

DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.	CASE OFFICER	DATE
23/00031/FUL	Majid Mir	28 November 2023

Address: 8-9 Paul Row, Temple Lane, Littleborough, OL15 9QG

Proposal: Alterations to building to facilitate conversion of one dwelling into two dwellings including demolition of single storey rear extension, formation of new front entrance doorway, formation of new rear doorway and rear first floor windows, installation of new internal staircase and internal walls, installation of timber windows and doors, installation of rooflights to rear roof elevation, infilling of existing internal walls and erection of boundary treatment to rear and side

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: RG

DATE: 01 December 2023

SITE

The application relates to 8-9 Paul Row. The application property is an end of terrace property with the whole row of terrace properties being designated as grade II listed buildings. The application is also located within Rock Nook Conservation Area. There are a number of more modern residential properties located to the north and west of the site. .

The Historic England description states:

"II Row of 8 cottages, now 6 cottages. Early C19. Hammer-dressed watershot stone with graduated stone slate roof. Each cottage is double-depth, has 1 bay and 2 storeys. Each has a door with square-cut surround adjoining a 3-light flat faced mullion window. Similar 5 or 6-light windows on first floor (total of 5 mullions missing). Bay added to right in C19.9 ridge chimney stacks. Similar window type to rear but of 2 and 3 lights. House."

PROPOSAL

The application seeks to subdivide the existing property in to two separate dwellings. Additionally the application seeks to demolish a previously constructed single storey rear extension. There is no planning history available for the construction of the single storey extension. Furthermore, during the site visit, it was noted that the demolition of the single storey extension had already been undertaken.

The application also seeks to insert a new front entrance doorway in the front elevation, a new rear doorway in the rear elevation, a new window opening in the first floor rear elevation, install a new internal staircase and internal walls, infilling of existing internal walls, replacement of UPVC windows and doors with timber framed windows and timber doors, installation of two roof lights to the rear roof elevation, erection of boundary treatment to rear and side. Timber boundary treatment has already been partly constructed to the rear of the properties.

The application has been submitted in tandem with a Listed Building Consent application 23/00032/LBC.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas Act) 1990 (as amended)

Section 66 of the above Act states that in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority, or as the case may be, the Secretary of State 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.

Section 72 of the above Act states that in the exercise of planning functions with respect to any buildings or other land in a Conservation Area, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS):

SO3	Improving design, image and quality of place
P2	Protecting and enhancing character, landscape and heritage
P3	Improving design of new development
SO2	Creating successful and healthy communities
C1	Delivering the right amount of housing in the right places
C3	Delivering the right type of housing
C6	Improving health and well being
DM1	General Development Requirements
SD1	Delivering sustainable development
SO5	Improving accessibility and delivering sustainable transport
T2	Improving Accessibility

Unitary Development Plan (UDP):

G/D/1	Defined Urban Area
BE/18	Changes of Use to Buildings in Conservation Areas

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):

Supplementary Planning Guidance note 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (June 2016).

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

23/00032/LBC	Alterations to building to facilitate conversion of one dwelling into two dwellings including demolition of single storey rear extension, formation of new front entrance doorway, formation of new rear doorway and rear first floor windows, installation of new internal staircase and internal walls, installation of timber windows and doors, installation of roof lights to rear roof elevation, infilling of existing internal walls, erection of boundary treatment to rear and side.
21/01623/FUL	Alterations to building to facilitate conversion of one dwelling into two dwellings including: porch extension to side elevation, removal of existing rear extension and erection of new extension to rear elevation, installation of new window to the first floor side elevation; installation of new internal staircase and partition walls and infilling of openings to existing internal walls. Decision: Withdrawn.
21/01624/LBC	Alterations to building to facilitate conversion of one dwelling into two dwellings including: porch extension to side elevation, removal of existing rear extension and erection of new extension to rear elevation, installation of new window to the first floor side elevation; installation of new internal staircase

and partition walls and infilling of openings to existing internal walls.

Decision: Withdrawn.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Highways and Engineering

Highways have considered a previous application for this site which is very similar to this recent application. Parking provision for the development has been a previous concern and we would have expected some reference from the applicant to how parking concerns would be addressed but we can find no reference to parking in this recent submission.

Parking demand will increase as a result of making one property into two on a street which is narrow and has limited on street parking available due to existing driveways. For the size of dwellings proposed the Councils maximum car parking standards would require the provision of two parking spaces per property and it appears that this application provides only one off street parking space. This shortfall has the potential to result in an additional three cars parking on Temple Lane. The existing property is also situated on a junction and additional on-street parking will make turning movements difficult particularly for larger vehicles so there is the potential detrimental impact on highway capacity and road safety

The application if granted would not have a detrimental impact on highway capacity on the wider highway network.

