

Application Number:	24/00039/HOUS
Location:	Old Police Station, 77 Mellor Street Rochdale OL11 5BT
Proposal:	Single-storey rear extension and insertion of 1no rooflight to rear elevation following demolition of existing rear conservatory
Applicant:	Mr Omar
Case Officer:	Chelsea Petrillo
DETERMINATION DATE 01.04.2024	EXT OF TIME 16.05.2024
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

The Old Police Station located at 77 Mellor Street is a two storey detached dwellinghouse in the Spotland and Falinge ward of Rochdale and in the designated Spotland Bridge Conservation Area. The dwelling has been allocated as a non-designated heritage asset by RBC resulting from its architectural and historic fabric and sits adjacent to the grade II listed Spotland Bridge Mill.

The property is sited on a prominent corner junction at the intersection of Mellor Street, Bridgefold Road, Spotland Road and Rooley Moor Road. The plot abuts residential development to the south and faces east onto the adjacent highway.

The dwelling benefits from on-site parking, generous amenity space and two outbuildings.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a brick built single storey rear extension constructed with matching materials and a lean to roof replacing the siting of the existing conservatory which is to be demolished. The extension would host a parapet roof of similar dimensions to that on the existing build and would project approx. 4m from the main body of the dwelling. 1no roof light is to be added to the rear roof slope of the single and the existing rear conservatory is to be demolished prior to implementation.

Relevant History

80/D11702

Use of hostel and business premises as dwellinghouse

Granted December 1980

88/D22766

Use of land as private garden area

Granted January 1989

Township/Member comments

None Applicable

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

Thank you for your consultation request.

This proposal is unlikely to have any noticeable impact upon the highway following completion.

We have no highways comment regarding this application.

Conservation and Design

The property was originally built as the area's police station in 1908 before being converted to residential use. While the building has undergone some unsympathetic alterations, it still retains a number of original and historic features, including stone detailing and parapet features. The property has been identified as a non-designated heritage asset for its architectural and historic interest.

The Old Police Station sits on a prominent junction within the Spotland Bridge Conservation Area and makes a positive contribution towards the architectural and historic interest of the Conservation Area. This Conservation Area is characterised by a distinct industrial heritage, the centrepiece of which is the grade II listed Spotland Mill. The application site lies within the immediate setting of this mill.

As the application site is within the Conservation Area and the setting of a grade II listed building, the provisions of 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Additionally the provisions of NPPF Chapter 16 apply.

The application is supported by a heritage statement. This provides details of the host property, but does not consider its significance. Nor does it set out the significance of other relevant heritage assets, including the Spotland Bridge Conservation Area or the grade II listed Spotland Mill, which is in close proximity to the site. It is not considered that the report adequately meets the minimum requirements as set out within NPPF paragraph 200.

The proposal includes a new single storey extension, which would replace the existing conservatory. The conservatory does not make a positive contribution to the significance of the building. There is no objection to its removal and replacement with a new brick built extension. To ensure that the extension relates well to the host property, a condition should be imposed requiring samples of materials (these should match the existing).

The existing property has two eaves lines along the rear elevation. Part of the roof appears to have been raised at an earlier date. The proposed scheme, seeks to alter the roof, so that there is a single eaves line along the rear elevation. It also seeks to raise the parapet, to screen the raised eaves level. The rationale for these works is not clear. The existing raised eaves level is a poor detail, which has resulted in a catslide roof, which sits awkwardly with the main body of the building.

The raising of the roof to continue this catslide detail and the subsequent raising of the parapet would result in the loss of some historic fabric and would extend a detail, which already relates poorly to the host property. This aspect of the proposal would result in some harm to the significance of the non-designated heritage asset.

A new dormer window is also proposed, infilling the valley between the two single storey projections. The dormer window would extend up to the ridge, and to just behind the parapet of the front projection. As part of the works, an existing chimney and window would be removed, resulting in the loss of historic fabric. As a result of its dimensions and location on a highly visible public elevation, the dormer window would be an intrusive and harmful feature, which would detract from the appearance of the NDHA. No justification for this harm has been put forwards.

The proposed works to the rear roof and the side elevation, including the new dormer window and raised parapet would result in some harm to the non-designated heritage asset. This would through the loss of historic details and the construction of incongruous features, such as the dormer window and raised eaves level. This harm is a material consideration in the planning balance, as set out in NPPF paragraph 209.

