APPLICATION NUMBER: 18/01404/HOUS

Application Number:	**18/01404/HOUS**
Location:	Oakenrod Edge Oakenrod Hill Rochdale OL11 4ED
Proposal:	Demolition of existing single storey extension, erection of two storey extensions to north and east elevations, erection of single storey porch to east elevation, erection of single storey extension to west elevation and alterations to existing fenestration
Applicant:	Mr Aftab Hussain
Case Officer:	Rachel Carney
Recommendation:	**REFUSE**

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?	**N**

CONDITIONS	**Pre-commencement conditions proposed?**	**N/A**
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	**N/A**

Location

The application relates to a detached property located in the Bamford area of Rochdale and sited via a private road accessed from Oakenrod Hill. The property is surrounded by other residential properties which include Oakenrod Hall, to the east and nos. 1, 3 and 5 Oakenrod Hill to the west. No. 1 Oakenrod Mews is sited to the north of the application site.

Oakenrod Edge is a 20th century building constructed of red brick, executed in a modernist architectural style. The site is located within the setting of Oakenrod Hall, a Grade II listed building, along with nos. 1, 3 and 5 Oakenrod Hill which are all non-designated heritage assets.

Description of Proposal

The proposal seeks to demolish an existing single storey extension and erect a two storey side/rear extension to the north and east, a single storey extension to the west, a single storey porch extension to the east along with undertaking other external alterations to the property including fenestration pattern.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Conservation

Oakenrod Edge is a 20th century building constructed of red brick, executed in a modernist architectural style. The site is located within the setting of Oakenrod Hall, a Grade II listed building, along with being in location of a number of non-designated heritage assets.

The proposal seeks to demolish an existing single storey extension and erect a two storey extension to the north, a single storey extension to the west, a single storey porch extension to the east along with undertaking other external alterations to the property including fenestration pattern.

For clarification, the front elevation as identified within the plans references the south elevation and the existing side elevation (main entrance) refers to the east elevation. These two elevations face directly on to Oakenrod Hall and are therefore considered to be the most sensitive areas of the site. This being said it is recognised that the inclusion of the boundary wall surrounding the listed building has somewhat enclosed the property.

The single storey extension to the west will have neutral impact on the setting of the designated and non-designated heritage assets (NPPF, paragraph 192). Similarly, the two storey extension proposed to the north of the property will also have a neutral impact upon the setting of the designated and non-designated heritage assets (NPPF, paragraph 192).

The two storey extension, including porch, to the east of the property has the potential to cause less than substantial harm to the setting of the designated heritage asset (NPPF, paragraph) however it would have a neutral impact on the setting of the non-designated heritage assets (NPPF, paragraph 192). The harm identified will result from the significant increase in the scale and massing of the existing dwelling at an elevated position which will begin to impose on the adjacent listed building.
It is also noted that the proposal seeks to overhaul the design of the dwelling and it is evident that the proposed extensions do not complement the character of the original host building. In particular the eastern extension as proposed is not in keeping with this new design in terms of fenestration proportions. The materials and finishes used for the property should be high quality and take inspiration from the surrounding environment to ensure that no further harm is caused to the setting of the identified heritage assets.

To conclude, until further design development is undertaken which should scale down the proposed extensions and consider a more sympathetic design for the property, this application cannot be supported for approval.

Impact Assessment

The proposal will cause less than substantial harm to the setting of the designated heritage asset (NPPF, paragraph 106). This harm is not justified or mitigated within the application and there are no public benefits identified to outweigh this.

Representations

The application has been publicised with a site notice, neighbour notification letters and a press notice. No letters of representation have been received.

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
BE/17 New Development Affecting Conservation Areas

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016:

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

DM1 General Development Requirements
P3 Improving Design of New Development
P2 Protecting and Enhancing Character, Landscape and Heritage
T2 Improving Accessibility

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):

Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development (2016)

Amendments

None Applicable

Assessment

Design and Heritage: BE/17, DM1, P2 and P3

The application site is within the setting of the Grade II listed building Oakenrod Hall and in the setting of the non-designated heritage assets nos. 1, 3 and 5 Oakenrod Hill.

Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) states that 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 Rochdale Core Strategy sets out that the Council will conserve, enhance and promote key heritage assets, including consideration of their wider settings.

'Significance' with regard to heritage assets is defined by the NPPF as:

> *'The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. That 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 National Planning Policy Framework is concerned with conserving and enhancing the historic environment. Paragraph 192 of the NPPF states that 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.

Planning practice guidance identifies that substantial harm is a high test and may not arise in many cases. Whether a proposal causes substantial harm will be a judgment for the decision maker, having regard to the circumstances of the case and the policy in the National Planning Policy Framework. In determining whether works that affect a listed building constitute substantial harm, an important consideration would be whether the adverse impact seriously affects a key element of its special architectural or historic interest. It is the degree of harm to the asset's significance rather than the scale of the development that is to be assessed. The harm may arise from works to the asset or from development within its setting.

The application proposes demolition of an existing single storey extension and the erection of a two storey extension to the north and east elevations, a single storey extension to the west and a single storey porch extension to the east elevation. Additional alterations including alterations to fenestration are also proposed

Considering the proposal the existing property is constructed in a distinctive style with a 20th Century design which is visibly different from surrounding older buildings at this location. To assess the acceptability of the alterations and their impact on the setting of adjacent heritage assets consultations have been undertaken with the Council's Conservation Officer.

