

Application Number:	22/01602/HOUS
Location:	Handle Cottage, Calderbrook Road, Littleborough, Rochdale, OL15 9NR
Proposal:	First floor rear extension with side porch following partial demolition to rear of dwelling wall decrease in ridge heights with alteration to fenestration on front and side elevation
Applicant:	R Edwards
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?	N

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

Location

The application relates to Handle Cottage, a two-storey detached Georgian cottage located in a semi-rural area of Calderbrook, Littleborough. The property likely dates from the 19th century, is depicted on the 1851 OS map and has subsequently been identified as a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA).

The main dwelling is of a coursed sandstone construction with a sandstone slate pitched roof. It also comprises a two-storey side extension and a single-storey rear extension circa 1960, constructed from cream render with a blue slate roof and part uPVC, part timber-framed windows. The property benefits from a substantial rear, side and front garden and an attached double garage with a front driveway.

The dwelling faces the highway to the south-east and is surrounded by open farmland to the south and west. To the north-east of the dwelling stands Handle Hall and Adjoining Barn, a Grade-II listed building, and Handle Hall Cottage, a non-designated heritage asset. The property lies within Green Belt land.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the reconstruction of the existing north-east facing two-storey side extension following the partial demolition of the single-storey rear extension. The proposed side extension measures approx. 5.78m in width, approx. 8.75m in depth and is set down approx. 0.13m from the ridge line of the host dwelling with a matching ridge height. The existing windows would be resized and repositioned to match ones of the existing dwelling.

A side porch is proposed to project an additional approx. 2.48m from the side elevation of the proposed side extension. It is characterised by a dual-pitched roof and has a ridge height of approx. 3.1m and an eaves height of approx. 2.58m.

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

Relevant History

14/00610/FUL - Erection of one detached dwelling including demolition of part of existing property – Refuse

Officer's Comment

1. The site lies within the Greater Manchester Green Belt, where the erection of new buildings is inappropriate development, unless they are for a limited number of purposes or where very special circumstances have been demonstrated. The proposal would not fall into any of the categories of new buildings considered appropriate in the Green Belt. Although the proposal would involve the demolition of part of the existing dwelling of Handle Hall Cottage, it would not constitute the complete demolition and replacement of that building. Instead, it would give rise to the development of an entirely new dwelling at the site with its own separate residential curtilage. Furthermore, the proposed new dwelling would be materially larger than the part of Handle Hall Cottage that is intended to be replaced. The development would therefore cause harm to the Green Belt by reason of its inappropriateness and would also give rise to a significantly greater and more harmful impact upon the openness of the Green Belt. No very special circumstances have been demonstrated which would outweigh the identified harm and the proposal would therefore comprise inappropriate development, harmful to the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land within it. The proposal would therefore fail to satisfy Policies G/D/2- Green Belt and D/4- Control of Development in the Green Belt-General of the Council's Unitary Development Plan. The Proposal would also be contrary to the relevant advice in the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposal would necessitate the removal of several mature trees from the frontage of the site and would also be likely to harm the health of various others within the site, close to its boundary with Calderbrook Road and Hey Head Lane. These trees make a significant and positive contribution to the

setting of the nearby Listed Building of "Handle Hall", as well as to the general visual amenities and the biodiversity value of the vicinity. The proposal would therefore fail to satisfy policies BE/2, BE/15, NE/3 and NE/8 of the Council's Unitary Development Plan, as well as the relevant advice of the National Planning policy Framework.

3. The design and external appearance of the proposed dwelling would not be compatible with or improve the surroundings of the site by virtue of its materials or architectural style and detail. The proposal would harm the setting of the nearby Grade II Listed Building of "Handle Hall and Barn" and would be detrimental to the general visual amenities of the vicinity. The proposal would therefore fail to satisfy policies BE/2 and BE/15 of the Council's Unitary Development Plan, as well as the relevant advice in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Conservation and Design

The application site is situated approximately 30 metres west of Handle Hall Farm & Barn. This early 19th century farmhouse and barn is a reconstruction of an existing farmhouse dated from approximately 1610. The structure is a hammer-dressed watershot stone building with a graduated stone slate roof. Due to its historic and architectural value, this site is designated as a Grade-II listed building.

With regards to the application site itself, the site consists of a stone work main body, along with the later rendered two storey side extension, a single storey lean to the rear of the two storey side extension and a single storey lean to extension to the western elevation of the original dwelling house.

Some structures on site appear on the first Ordnance Survey, dated from 1851. Whilst the application site has gone through some unsympathetic alterations and additions, by reason of its historic dating and Georgian architectural qualities and features, it has been identified as a non-designated heritage asset.

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

The application seeks permission to partly remove the existing single storey rear extension, to construct a first floor rear extension, in addition to cladding the existing two storey side extension with regular coursed stone walls to match the existing main body of the dwelling house and provide some level of insulation.

Paragraph 197 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”.