We would also need to assess the position of the bin storage area particularly for Number 7 as it would seem that there is no direct access from the rear of the separated property to Temple Lane. Highways would not support any proposals that led to bins being stored on the adopted highway.

Further information is required before Highways could support this application.

Conservation And Design

11/09/2023

Summary: Amendment required to exclude the proposed canopy to the front elevation. All other details agreeable subject to condition.

Significance Assessment:

When making a decision on all listed building consent applications, the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires a local planning authority to 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. Preservation in this context means not harming the interest in the building, as opposed to keeping it utterly unchanged.

NPPF Paragraph 190 states that plans for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment. Plans should take into account the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets, and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation.

NPPF Paragraph 194 states that In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to

understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

NPPF paragraph 199 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.

NPPF paragraph 200 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.

This is reiterated at a local level by Rochdale CS policy P2, which seeks to protect the borough's heritage. This policy seeks to conserve, enhance and promote key heritage assets.

Impacts on heritage significance

In terms of their impact on heritage significance, all internal works are agreeable and are seen to enhance the significance of the listed building by instating historical materials, by generally conserving the listed building, and by generally altering the building to more closely reflect its original plan form. With respect to external works, these works are agreeable, save for the proposed canopy to the front elevation. Whilst it is in line with the property next door, this addition is not in line with the plan form or façade of a typical weaver's cottage (which this row of cottages is, as assessed within the heritage statement) and would result in a loss of significance to the listed building. These alterations are therefore not agreeable; plans should be resubmitted to exclude these from the most recent plans.

This application is recommended for approval subject to the following conditions:

- Specification of any mortar to be instated should be provided to the LPA for approval prior to instatement. Any mortar should be lime based and chosen to match the existing mortar's colour; any replacement stone which may be needed throughout the course of works should be submitted to the LPA for approval prior to instatement; any stone should be chosen to match the existing in type, colour and durability.
- Full architectural details (including elevations and cross-sections) of all proposed windows and doors. These should all be timber, as detailed on the submitted drawings. Proposed windows should have one central, horizontal or no glazing bar, to be in line with windows to the rest of the terrace. The present proposal for the door, in keeping with those to the rest of the terrace, is agreeable. These details should be agreed upon in writing prior to instatement.
- The proposed door location to the proposed number 9 Paul Row is agreeable, although a method statement for creating this opening is required. This should detail any tools to be used and should include method

statements to ensure that no undue damage to stone fabric is incurred during works. Details of the lintels and jambs to the door opening are required to. Ideally, these will be solid sandstone pieces, to mimic those to the door to no. 8, as well as to the rest of the terrace. These details should be agreed via written submission with the LPA prior to the commencement of all works.

16/10/2023

I note the canopy is still on the most recent submitted plans, please exclude. With respect to the proposed conditions:

“- Specification of any mortar to be instated should be provided to the LPA for approval prior to instatement. Any mortar should be lime based and chosen to match the existing mortar's colour; any replacement stone which may be needed throughout the course of works should be submitted to the LPA for approval prior to instatement; any stone should be chosen to match the existing in type, colour and durability.”

The mortar has been roughly specified, but I am unsure what this mix's composition is or its colour. In order to avoid condition you must provide both of these. No details of the replacement stone have been specified. These are needed to avoid condition- you must disclose geographical origin and type. Any stone should be pieced in sympathetically to match the fabric of the rest of the exterior, creating a seamless wall where relevant. Any new lintels, jambs or sills should likewise be chosen to match those existing with respect to type and geographical origin- dimensions have been specified and are agreeable.

“- Full architectural details (including elevations and cross-sections) of all proposed windows and doors. These should all be timber, as detailed on the submitted drawings. Proposed windows should have one central, horizontal or no glazing bar, to be in line with windows to the rest of the terrace. The present proposal for the door, in keeping with those to the rest of the terrace, is agreeable. These details should be agreed upon in writing prior to instatement. “

The windows detailed do not comply with the glazing bar arrangement as specified, please see comments above and submit plans which comply with these comments

“- The proposed door location to the proposed number 9 Paul Row is agreeable, although a method statement for creating this opening is required. This should detail any tools to be used and should include method statements to ensure that no undue damage to stone fabric is incurred during works. Details of the lintels and jambs to the door opening are required to. Ideally, these will be solid sandstone pieces, to mimic those to the door to no. 8, as well as to the rest of the terrace. These details should be agreed via written submission with the LPA prior to the commencement of all works.”

The method statement is not agreeable as it does not detail that handtools will first be used to rake out old mortar. This method should detail the points made about the first condition (above) to indicate that all new stone will be sympathetically pieced in.

REPRESENTATIONS

Letters of notification were sent to neighbouring properties, a site notice was placed in the vicinity of the site and a press notice was released. No responses have been received.

