APPLICATION NUMBER: 21/00058/FUL

DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.	CASE OFFICER	DATE
21/00058/FUL	Ryan Killeen	11 February 2021

Address: Aunt Marys Nursery Taylor Street Heywood OL10 1EF

Proposal: Erection of single storey extension to building entrance and part upward extension to form second storey, with associated elevation works and internal alterations and formation of new covered play areas

PUBLICITY	**Weekly list expired?**	Y	**Site notice expired?**	Y
	Neighbour letters expired?	Y	**Press Notice expired?**	Y

DELEGATION	**Significant departure from local plan?**	N	**Contrary to national policy?**	N
	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	N	**Contrary to previous decision?**	N
	Major with 10 or more objections and recommending approval?	N	**Called in or Planning Panel objection?**	N

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

EIA	**Screening opinion completed and saved to Onbase?**	N/A

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

RECOMMENDATION	**Grant Subject to Conditions**

CHECKED AND SIGNED OFF BY: EH **DATE: 9 March 2021**

SITE

This application relates to Aunt Mary's Nursey, a single storey detached brick building 130m south of Heywood Town Centre in a mixed use urban area. The property is in active use as an early years nursery. The property faces west towards Taylor Street, and is adjacent to Sandon House, a community centre, to the north with offices at no.9 Taylor Street to the south. No.22 Hind Hill Street, an office building known as the Old Police Station is sited east, adjoining the rear boundary of the site.

The property benefits from a front curtilage which provides parking provisions at the site, with outdoor recreational space provided to the rear.

PROPOSAL

The application proposes a first floor extension that would be set back 5m from the front elevation of the host property, adding 1no. additional floors increasing the maximum height from approximately 5.8m to 8.8m. It would occupy the full width of the property and be constructed with a dual pitched roof with a matching roof slope gradient to the existing. It is to be constructed from matching materials.

A front porch is proposed to the southern side of the front elevation, it is to be formed with a dual pitched roof which extends beyond the front elevation to provide cover over the entrance.

The application also proposes a translucent roof covering over the north side curtilage and the easternmost part of the rear curtilage.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) February 2019
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:

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).

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

N/A

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Historic England
On the basis of the information available to date, in our view you do not need to notify or consult us on this application under the relevant statutory provisions.

Conservation And Design

No Comments or Objections.

Highways And Engineering
No objections

Env Health - Noise/Odours
No comments

REPRESENTATIONS

Letters of notification were sent to all surrounding properties, a site notice posted adjacent to the site, and a press advert issued, no responses were received.

ANALYSIS

The applicant building does not lie within a Conservation Area but is sited 55m north of the Grade II listed St Joseph's RC Church, with no.7 Taylor Street sited in between. As the nursery lies within the setting of the listed building, regard must be given to Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) which 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.

'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 setting of a listed building is defined by the NPPF as:

> *'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.'*

Paragraph 192 of the NPPF states that in determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- The desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;

- The positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- The desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Paragraph 190 of the NPPF states that in considering the impact of a proposed development, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration of a heritage asset and as they are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building should be exceptional.

Paragraph 196 of the NPPF directs that where a proposal 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. The Court of Appeal decision in the case of *Barnwell vs East Northamptonshire DC* [2014] (2) clarified that decision makers should give "considerable importance and weight" to the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings when carrying out the balancing exercise'.

The application building proposed to be extended is sited 55m north of the curtilage of the Grade II listed St Joseph's RC Church (the Church hereafter). The listing text of this property reads:

> *The Roman Catholic church of St Joseph and associated presbytery, Heywood, of 1913-16 by Henry Oswald Hill, with later additions, is listed at Grade II for the following principal reasons: * Artistic interest: the apsidal sanctuary dominates with an impressive scheme of mosaic designed by Eric Newton of Ludwig Oppenheimer Ltd, a specialist mosaic company, which demonstrate a knowledge and understanding of the use of mosaic in the designs, and high degree of craftsmanship and use of high-quality materials in their construction; * Architectural interest: as an urban Catholic church designed in a Romanesque style representative of the interest in early Christian architecture in the late C19 and early C20 and particularly successful in the harmonious use of internal space; * Architect: Henry Oswald Hill was a promising architect with a clear interest in contemporary church-building trends, as shown by his Byzantine design for the listed St John the Baptist, Rochdale, who was tragically killed in action in the First World War * Group value: the presbytery has functional group value with the church and both were designed by Hill, who achieved a visual unity through the use of the same materials while choosing a more domestic Queen Anne style for the presbytery.*

The Church attributes much of its significance to internal artistic features in addition to its external architecture. The property is best viewed from Mary Street to the west, which leads directly to the front entrance, and is possible to experience the main architectural features. The property is certainly appreciated from Taylor Street to the North, where it is possible to experience the full side profile of the Church, in addition to the later added northern transept. Due to the siting of buildings on the eastern side of Taylor Street, such views are only possible up to the main entrance of the applicant property.

As such, it is not considered that the proposal would be read in conjunction with the Church where it would be best viewed from. Whilst this would be the case when viewing the Church from further afield, it is considered that the proposal would amount to neutral harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset.

