

DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.	CASE OFFICER	DATE
23/00032/LBC	Majid Mir	27 October 2023

Address: 8-9 Paul Row Temple Lane Littleborough Rochdale 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 full planning application 23/00031/FUL.

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.

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
 DM1	 General development requirements

Unitary Development Plan (UDP):

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

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

23/00031/FUL	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

Conservation Officer

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

Impact on Heritage Assets

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.

‘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 197 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 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'.

Assessment of Harm to the Listed Building

In regards to the internal works proposed, including installation of stairway, partition to create new rooms and blocking up of internal wall to subdivide the property in two, it is considered that the proposed works are acceptable. As noted by the Conservation Officer, the proposed works would enhance the significance of the listed building by instating historical material, altering the building to more closely reflect its original plan form and by generally conserving the listed building.

In regards to the external works 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 rooflights, and boundary treatment to the side and rear.

The proposal originally included 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 plans from Right Move suggest that it was before the 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. 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.

Impact on Listed Building - Balancing Exercise

The NPPF requires, where harm to a heritage asset is identified, that a balancing exercise is undertaken with respect to the public benefits of a scheme. Paragraph 199 of the NPPF requires great weight to be given to the assets conservation. As the level of harm to the heritage asset has been identified as neutral, it is not necessary to perform a balancing exercise, as such, it is considered that the proposal would accord with the requirements of Policies DM1, P2 and P3 of the Adopted Core Strategy, the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF and Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act.

RECOMMENDATION

Grant Subject to the Following 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 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).