the earlier skew bridges. The toll house still stands to the east of the bridge but is not of special interest.”

- ❑ Nos. 2-4 Belfield Lawn, which includes the host dwelling, are identified as a non-designated heritage asset by the Council’s Conservation officer due to its architectural and historic interest. The dwellings are characterised as a set of pre-1851 vernacular cottages, later converted to residential dwellings. Despite numerous alterations and extensions, some historic features remain evident on the host property, including the stone-built dwelling and the chimney. The host dwelling may have previously functioned as a toll house to Belfield Bridge and as such, this association would add to the significance of Belfield Bridge as a heritage asset.

- ⑦ The application property is also adjacent to the Rochdale Canal, which is identified as a non-designed heritage asset due to its historical interest.
- ⑦ The proposal seeks to construct a first-floor extension which would project from the side and rear elevation of the dwelling. The submitted Heritage Statement states the intention to reinstate the first floor of the building to its original height prior to World War II. An historic photograph of the original building has also been submitted for consideration. However, the photograph indicates the original height of the building to be substantially greater than the proposed extension. Given the property in its current form has stood for a significant amount of time and has been subject to numerous extensions, a view has been taken that a material change in appearance has been established and a full-height reinstatement would not be appropriate in this context. The proposed extension under this application would be considered on its own merits.
- ⑦ Notwithstanding irregular built forms of the host dwelling and the discrepancies in ceiling heights between the ground floor and first floor, the reduced projection width of the revised scheme would appear less imposing against the host dwelling and would better relate to the existing proportions. The proposed extension would also retain the pitched roof form and ridge height of the existing two-storey element which would appear in keeping.
- ⑦ The proposed plans indicate the retention of the end chimney which would serve to preserve the existing historic fabric of the host dwelling.
- ⑦ Amendments have been accepted to reduce the width of the proposed first-floor front windows, in line with the width of the directly above proposed roof lights. Notwithstanding the existing mix of windows sizes, the proposed fenestration are considered to be sized and positioned appropriately with the corresponding existing fenestration. Appropriate use of fenestration and 'Conservation Style' roof lights can be secured via condition to mitigate any potential harm to the significance of the dwelling.
- ⑦ As it stands, the host dwelling comprises a varied material palette on each of its elevations. The proposal would be constructed in materials matching ones of the host dwelling. Whilst it is noted this may further accentuate the difference in materiality, given the overall scale of the extension has been reduced, the resultant visual impact is considered to have been minimised to an acceptable level. Notwithstanding, suitable materials can be achieved via condition as to mitigate any further harm to the significance of the dwelling.
- ⑦ Taken as a whole, the revised plans are considered to have sufficiently addressed design and heritage concerns raised in the original submission and would have a neutral impact to the significance of the adjacent designated and non-designated heritage assets. The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable, in accordance with Policies DM1, P2 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Trees: G6

- ⑦ Paragraph 131 of the NPPF notes that *"trees make an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments, and can also help mitigate and adapt to climate change."*

- ☐ The application property consists of eight trees under Tree Preservation Orders. A mature Sycamore is located near the front entrance of the host dwelling, though most of the remaining protected trees are sited within the rear curtilage, at considerable distances from the host dwelling.
- ☐ No comments have been submitted by the Tree Officer at the time of writing. Notwithstanding, comments provided as part of the original submission have been considered. Given the proposed development relates to an upward extension of the existing footprint, and the siting of trees away from the host dwelling, it is considered the proposal would not cause significant harm to protected trees. However, an approval to the application would be subject to a detailed Tree Method Statement or Tree Protection Plan to be provided as a condition, specifically the protection measures to the adjacent Sycamore tree.
- ☐ Subject to appropriate condition, the proposals would accord with the requirements of Policy G6 of the adopted Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ☐ Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy states development proposals should ensure they *“do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.”*
- ☐ In particular, Section 4.1 of the SPD states the following minimum space standards for development proposals:
 - (i) *“21m between directly facing principal windows of habitable rooms, at an upper floor level AND 10.5m between a principal window at an upper floor level and a directly facing boundary of the curtilage.”*
- ☐ Given the approx. 37m distance between the first-floor habitable room windows of the proposed extension and the rear curtilage boundary of the host dwelling, no concerns are had over the amenity impacts on no. 1 Dobfield Road.
- ☐ Additionally, Section 5.9 of the SPD states first floor extensions to terraced dwellings projecting *“beyond a 30 degree line drawn from a point 2.4m along the common boundary from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s)”* would not normally be granted planning permission.
- ☐ The proposed first-floor rear extension projects 2m from the rear elevation of the dwelling and is not considered to result in significant overbearing and overshadowing impacts to the rear garden and rear-facing habitable room windows of adjoining no. 4.
- ☐ The submitted plans indicate the provision of natural light to all habitable rooms and that ample garden space of a functional layout would be retained. As such, the proposed works would ensure an acceptable standard of living for existing and future occupants.
- ☐ The proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties in accordance with Policy DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