The proposed works would also result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the Conservation Area, owing to the importance of the existing building and its prominence within the streetscene. No justification has been put forwards for this harm and no public benefits appear to have been identified. The proposal would fail to comply with NPPF paragraph 208 or Rochdale CS policy P2.

It would also fail to comply with the provisions of section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as it would neither conserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

It is noted that grey fencing has been installed around the perimeter of the site. This appears to have been installed recently and does not appear to have planning permission.

Following receipt of amended plans, a meeting was had with the case officer and conservation officer. The following comments were received:

Thanks for sending this through. It looks a lot better, without the raised parapet and the removal of the dormer. Please condition samples of materials to ensure a good match. Details of windows and doors should be required by condition.

Technically, they do need to update the heritage statement to meet the requirements of the NPPF. This can just be a short addendum to the original statement.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding neighbours, an advert published in the local press and a site notice posted. No public comments were received.

Policy **National**

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

Sub-Regional

Places for Everyone (PfE) JDP 2024

JP-P1 Sustainable Places

JP-P2 Heritage

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

Amendments were sought for the retention of the existing parapet roof to the rear elevation as well as the removal of the proposed infill dormer given both were considered harmful to the heritage asset. The dormer was subsequently removed from the proposal and the rear parapet retained. The existing chimney and side facing window have also been retained to preserve the original fabric of the dwelling.

The heritage statement was also amended in line with the above.

Assessment

Design: JP-P1, JP-P2, DM1 and P3

Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy states that all new developments will be expected to demonstrate that they “are of high quality design and take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area”. Paragraph 126 of the NPPF states “The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve.” and “good design is a key aspect of sustainable development”.

Policy P2 of the Council’s adopted Core Strategy requires development to protect and enhance character, landscape and heritage. 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.

It is noted the existing conservatory does not add to the significance of the heritage asset therefore no concern is raised to its removal.

The proposed single storey rear extension to replace this arrangement would be brick built and visually sympathetic to the external appearance and proportions of the host dwelling. The extension would project a sensible distance relative to the depth of the host property and would adhere to good design principles in terms of scale, massing and form. The extension seeks to incorporate elements found locally on the host dwelling to be visually sympathetic to the existing external fabrications and architectural details.

The material palette of the extension would visually respect the overall external appearance of the existing dwelling and incorporate detailings found on the host

dwelling. However, in order to ensure a high standard of design, a condition has been attached to the decision notice requiring samples of any materials to be used to be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

In a wider sense, there is not considered to be any harmful impact to the overall street scene. Public viewpoints to the proposed works are considered to be limited therefore no concerns are raised in this regard.

The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD, PfE and the NPPF

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

Residential amenity is considered under policy DM1 of the Core Strategy and the SPD.

Paragraph 5.6 of the SPD sets out the following guidance for single storey rear extensions;

- *For attached properties, a point 3 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s);*
- *For detached properties, a point 4 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s).*

When measured along the common boundary shared with the adjacent neighbour, 77a Mellor Street, the extension would project approx. 4.6m from the adjacent rear elevation. However paragraph 5.7 states that when the extension is set away from the boundary, the projection can be increased providing it does not surpass a 45 degree line measured from the point along the boundary. When assessed in line with paragraph 5.7, the development would be in accordance with the above guideline.

Further to this, the extension will cover broadly the same footprint as the existing conservatory therefore no concern is raised in this regard.

Section 4.1 of the SPD sets out minimum separation distances for habitable room windows which the development is considered to be in accordance with.

Post-development, sufficient amenity space is to be retained for the enjoyment of the occupiers. Furthermore, occupier amenity is to be maintained to a good standard where all habitable rooms would receive adequate light and outlook.

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

The proposed parking arrangements are 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:-

- MO/01/01/EX/SITE Location Plan
 - MO/03/03/PRP/SITE Proposed Site Plan
 - MO/06.1/03/PRP DORMER REMOVED Proposed Roof Layout
 - MO/04.1/03/PRP DORMER REMOVED Proposed 1st Floor
 - MO/02.1/03/PRP DORMER REMOVED Proposed Elevations
- and 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.

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. 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 in accordance with policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy 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	15.05.2024	Signed: CPetrillo
Authorisation	16.05.2024	Signed: TH

Report Author Chelsea Petrillo