Regard has also been had for paragraph 197 of the NPPF; the application site sits partially opposite the Kingdom Halls of Jehovas Witnesses Church, a former public swimming baths converted into a church which currently stands vacant. This has

been recognised by the Council as a Non-Designated Heritage Asset (NDHA) and is included on the Council's formal list. The property is a part single-storey, part two-storey structure, finished in white render. There is no notable architectural qualities present, and it is considered much of its historic significance is derived through its use as a community asset. As such, the proposed upwards extension is not considered to result in a neutral impact to the significance of the NDHA.

Further to this, the Council's Conservation Officer has raised no objection to the proposal, also providing no further comments.

In terms of the impact to the character and appearance of the host property and wider street scene, it is considered that the scale and massing of the upwards extension does not result in an overly dominant addition, and would be in keeping with the scale and form within the existing street scene. This is further compounded through setting back the first floor from the front elevation. The design of the extension would be in keeping with the existing property by virtue of its fenestration placement and use of matching materials.

The proposed front entrance would be minor in the context of the site and would not significantly alter the external appearance of the property, notwithstanding this, the design is considered appropriate, replicating the roof pitch, proportions, fenestration design and materials of the host property.

The proposed polycarbonate covers to the side and rear of the property are considered to be of limited visibility due to their profile and siting which would be obscured by the applicant property. As such, no concerns are raised.

Subject to the recommended conditions, it is considered that the proposal accords with the requirements of Policy DM1, P1, P2 and P3 of Adopted Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Amenity

The property sits within a mixed use area. Mostly adjacent properties are commercial in use, however it is acknowledged that a pair of semi-detached dwellings sit on the west side of Taylor Street, non-directly facing in relation to the applicant nursery. Due to the 25m of separation that would be retained between the proposed first floor front elevation of the extension and the front elevation of no.10 Taylor Street, it is not considered that the proposal would unduly impact the residential amenity of the occupants.

The proposed extension raises no concern in regards to overshadowing of surrounding properties; the increased built form would remain in line with the built form on Taylor Street, and there are no other habitable room windows that would be unduly impacted by overshadowing or loss of outlook as a result of the extension.

The proposal is not considered to intensify the level of activity on site to the point it would surpass an acceptable level.

In light of the above, it is considered that the proposal accords with the requirements of Policy DM1 of Adopted Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Highways

Core Strategy Policy T2 seeks to improve accessibility by locating development where good access to public transport is available or can be provided, backed by measures to reduce the need for travel. Appendix 5 of the adopted Core Strategy

sets out the maximum standards for car parking provisions. For a Use Class D1 Non-Residential Use (Now Class E), the maximum car parking standard would be 1 space per FTE staff member.

The application would increase the capacity of the site, with regards to the quantity of children and associated staff. The supporting Design and Access Statements states that the intended child numbers will increase by 11 from 54 to 65 (20%) with staff numbers increasing by up to 3 from 14 to 17 (21%). It is considered that the service is used by a number of local residents who visit the site using sustainable methods of transport and is close to the town centre and therefore, the site well served by public Transport.

Publicly available records demonstrate that the forecourt is used for parking at the moment, however, it is recognised that there are no formal spaces.

The site lies within a quiet area south of Heywood Town Centre that sees little use throughout the day. Given the extent of the increased activity at the site through additional staff members and child numbers, the subsequent increase in drop-offs and pick-ups created through the intensified use are not considered to result in an unacceptable impact to the highway network over the existing situation. Further to this, the proposed parking arrangements would not exceed the provisions of appendix 5 of the Core Strategy and would not promote an over-reliance on personal vehicle transport. The site is considered to be in a sustainable location that is well served by public transport and is not overly reliant on personal vehicles for access and the proposal is therefore not considered to result in an over-dominance of on street parking.
It is appreciated that the proposed parking spaces are not easily accessed due to the limited manoeuvring space within the front curtilage of the applicant property, however it is considered that there will be no additional harm in this instance where the forecourt is used for parking at present.
Additionally, the Council's Highways Officer has been consulted and gave no objections to the proposal.

The application is therefore considered to be in accordance with Policies DM1 and T2 of the Adopted Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

RECOMMENDATION

Grant Subject to 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
   - LM-01/01 – Existing Site Plan, Floor Plans and Elevations
   - LM-01/02 – Proposed Site Plan, Floor Plans and Elevations

   and the development shall be carried out in complete accordance with the approved drawings.

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. The materials used in the construction of the exterior of the development hereby permitted shall be in accordance with details provided within section 7 of the submitted application form unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

   Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with policies P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. The parking spaces within the front forecourt as shown on drawing no. LM-01/02 – Proposed Site Layout shall be fully provided prior to the first floor extension hereby approved being brought into use and be always made available for the parking and turning of vehicles hereafter.

   Reason: In the interest of highway safety and to accord with policies T2 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and policy in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Procedure Statement

The proposal complies with the development plan and would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. It therefore comprises sustainable development and the Local Planning Authority worked proactively to issue the decision without delay.

Notes for Applicant:

Report Author Ryan Killeen