

**APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/00684/HOUS**

|                                         |                                       |
|-----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <b>Application Number:</b>              | 24/00684/HOUS                         |
| <b>Location:</b>                        | 24 Whitegate, Littleborough, OL15 8PU |
| <b>Proposal:</b>                        | Two storey side extension             |
| <b>Applicant:</b>                       | Joseph Sheargold                      |
| <b>Case Officer:</b>                    | Sam Yuen                              |
| <b>DETERMINATION DATE</b><br>06.09.2024 | <b>EXT OF TIME</b><br>16.01.2025      |
| <b>RECOMMENDATION:</b>                  | <b>Grant subject to conditions</b>    |

|                   |                                               |          |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------------------|----------|
| <b>DELEGATION</b> | <b>Applicant a Council Member or officer?</b> | <b>N</b> |
|                   | <b>Contrary to previous decision?</b>         | <b>N</b> |
|                   | <b>Called in or Planning Panel objection?</b> | <b>N</b> |

|                 |                                          |          |
|-----------------|------------------------------------------|----------|
| <b>COMMENTS</b> | <b>Planning Panel comments received?</b> | <b>N</b> |
|                 | <b>Neighbour comments received?</b>      | <b>N</b> |

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

**Location**

The application relates to no. 24 Whitegate, a two-storey end terrace dwelling of stone construction located in the suburb of Smithy Bridge in Littleborough. The dwelling forms part of a fold of vernacular cottages present by 1851 and has been identified as a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA) together with adjoining no. 26 Whitegate by the Council's Conservation Officer. A later addition, a two-storey redbrick infilled dwelling connects the cottages. The dwelling is adjoined by no. 22 Whitegate to the west and faces the highway and the rear curtilage of no. 3 Paddock Head to the north. The rear curtilage boundary falls away and backs onto the rear curtilage boundaries of no. 3 Stopford Avenue and nos. 15 and 17 Lightburn Avenue to the south. The property benefits from considerable hardstanding space to the east.

**Description of Proposal**

Planning permission is sought for a two-storey side extension which projects 5.35m from the side elevation of the dwelling. The extension comprises a matching dual-pitched roof form and is set down 0.19m from the ridge line and set back 0.66m from

the main front wall of the dwelling with matching height to eaves. The proposal would be constructed in matching stonework.

The proposed works also include the partial removal of the existing front stone wall and the installation of 0.8m-high timber fencing with landscaping in the intervening space between the boundary treatments and the extension.

### **Relevant History**

03/D41411 - Erection Of 1.8M High Boundary Wall & Gates - Grant subject to conditions

88/D21682 - Private Double Garage - Grant subject to conditions

85/D18236 - Residential Development - One Bungalow. - Refuse

### **Township/Member comments**

N/A

### **Consultee responses**

#### **Highways and Engineering**

Highways have no objections to the proposal which is not likely to have any impact upon the highway.

#### **Conservation and Design**

The Conservation Officer had requested the submission of a heritage statement at the start of the determination process due to the property's identification as an NDHA.

### **Representations**

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. One neutral representation was received in relation to the viewing of the proposed plans.

### **Policy**

#### **National**

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)  
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

#### **Sub-Regional**

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

The Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan was adopted and became part of the statutory development plan for each of the 9 authorities covered by the plan on 21st March 2024. The following policies are relevant:

**Policy JP-P1** Sustainable Places

**Policy JP-P2** Heritage

## **Local**

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:

**G/D/1** Defined Urban Area

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016:

The Rochdale Core Strategy was adopted on 19<sup>th</sup> 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

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD): Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016)

## **Amendments**

N/A

## **Assessment**

**Design:** DM1 and P3

- ☐ Achieving good design to achieve sustainable development is a key component of the NPPF, whereby decisions should ensure developments are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character. This is also reflected in Policy JP-P1 of the PfE and Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, which require development to respect local context with regard to siting, size, scale, massing, height and materials. 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.
- ☐ The proposed two-storey side extension is set down below the ridge line and set back from the front wall of the host dwelling and would appear subservient. The use of matching dual-pitched roof form would also be in keeping and raises no concern.