Paragraph 200 of the NPPF states that 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 states that *‘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.’*

The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 refers to the ‘preservation’ or ‘enhancement’ of the special architectural or historic interest of the heritage asset or its character and appearance. The NPPF sets out in Chapter 16 of the document decision-making policies using different terminology, referring in particular to ‘conservation of significance’. It is important to note that ‘conservation’ and ‘preservation’ are concerned with the management of change in a way that sustains a heritage asset’s special interest or significance. However, ‘conservation’ has the added dimension of taking opportunities to enhance significance where opportunities arise and where appropriate.

Rochdale CS policy P2 deals with *‘protecting and enhancing character, landscape and heritage’*. Paragraph 2a states that the borough’s heritage will be protected by conserving, enhancing and promoting key heritage assets, both statutory and non-statutory. Key heritage assets include the borough’s listed buildings and Conservation Areas.

With regards to the proposed first floor rear extension, considering this extension would be situated behind the dwellinghouse and largely obscured from the street scene, whilst also appearing proportionate and subordinate to the house dwelling, this extension would have a neutral impact on the setting of the designated heritage asset and non-designated heritage asset. This view is shared with the proposed porch extension.

Furthermore, whilst in many situations cladding should be avoided, in this case where it would result in the removal of the unsympathetic rendering, this element of the proposal would enhance the significance of site itself, and also enhance the setting of the designated Grade II neighbouring structure. To ensure this alteration would enhance the heritage assets, samples of the proposed stonework should be submitted and approved by the LPA.

With regards to the fenestration of the proposed development, the application form indicates that the proposed material would be uPVC. Considering the application site benefits from a number of existing timber windows, and could be considered a non-

designated heritage asset, the proposed windows should be timber and painted to match the existing. UPVC windows would result in less than substantial harm to the non-designated heritage asset. The conservation officer suggests a condition for the windows to be timber and painted to match the existing – details of this should be provided by the applicant by way of a condition.

Conclusion

The proposed development, if amended/conditioned, would enhance the significance of heritage assets. The conservation officer would be supportive of the application on the basis that the windows are conditioned to be timber, and samples of the stonework are submitted to and approved by the LPA.

Rights Of Way Officer

The proposal will not affect any rights of way if the developer gains access from Calderbrook Road and does not run along Hey Head Lane to access Handle Hall Cottage.

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties and a site notice was posted at the entrance of Hey Head Lane. No 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:

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

Amendments

N/A

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ❑ 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.”*
- ❑ As it stands, the host dwelling comprises a two-storey side extension which is considered to be unsympathetic and non-subservient by virtue of its dominant scale, the uncomplimentary use of white render and disproportionate windows.
- ❑ The proposal seeks to reduce the depth of the two-storey side extension by approx. 1.07m, and the ridge height by 0.13m, resulting in a more regular and symmetrical built form which would appear better articulated than the existing extension. Whilst the alterations are minor in nature, it would nevertheless appear subordinate to the main dwelling and would be acceptable.
- ❑ No concerns are had with the dual-pitched roof form of the proposed side extension and the proposed side porch which would appear in keeping.
- ❑ The use of regular coursed stone walls in lieu of the unsympathetic rendering of the existing two-storey side extension would more complementary to the host dwelling. Suitable specification of stonework can be achieved via condition as not to harm the character and appearance of the street scene.
- ❑ It is considered the proposed fenestration are sized and positioned appropriately with the existing fenestration. The proposed sawn stone door and window surrounds would also appear match with the architectural features of the original dwelling and would be appropriately designed.
- ❑ Taken as a whole, the proposal constitute a sympathetic improvement of the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding street scene and constitute a satisfactory standard of design and visual appearance.
- ❑ The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Heritage: P2

- ❑ 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.”*

❑ 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 host dwelling is a Georgian cottage circa the 19th century and has retained some of its vernacular architectural qualities and features. Subsequently, it has been identified as a non-designated heritage asset by the Conservation Officer.
- ☐ The proposal is adjacent to Handle Hall and Adjoining Barn, a Grade-II listed building due to its architectural and historic interest. According to its official listing, the property is an 1820 rebuilding of a house of 1610 with a barn added in the 1840s. It is constructed from hammer-dressed watershot stone with graduated stone slate roof.
- ☐ The proposal seeks to reconstruct an unsympathetic rendered existing two-storey side extension circa 1960s to one which would relate more positively to the built forms of the original dwelling. The overall scale of the extension would be reduced and would appear more proportionate and subservient to the original building.
- ☐ The use of regular coursed stone would serve to enhance the significance of the host dwelling, as well as the setting of the designated heritage asset. Suitable stonework can be secured via condition to prevent less than substantial harm to the heritage assets.
- ☐ The submitted plans indicate the proposed windows would be constructed from uPVC, which, given the presence of timber windows in the host dwelling, would constitute less than substantial harm to the dwelling as a non-designated heritage asset. However, it is noted this harm can be minimised via condition requiring timber windows to be painted to match the host dwelling.
- ☐ The proposed development is sited approx. 35m away from the Handle Hall and is largely screened by mature trees along the north-east curtilage boundary, as well as Hey Head Lane as an access road. On this basis, it is considered the host dwelling and the proposed side extension are unlikely to be readily visible when viewed from the listed building.
- ☐ Given the overall improved design and appearance, it is considered the proposals would have a neutral impact on the significance of the adjacent designated and non-designated heritage assets and would be acceptable, in accordance with Policy P2 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

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:

☐ *“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 host dwelling does not directly face any properties to its front and rear, the approx. 35m intervening distance from Handle Hall Farm, and the substantial screening between the properties, it is considered the proposed development would not result in significant amenity impacts to neighbouring occupiers.
- ☐ 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 Policies 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 proposals would not result in the addition of bedrooms and would retain a maximum four parking spaces in the attached double garage and front driveway. The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with Policies T2 and DM1.