ANALYSIS

Principle of development

The site is located in the Defined Urban Area, Rochdale Town Centre and Rochdale Town Centre Conservation Area as defined in Rochdale Borough Council's Unitary Development Plan (UDP) Proposals Map. New development, wherever possible and appropriate, should be concentrated within the urban area in order to support urban regeneration and to protect the countryside.

Core Strategy Policy C1 sets out that the Council will seek to maximise the potential of previously developed sites within the urban area to achieve a target of 80% of new housing on previously developed land. In addition, Policy C3 seeks to widen the housing choice to broaden the appeal of the Borough and support its economic growth and states that the Council will promote densities that make efficient use of land whilst delivering a range of housing to widen choice in the borough and reflect local character.

Therefore, subject to further assessment of the impacts of the proposed development and any other development management policies, the scheme is considered to be acceptable in principle, and would accord with the requirements of Policies C1 and C3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy in principle.

Heritage and design

Policy P2 of the adopted Core Strategy states that the Council will protect the Borough's heritage by conserving, enhancing and promoting key heritage assets, both statutory and non-statutory, including consideration of their wider settings.

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.

Paragraph 199 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 202 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'.

Whilst a number of internal works are required to facilitate the subdivision of the building, they are to be considered under an application for listed building consent, which accompanies this planning application.

In regards to the external work being proposed these consist of demolition of a single storey extension, replacing UPVC doors and windows with timber alternatives, create door openings to the front and rear, window on the first floor rear elevation, two roof windows, and boundary treatment to the side and rear.

The proposal originally including the addition of canopies. This was subsequently removed from the proposal. Although many of the adjoining listed cottages do have canopies, these are not in line with the plan form or façade of a typical weaver's cottage and would have resulted in a loss of significance to the listed building.

The application proposes to reinstate doors to the rear and front. The inclusion of a new front door to what would become no. 9 Paul Row would be notable. No. 9 Paul Row does slightly differ from the other cottages with the window forms and ridge heights being different. It also appears that no. 8-9 Paul Row were converted into one property at some point. The new door opening to the front has been sited away from the edge and the quoins. Further to this, the reintroduction of historic elements to the property is considered to be advantageous. The Conservation Officer considered that the location of the proposed doors to be acceptable however a method statement for the creation of the re-opening including details of any tools to be used will need to be provided to ensure undue damage to stone fabric is not incurred during works. Additionally details of the lintels and jambs to the door opening were also requested. Subsequently, a method statement plus details of the openings was provided. This is considered to be acceptable.

At present, UPVC windows have been installed. These are considered to be unacceptable additions to listed buildings. The application proposes to replace these with timber windows which would provide betterment. Details of the timber windows and doors have been provided and are considered to be acceptable. It is considered appropriate to include a condition requiring the windows and doors to be installed in accordance with the plans. Additionally, it is considered appropriate to include a condition requiring the rooflights to be conservation style rooflights.

The building had seen a lean to extension added to the rear and the extension that is being proposed to be demolished. When visiting the property it is noted that this had already been demolished. No remnants of the extensions are visible. Looking at historic images, it is unclear when the extension was demolished but appears to be before the recent sale of the property. Further to this, historic photographs show that this extension was a later addition. The removal of an element of the property that was not a part of the historic fabric of the property is considered a positive.

In regards to the boundary treatment, this has already been partly installed. It is traditional timber boundary treatment that is commonly used. This is considered to be acceptable.

In conclusion, it is noted that the openings have previously been replaced unsympathetically. The proposal would see the reintroduction of historic elements of the building which more closely reflect its original plan form along with some other sympathetic additions. Furthermore, it is noted that it would remove some

unsympathetic additions to the building. As such it is considered that the proposal would have neutral impact on the designated heritage asset.

Amenity

Paragraph 174 of the NPPF also states that Planning policies and decisions should ensure that new development is appropriate for its location, taking into account the likely effects of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development. Paragraph 130 also seeks to ensure that planning decisions create places which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. Policies DM1 and G9 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy seek to ensure that new development is compatible with surrounding land uses, both in terms of its impact upon those uses and the impact of the surrounding land uses upon the amenities of future residents / users, also requiring that development does not have impacts that lead to an unacceptable increase in air, water, noise, light or other pollution. Additionally, policy DM1 of the Core Strategy requires that proposals should not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.

The property is located in a residential area and the property is presently a single residential property. The proposed subdivision in to two residential properties is unlikely to cause undue harm to any of the surrounding neighbours. Furthermore, the application proposes a new window on the first floor rear elevation. The window would not face any residential properties and would not project any further than the existing windows on the first floor rear elevation. Finally, the boundary treatment would not be considerably tall and would be the same found on the neighbouring properties.