Firstly considering the two storey extensions the Conservation Officer has advised that the extension to the north of the property would also have a neutral impact on the setting of the heritage asset. However, this is due to its relationship with the listed building, with this element of the development being mostly obscured and thus not affecting setting. However, in terms of general design, there are concerns with this element of the application as the extension would sit as an overly prominent and poorly designed addition, resulting in a double pitched elevation that would detract from the appearance of the original property and appear as an overly large addition.

In a similar vein, the two storey extension to the east of the property as well as the porch would introduce an extension of substantial mass and what is in effect a conservatory style addition to the front of the property in the setting of the listed building. This is a poor design detail and would harm the property as well as the setting of the listed building, resulting in an overly prominent addition that would sit awkwardly with the host dwelling. The Conservation Officer has also advised that this element of the development would result in less than substantial harm to the setting of the designated heritage asset (listed building) due to the aforementioned, significant increase in scale which would result in overly large massing at an elevated position.

The Conservation Officer has also advised that the overall design of the proposed extensions do not complement the character of the original property and this is evident wherever the two storey extension are in view. These elements of the proposal do not respect the existing form and layout of the property and sit as awkward additions that would result in confused extensions. A mix of roof pitches and a variety of windows styles and scales exacerbate this awkward relationship and demonstrate how the proposals fail to complement the existing design features. It is noted that all these elements could not demonstrably result in harm to the adjacent listed buildings, however the overall massing and design, as highlighted above would cause harm and in any event, the development would undoubtedly harm the appearance of the host property and the wider visual amenity of the area.

Turning to the single storey extension, this would be sited to the west elevation and would cover the full depth of the property, including the depth of the two storey extension. The extension would be flat roofed with the inclusion of roof lanterns. The Conservation Officer has advised that this would have a neutral impact on the setting of the designated heritage assets and examining the design of this element of the proposal it is considered that an extension of such a form could be appropriate development at the site. However, as the width of the extension would cover the proposed two storey extension, which is not acceptable, it is considered that this element of the proposal is also too large in scale and not in keeping with the host property.

Further to the above it is considered that the proposed extensions are poorly designed and too large for the host property and do not complement its original form or design. Furthermore, due to the massing that would be created by the development and the inclusion of the proposed porch, the proposal would impose on and harm the character of the property and cause less than substantial harm to the setting of the adjacent listed building. This harm is not justified or mitigated within the application and there are no public benefits to outweigh this. The application is contrary to policies P1, P2, P3 and DM1 of the Core Strategy and policy in the NPPF.

Residential amenity

Policy DM1 establishes that development shall not adversely impact on the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy. Development should also mitigate against any impacts due to noise, air, dust, light and odour pollution. Policy G9 also requires that development does not have impacts that lead to an unacceptable increase in air, water, noise, light or other pollution.

The proposed two storey rear and side extensions will maintain an approximate gap of 1.6m between the proposed rear elevation and the boundary shared with adjacent no. 1 Oakenrod Mews. The application site is slightly elevated from this property, however an existing boundary hedge between the two properties provides significant screening and this would ensure that the massing of the extension would not create any overbearing impact from the development. Also given that there are no habitable room windows sited to this adjacent property facing towards the application site, the placement of the proposed two storey features are considered acceptable at this location and will not have a negative effect on neighbouring occupants over the existing arrangement.

The proposed single storey side extension will retain a side elevation that is sited approximately 8.75m from the boundary shared with adjacent properties sited along Oakenrod Hill. This proposed arrangement is considered acceptable over the existing arrangement with an open aspect between the application property and neighbouring properties along Oakenrod Hill.

The separation distance between the application property and adjacent Oakenrod Hall will remain unchanged over the existing arrangement. The proposal would not unduly affect the privacy and amenity of any neighbouring residents through overlooking, overshadowing, loss of daylight or outlook.

The property benefits from a large wraparound garden and an acceptable amount of outdoor amenity space would be retained also for current and future occupiers.

The proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties or of the host property in accordance with Core Strategy Policy DM1, the Residential Development SPD and the NPPF.

Recommendation: REFUSE

The proposed extensions by virtue of their scale, design and siting would appear as poorly designed, prominent and incongruous additions that fail to complement the existing character and form of the host dwelling. Furthermore, due to the design and massing that would be created by the extensions the proposal would impose on and harm the setting of the adjacent designated heritage asset, the Grade II listed building, Oakenrod Hall. The proposal would fail to respect the visual amenity of the area and would cause less than substantial harm to the setting of the designated heritage asset. This harm is not justified or mitigated within the application and there are no public benefits to outweigh this. The application is therefore contrary to policies P1, P2, P3 and DM1 of the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Article 35
The proposal would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area nor does it comply with the development plan and therefore does not comprise sustainable development. There were no amendments to the scheme, or conditions which could reasonably have been imposed, which could have made the development acceptable and it was therefore not possible to approve the application.

INFORMATIVE:
For the avoidance of doubt, this Decision Notice relates to the following drawings:-

- All drawings titles 'Proposed rear and side extensions and internal alterations', Drawing No. 606/1
- Location Plan, Amended 27/02/2019
- Existing Elevations, Amended 27/02/2019
- Proposed Elevations
- Existing Site Plan
- Proposed Site Plan
- Existing Ground Floor Plan
- Existing First Floor Plan
- Proposed Ground Floor Plan
- Proposed First Floor Plan

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	23 October 2019	Signed: Rachel Carney
Authorisation	23 October 2019	Signed: Alison Truman

Report Author Rachel Carney