Principle of Development – Green Belt: G4

- ☐ The application site is allocated as Green Belt under saved Policy G/D/2 of the Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (2006). Policy G/D/2 is therefore relevant to any applications on the site and in the supporting text to this policy it is established that the Green Belt will be protected from inappropriate development in order to maintain the framework of open land separating and surrounding the urban areas of the borough. Core Strategy policy G4 seeks to restrict development within the Green Belt to the limited types of development which are deemed appropriate by national planning policies unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated.
- ☐ Paragraph 147 of the NPPF establishes that, as with previous Green Belt policy, *“inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances”*. Paragraph 148 adds *“local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. ‘Very special circumstances’ will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.”*

¶ Paragraph 149 of the NPPF establishes that “a local planning authority 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.”

¶ Therefore, the main consideration in assessing the principle of development is whether the proposed scheme constitutes inappropriate development within the Green Belt and, if so, whether very special circumstances have been demonstrated which may outweigh the presumption against development.

¶ In respect of the above policy guidance, Section 5.20 of the Council's adopted 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016) Supplementary Planning Document states that “normally, in principle, extensions that result in up to a 35% increase in floor space or volume over and above the original dwelling would normally be considered appropriate and not disproportionate (this calculation would include previous extensions to the original dwelling, which is defined as the dwelling as it was first built or as it stood on 1 July 1948). However, the characteristics of properties and proposals will vary significantly and there may be instances when a 35%

increase would be considered disproportionate and other occasions when a greater than 35% increase may be considered proportionate.”

- ② The proposal seeks to demolish the existing single-storey rear extension and reconstruct the existing two-storey side extension. As it stands, the host property comprises a number of non-original enlargements, including the aforementioned side and rear extension, as well as an attached double garage. As no planning history has been attached to such development, and in the absence of the original plans, the existing extensions are considered to have stood for some time and are generally accepted as part of the host dwelling.
- ② Notwithstanding, the proposed two-storey side extension would result in a reduction in floor space from 70 to 58 square metres. Subsequently the volume of the side extension would be proportionally reduced and would not appear materially larger than the existing structure. On this basis, the proposed works would be considered appropriate and proportionate additions to the original dwelling.

Openness

- ② Paragraph 137 of the NPPF states that *“the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.”*
- ② “Openness”, for the purpose of Green Belt policy is not formally defined within Planning Policy or legislation but is taken to mean the absence of built development. The term “openness”, comprises a spatial and visual component which should be assessed in considering whether a proposal preserves the openness of the Green Belt.
- ② Given the proposed development would result in an overall reduction in floor space and volume over and above the original dwelling, and would not appear materially larger than the existing building it replaces, no harm has been identified with regard to the spatial and visual openness of the Green Belt.

Planning Balance

- ② In light of the above assessment, the proposal would meet inappropriate development exemption (c) which would allow for 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, and (d) which would allow for the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces. No other harm has been identified in terms of design or neighbour amenity. The application therefore accords Policy G4 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

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:

- ☐ Existing Location Plan – Drawing No. 1313.001 dated 11/2022
- ☐ Proposed Site Plan – Drawing No. 1313.101 dated 11/2022
- ☐ Existing Ground Floor Plan – Drawing No. 1313.002 dated 11/2022
- ☐ Existing First Floor Plan – Drawing No. 1313.003 dated 11/2022
- ☐ Existing South East and North East Elevation – Drawing No. 1313.004 dated 11/2022
- ☐ Existing North West Elevation and Section Plan – Drawing No. 1313.005 dated 11/2022
- ☐ Proposed Ground Floor Plan – Drawing No. 1313.102 dated 11/2022
- ☐ Proposed First Floor Plan – Drawing No. 1313.103 dated 11/2022
- ☐ Proposed South East and North East Elevation – Drawing No. 1313.104 dated 11/2022
- ☐ Proposed North West Elevation and Section Plan – Drawing No. 1313.105 dated 11/2022

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 order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity and to protect the significance of the non-designated and designated heritage asset, in accordance with Policy P2, 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. The proposed windows shall be constructed in timber and painted to match the timber windows of the existing dwelling. 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 non-designated and designated heritage asset, in accordance with Policy P2, P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Article 35 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.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	11/08/2023	Signed: SY
Authorisation	11/08/2023	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen