

DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.	CASE OFFICER	DATE
23/01027/LBC	Claire Ringwood	19 th January 2024

Address: 102 Syke Road, Rochdale, OL12 9TE

Proposal: Alterations to a partially converted basement to provide additional living accommodation to include the removal of all previous timber studwork, raising of the floor level, installation of a cavity drainage channel and a cavity drain lining installed on all external walls, installation of a timber stud wall, insulation and insulated plasterboard and existing openings to be made wider

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?	Y

EIA	Screening opinion completed and saved to Onbase?	N
-----	--	---

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

RECOMMENDATION	GRANT subject to conditions
----------------	-----------------------------

CHECKED AND SIGNED OFF BY: RG

DATE: 02 February 2024

SITE

102 Syke Road (also referred to as Frazer Cottage) is a three storey mid-terrace property (basement, ground and first floor) and also a Grade II listed building.

The Historic England listing reads:

“Weaver’s cottage, early C19, architect unknown.

MATERIALS: built from sandstone.

PLAN: number 102 is a double pile dwelling. The ground floor is divided longitudinally. The upper floor comprises a number of rooms opening onto a hall. The basement comprises a single room and corridor.

EXTERIOR: the west elevation of number 102 is built of watershot coursed sandstone. The ground floor has a two light wooden top hung sash window in a stone surround under a key-stone lintel. The first floor is marked by a line of weavers’ windows in stone. The cellar is lit by a three light mullioned window in stone. The rear elevation is of rendered stone with square timber windows in stone surrounds and a pair of French windows. The roof is covered with stone, with brick chimney stacks.

INTERIOR: the ground floor contains a large fireplace with a stone bressummer projecting from the wall. The upper storey is supported on exposed plain timber beams. The upper storey is modernised but contains the exposed stone surrounds and mullions of the weavers’ windows and a cast iron register grate. The garret is supported on exposed moulded timber beams. The cellar is of brick and stone and contains the remains of a bricked up door and window to the rear and a fireplace.”

The application site is within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone.

PROPOSAL

The application proposes alterations to the partially converted basement to provide additional living accommodation to include the removal of all previous timber studwork, raising of the floor level, installation of a cavity drainage channel and a cavity drain lining installed on all external walls, installation of a timber stud wall, insulation and insulated plasterboard and existing openings are to be made wider.

PLANS AND DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED

Drawing No: 72_01 – Site Location Plan
Drawing No: 72_02 – Existing Basement Floor Plan
Drawing No: 72_03 – Proposed Basement Floor Plan
Drawing No: 72_04 – Typical Section
Drawing No: 72_05 – Typical Notes – page 1
Drawing No: 72_06 – Typical Notes – pages 2
Photos of the existing Basement Floor
Received on 15th September 2023

Heritage Statement by CRISP Architecture
Received on 16th October 2023

Drawing No: 72_01 Rev A – Site Location Plan
Received on 29th November 2023

The agent submitted additional information, received on 4th January 2024:

Heritage Statement by CRISP Architecture Revision A, Date: 4th January 2024
Drawing No: DW-522-1-(C) – Delta System 500 with Delta Drainage Channel and Insulation
Delta Membrane Systems Ltd – Ancillary Products Brochure

The agent submitted the following amended plan, received on 19th January 2024:
Drawing No: 72_03 Rev A – Proposed Basement Floor Plan

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Chapter 16 – Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS):

P2 – Protecting and enhancing character, landscape and heritage

Unitary Development Plan (UDP):

D/10 – Protected Open Land

Emerging Policy – Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan

The Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan is a strategic regional plan for all of the Greater Manchester Local Authorities with the exception of Stockport. It seeks to guide the largest and most strategic developments of housing and employment land across the region. It also contains strategic policies for development management matters. This plan is at an advanced stage and is now afforded substantial weight in decision making.

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

91/D27374 - Replace Existing Windows To Front Elevation And Windows And Door To Rear Elevation. Approved 15/04/1992.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Conservation Officer

Original comments

Necessary information which is needed in order to recommend this application for approval:

- Information i.e. description of age, materials and photographic evidence of areas of the floor which are proposed to be levelled with waterproofing concrete as part of the waterproofing strategy. It was noted that most areas of the floor were levelled with concrete as part of the previous refurbishment strategy. It has not been specified whether or not the other areas of the floor were also screed or whether there is the historic floor there at present. Further information to these ends is required.
- Photographic images of the present treatment of the disused fireplaces and bricked in doorway. They are mentioned in the Historic England listing but are not explicitly or clearly depicted in the package of photographs included in the

application submission. As they clearly contribute to the significance of the building the proposed tanking to cover them up completely would certainly have some negative impact which would incur some less than substantial harm. Photographs of these areas are required. Also, in line with the comments received by HB and P, the lintel to the bricked in doorway appears to be being propped in some of the photos, although the angle of the photo and debris within it looks a bit like it obscures this. Should this lintel be unfit for purpose, a strategy for its repair/replacement should be proposed and included in a superseded heritage statement; any strategy should be analysed in terms of impact on the asset's significance and examined within the constraints of chapter 16 of the NPPF.