The properties would be subdivided in to a one bedroom property (no. 8) and a two bedroom property (no. 9). Both are set over two floors. In regards to no. 8, the property would have a gross internal floor area of 60.7 sqm. The property would meet the minimum internal gross area required for a one bedroom, two person property set over two floors. The property does have two rooms on the first floor excluding bathroom, however, one has been identified as a store room and therefore the property is identified as a one bedroom property. It is accepted that the smaller room identified as a store room may be used as a bedroom, but it may also be used as a store room or office. As the property is a listed building and the internal walls are already in place, it would not be appropriate to require reconfiguration of the internal walls.

In regards to no. 9, the property has an internal gross floor area of 67.3 sqm. This would be slightly short of the 70 sqm required for a two bedroom, three person property set over two floors. However, as noted above, the property is a listed building and there are other properties in the row of terrace that are also two bedroom properties. The rooms provided would be regular in shape and offer reasonable arrangements and storage. Considering that the property is a listed building and the arrangement is commonly found on the other properties in the row of terrace, it is considered that on balance, it is acceptable.

Additionally, both properties would retain sufficient private outdoor amenity space.

On balance, considering the listing of the properties it is considered that the proposal is acceptable. As such, it is considered that the proposal would comply with Core Strategy policies DM1 and G9 and the NPPF.

Highways

With any application for new development it is important to assess the impact on highway safety and under policy T2 of the adopted Core Strategy it is established that 'In all circumstances, the safety, accessibility and amenity of those who live or have business in the area will have priority, while providing reliable journey times for those travelling through'. Whilst Paragraph 111 of the NPPF states that 'development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe'.

The highways department did raise concerns in regards to the parking arrangements at the property, noting that parking demand will increase as a result of making one property into two on the street. It is noted that the Core Strategy parking standards would allow a maximum of 3 spaces based on the number of bedrooms proposed across the properties. This is however a maximum figure and it is noted there is sufficient parking space to the side for one of the properties and the other property will have access to on street parking as is the case for most of the other properties in the row of terrace. It is the officer's view that parking would not be a reasonable reason for objection to the application. The highways department concluded that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on highway capacity on the wider highway network.

Further to the above, the highways department raised concerns in regards to bin storage. The plans have identified a location for bins to be stored to the side of the properties from where they can be wheeled out and in on bin collection day.

As such, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable and in accordance with the relevant parts of adopted Rochdale Core Strategy policies T2 and DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

RECOMMENDATION

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 consent relates to the following list of submitted plans and documents:-

Location plan, Existing and Proposed Site Plan. Drawing No. JCBD-21-236 - 5. Rev: 04.

Existing Plans, Elevations And Roof Layout. Drawing No. JCBD-21-236 - 1. Rev: 03.

Proposed Plans, Elevations And Roof Layout. Drawing No. JCBD-21-236 - 2. Rev: 03.

Window, Door, Sandstone Head and Jambs Schedule. Drawing No. JCBD-21-236 - 3. Rev: 01.

and the works shall be carried out in accordance with these drawings and documents hereby approved.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure a satisfactory standard of works in accordance with the policies contained within the saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan, the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. The stone used in the works as detailed in the hereby approved plans shall match the existing stone and in accordance with details identified in the submitted document 'Method Statement (dated: October 2023) and submitted plan 'Window, Door, Sandstone Head and Jambs Schedule (Drawing No. JCBD-21-236 - 3. Rev: 01)'.

Reason: In order to preserve the historic fabric and architectural quality of the listed building in accordance with policies P2, P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas Act) 1990 (as amended).

4. The works hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the details and methodology shown in the submitted document 'Method Statement (dated: October 2023)'.

Reason: In order to preserve the historic fabric and architectural quality of the listed building in accordance with policies P2, P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas Act) 1990 (as amended).

5. All new windows and doors shall be of timber construction, and in accordance with the submitted plan 'Window, Door, Sandstone Head and Jambs Schedule (Drawing No. JCBD-21-236 - 3. Rev: 01)'. The windows and doors shall be retained and maintained as such thereafter.

Reason: To protect the significance of the listed building and in the interests of visual amenity, in accordance with policies P2, P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas Act) 1990 (as amended).

6. Pointing work shall be carried out using 'Womersleys Ironstone Lite Pre mixed Mortar NHL 3.5' and as identified in the submitted document 'Method Statement (dated: October 2023)'.

Reason: To protect the significance of the listed building and in the interests of visual amenity, in accordance with policies P2, P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas Act) 1990 (as amended).

7. The rooflights shall be conservation style rooflights and set flush with the roof.

Reason: To protect the significance of the listed building and in the interests of visual amenity, in accordance with policies P2, P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas Act) 1990 (as amended).

Procedure 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.