- ❑ Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy requires development proposals to *“provide satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking, manoeuvring, and servicing arrangements taking into account of the proposed use and location.”*
- ❑ The proposed extension would result in the addition of bedrooms from two to three and would require a maximum standard of two parking spaces, as stated in Appendix 5 of the adopted Core Strategy.
- ❑ The current parking arrangements for the host property consists of one off-street parking space to the side of the host dwelling and another undesignated space to the front of the dwelling which partially encroaches onto the highway.
- ❑ Considering the existing parking arrangements in the immediate vicinity and the limited capacity for additional parking spaces, and owing to the fact the proposal would not increase the footprint of the host dwelling, the proposed parking arrangements would be acceptable on balance 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. The permission relates to the following plans:

- ❑ Location Plan – Drawing No. PL03 dated 05/2022
- ❑ Existing and Proposed Site Plan – Drawing No. PL04 dated 05/2023
- ❑ Existing Floor Plans, Elevations and Roof Plan and Proposed Floor Plans – Drawing No. PL01 Rev. C dated 09/2023
- ❑ Proposed Elevations and Roof Plan – Drawing No. PL02 Rev. C dated 09/2023

and the development shall be carried out in 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 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 specifications of materials to be used externally on the building(s) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. For the avoidance of doubt, such details shall include the type, colour and texture of the materials and, where stonework is proposed, a one metre square freestanding panel of stonework showing the type of natural stone, coursing,

jointing and mortar mix and finish. Where masonry detailing is required, details drawn at a scale of not less than 1:20 shall also be submitted. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and in compliance with Policies P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. Notwithstanding any description of materials in the application, no above ground construction works shall take place until samples and / or full specification of materials of the proposed doors and windows have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include detailed elevation and cross-section drawings, and the type, colour and texture of the materials. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity and to protect the significance of the host non-designated heritage asset, in accordance with Policy P2, P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

5. No above ground works shall take place until details of the roof lights to be installed in the roof of the approved development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. For the avoidance of doubt, roof lights shall be of a 'Conservation Style' and shall be set flush with the roof slope or as close as is practicable. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details thereafter.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and in the interest of preserving the significance of Non-Designated Heritage Assets and in accordance with Policies P2, P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

6. No development shall take place until the trees that are to be retained within the site has been enclosed with temporary protective fencing and temporary ground protection has been fully installed in full accordance with BS:5837:2012. The fencing and flooring shall be retained during the period of construction and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted Arboricultural Method Statement dated 22/08/2022. For the avoidance of doubt, no work, excavation, tipping, or stacking/storage of materials shall take place beyond such protective fencing during the construction period.

Reason: In order to protect the existing trees on the site in the interests of the amenities of the area and in accordance with Policies P2, P3, G1, G6 and G7 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Reason for pre-commencement condition: The trees must be protected before any works are carried out.

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	03/10/2023	Signed: SY
Authorisation	06/10/2023	Signed: RK

INFORMATIVES:

The applicant is reminded that, under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), it is an offence to remove, damage, or destroy the nest of a wild bird, while the nest is in use or being built. Planning consent does not provide a defence against prosecution under this act. If a birds nest is suspected work should cease immediately and a suitably experienced ecologist employed to assess how best to safeguard the nest(s).

Under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 it is an offence to capture, injure or kill a bat, deliberately disturb a bat, or damage or destroy a bat roost. Planning consent does not provide a defence against prosecution under this act.

Report Author Sam Yuen