- Explicit details of any brick plugs which are proposed to be used to fix the cavity drain lining to the external walls will need to be detailed in more explicit detail. Whilst this is said to be removable in the future, the strategy will need to be detailed and analysed within a superseded heritage statement. This should include mention of the materials which are proposed to be fixed to (age, type, historical significance) as well as the methods of fixing within a superseded heritage statement. Whilst this has nominally been detailed in the specifications of the waterproofing system and on a detail submitted within the heritage statement, a more specific detail of simply the brick plug and its interaction with the external wall would be preferable.

It is also advised, in line with the comments given by Historic Buildings and Places that the applicant undertakes the necessary surveys to determine if adequate ventilation is being achieved to the ground floor timber structures at present. If this was not presently being achieved, then appropriate retrofitting measures should be proposed by the competent firm of surveyors commissioned to examine the property. These should then be included within the application submission.

Updated comments

Most points have been satisfied and information provided. Although proposed plans need to be superseded. Draft conditions suggested.

Joint Committee of National Amenities Societies

Statutory Remit: Historic Buildings & Places (HB&P) is a consultee on Listed Building Consent applications, as per the Arrangements for handling heritage applications - notification to Historic England and National Amenity Societies and the Secretary of State (England) Direction 2021. We are interested in historic assets of all types and all ages, including conservation areas and undesignated heritage.

Comments: Thank you for notifying HB&P about the above application for listed building consent. We have reviewed the documentation available online and provide the following comments for consideration in determining this application.

HB&P have concerns with the proposed tanking of the basement. Tanking should only be a solution of last resort as it risks trapping water within historic building fabric, and potentially causing unintended decay and other problems in the future. Before proceeding, it is essential that the cause of the damp is investigated and determined. The photo of the front wall to the lounge shows extensive damage under the windows extending much further up the wall than one would expect. Do the windows leak? Do the window cills trap water and direct it inwards? Is the drainage to the front lightwell in front blocked? Etc.

To the rear workshop, the alcove appears to have a lintel (though difficult to determine from the photo). Has this been blocked up and, potentially, is moisture entering from the original lightwell? Would reopening this rear window improve

ventilation,

etc?

The application suggests the previous owners inserted a cement floor that may also trap moisture in the walls. Details of the new floor to the lounge and workshop should be provided, but should be designed to breath, not trap moisture. We would also be concerned about the boarding over the fireplaces without further assessment and justification.

In summary, we recommend consideration be given to Historic England's advice note on damp in buildings: <https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/technical-advice/buildings/damp-in-historic-buildings/investigation-of-moisture-and-its-effects-on-traditional-buildings/>

Update comments

I note that they don't actually address the source of moisture, but given the principle of the use of the basement is acceptable, I am happy to defer to your conservation officer to address the outstanding matters.

Historic England

Suggest the views of the Council's Conservation Officer is sought and it is not necessary to consult them on this application again.

REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been publicised with a site notice, neighbour notification letters and a press notice. One letter of representation has been received in respect of whether the correct Notice has been completed as 101 and 102 Syke Road are leasehold and also as there is a flying freehold situation where the basement, utility and storage areas of 102 Syke Road under-sail 101 Syke Road. Party Wall and Building Regulation matters were also mentioned. As these are separate from the planning application, informatives will be included in the decision to advise the applicant of these matters.

Officers consulted with the applicant's agent who confirmed the basement of 102 Syke Road under-sails 101 Syke Road. Amended Notices were served and the red line on the Location Plan altered to address this matter.

ANALYSIS

As the application site is a Grade II listed 102 Syke Road, the provisions of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 apply. This requires a local planning authority to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

NPPF Paragraph 212 states that should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites, and within the setting of heritage assets, to enhance or better reveal their significance.

NPPF paragraph 206 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.

In accordance with NPPF paragraph 208, where a development 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.

Rochdale Core Strategy Policy P2 states that the borough's heritage will be protected through conserving, enhancing and promoting key heritage assets, which include conservation areas, listed buildings, and non-designated heritage assets.

GMCA's draft Places for Everyone Plan Policy JP-P2 seeks to encourage heritage place-making and states the desire to positively conserve, sustain and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets, and their settings.

Assessment of harm to the significance of the Listed Building

The application site is to the basement of a Grade II listed former Weaver's cottage. The proposal is largely for the removal of a previously unsuccessful and unsympathetic tanking system. Additionally, to re-screed the previously laid concrete floor and to remove previously instated timber and plasterboard partitions.

The alterations are with the aim of refurbishing the basement area to create a slightly downsized WC, as well as a games room in place of the present workshop.

The additional information sent over by the agent specifying the waterproofing strategy- what is specified as a type B system with an added drainage cavity- is agreeable in principle and is a good means of waterproofing a listed building in a way which is largely reversible.

Comments received by Historic Buildings and Places are mostly concerned with water penetration and ventilation. These comments are all valid and worth noting, although a good way to address issues of damp in a basement would be through instating a drainage system such as the one proposed.

Additional information was requested by the Council's Conservation Officer as detailed above which was submitted on 4th January 2024. The Council's Conservation Officer has reviewed this information and advised that the updated Heritage Statement and associated documents have addressed a number of the points previously raised.

The condition of the floor has been verified. It has been made clear in the updated Heritage Statement that all of the floors have previously been screed in concrete. Therefore, the specification of new waterproofing concrete as part for the type C drainage cavity with waterproof screed is agreeable. No conditions are required with respect of heritage in relation to these works as the floor is of no longer of historical significance.

The specification of the steel helical ties to repair the beam acting as the lintel for the bricked up opening is agreeable in principle, although the proposed plans do not specify any repair works in association with this defect. The steel helical bars method should clearly be denoted on the plans. It would be preferable if these repairs could be carried out whilst the beam/lintel is in situ. This matter can be dealt with by way of a condition.

As specified in the updated Heritage Statement, it may not be practicable to repair the lintel and thus it would need to be replaced. If there is a deviation from repairing the lintel, a set of superseded plans would be required, indicating that the lintel is to be replaced and a method statement of its replacement and specification of the replacement material would need to be submitted. This matter can be dealt with by way of a condition.

Specific mention has been made that the plugs will be fit into the mortar joints and this has been included in the amended basement plan.

The widening of the doorways to the utility area was not agreeable as this will affect the historical brick fabric which is believed to be original to the structure. The amended plans now show the original door openings to remain which is acceptable.

Beams "A" were proposed to be removed which was not agreeable unless they have been proven to be structurally unstable and beyond repair. These beams appear to be original, as they appear to have old housings, their general appearance, and their bearing configuration on either side of the chimney breast in each room. The amended basement plan show the beams to remain but coated in a matt intumescent varnish, which the agent advised was to give the beams fire protection. The Conservation Officer raised no objection to this.

The Conservation Officer advised that should the joists, marked on the plans as "Beam(s) B" be proposed to be replaced, a method for propping of the ground floor should be submitted via condition. The amended basement plan states that the beams will be checked and remain in place where possible and if new beams are required then a method statement will be submitted.

The Conservation Officer advised that the fireplaces should be not irreversibly blocked up to allow for the partition works. The amended basement plan states that the works will be reversible and no permanent infilling will be undertaken which is acceptable.

The NPPF directs local planning authorities to give great weight to an asset's conservation. It is considered that the public benefits associated with the refurbishment and the repairs would clearly outweigh the less than substantial harm identified to its significance.

Subject to conditions as detailed in the recommendation below, the proposal would comply with NPPF paragraph 208 and Core Strategy Policy P2.

The proposed works would help to preserve the building and its features of special architectural and historic interest. It would comply with the requirements of the Planning (Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings) Act 1990.

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT subject to conditions

1. The works must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this consent.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of section 18 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. This permission relates to the following plans and documents:

Drawing No: 72_01 Rev A – Site Location Plan
Received on 29th November 2023

Heritage Statement by CRISP Architecture Revision A, Date: 4th January 2024

Drawing No: DW-522-1-(C) – Delta System 500 with Delta Drainage Channel and Insulation

and the development shall be carried out in complete accordance with these drawings and documents 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. Prior to the instatement of any repairs/replacements, a method statement for the repair of any lintels should be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of these works. This method statement should include: specifications of all materials to be instated, tools and equipment to be used (including any propping or stabilising measures) and measures to ensure that no undue harm will be incurred on historical fabric throughout the course of these works.

Reason: to ensure that special regard is paid to protecting the special architectural and historic interest and integrity of the building under Section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

4. Should there be a deviation from the approved plans with respect to lintel repair throughout the course of works, a set of superseded plans and a method statement for any lintel's replacement should be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of replacement works. The plans should indicate the lintel to be replaced and make specific mention of the material of the replacement lintel; any replacement lintel should be locally sourced sandstone and the mortar used to bed it should be lime-based. The method statement should include: details and tools/equipment to be used for propping/stabilising, the geographical origin of any replacement, the recipe/specification of mortar used to bed it, any tools to be used, and measures to ensure that no undue harm will be incurred on historical fabric throughout the course of works.

Reason: to ensure that special regard is paid to protecting the special architectural and historic interest and integrity of the building under Section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

5. If Beams B are to be replaced: Prior to the commencement of works to the ground floor structure, a method statement detailing propping measures should be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. This statement should include measures to ensure that no undue harm will be incurred on any historical fabric throughout the course of these works.

Reason: to ensure that special regard is paid to protecting the special architectural and historic interest and integrity of the building under Section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Notes for Applicant:

The applicant is advised of their obligations and requirements of the Party Wall Act (1996) details of which can be found at:

www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/partywall as the basement of 102 Syke Road under-sails 101 Syke Road.

Your attention is drawn to the requirement for submission of a Building Regulations application for the proposed development. Please contact RBC Building Control on 01706 924327 or email building.control@rochdale.gov.uk