- ☐ There are also no concerns relating to any potential harm arising from the ‘terracing effect’ by virtue of the extension setback and separation distance in excess of 11m from the neighbouring boundary.
- ☐ Materials of the proposed development would match the host dwelling and would be designed appropriately for this context.
- ☐ It is considered the proposed fenestration are sized and positioned appropriately with the existing fenestration.
- ☐ The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD, Policy JP-P2 of the adopted PfE and the NPPF.

## Heritage: P2

- ☐ Policy JP-P2 of the adopted Places for Everyone and 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.”*
- ☐ The host dwelling has been identified as a non-designated heritage asset by the Council’s Conservation Officer due to its historic and architectural interest. Paragraph 216 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.”*
- ☐ The submitted Heritage Statement notes the property was originally part of an L-shaped group of workers cottages dating from the early 1800s. The western end of the row was then replaced with a two-storey brick built dwelling in 1903. Whilst the Statement contends the eligibility of the property as an NDHA is somewhat borderline due to the later alterations, the residual cottages nonetheless retains a legible built form and much of its historic fabric, including the mullioned windows and sills. On this basis, the property is considered to comprise local historic and architectural significance.
- ☐ Owing to its siting below the ridge line and setback from the front wall of the dwelling, the proposed side extension would read as a subordinate addition to the cottages and would not visually detract from its appearance, where the cottages would remain the dominant structure on the street scene.
- ☐ The extension has also replicated the mullioned window design and sill band of the original dwelling. Whilst it is acknowledged the fenestration pattern does not directly match ones of the cottages, the extension would be seen as an addition rather than a continuation to the original building and would not constitute wholly incongruous features.
- ☐ Whilst the side elevation round window and the rear elevation French doors are not characteristic of the vernacular cottages, by virtue of their siting, they would not be readily viewed alongside the original cottages and would therefore have a neutral impact on the appearance of the NDHA.
- ☐ The proposal would be constructed in matching stonework, roof tiles and fenestration, suitable materials of which can be secured via planning conditions as to mitigate harm to the NDHA. In addition, a condition requiring

samples of the proposed roof lights in 'Conservation Style' has been recommended.

- ☐ Taken as a whole, the proposed side extension would constitute a subservient and non-intrusive addition to the host dwelling and would have a neutral impact on the significance of the NDHA. The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable in accordance with Policy P2 of the adopted Core Strategy, Policy JP-P2 of the adopted PfE and the NPPF.

#### **Amenity: DM1 and SPD**

- ☐ Protection of residential amenity is considered under Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, which 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.”*
- ☐ The proposed two-storey side extension does not directly face any habitable room windows to the front and rear and thus no concerns are had on the overlooking impacts to neighbouring dwellings.
- ☐ The proposed first-floor rear window would be sited circa 5.4m from its directly facing curtilage boundary of no. 17 Lightburn Avenue, which falls below the minimum space standards of Section 4.1 of the SPD. Regards have been had to the immediate surrounding properties, particularly around the original footprint of the cottages, which comprise of reduced distances between the dwellings. No. 17 also benefits from a substantial rear garden which extends 17.44m, far in excess of the minimum upper floor window to curtilage boundary distance of 10.5m as per the SPD. Given this spatial relationship, the rear window would mostly overlook the rearmost and less actively used area of the garden of no. 17. As such, it is considered the privacy of the neighbouring occupants in the use of their rear amenity space would not be significantly compromised by the proposal and would be acceptable on balance.
- ☐ The submitted plans indicate the provision of natural light to all habitable rooms and that sufficient 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 Policy 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 proposed development would not impact on the provision of parking spaces for the host property, where sufficient space for two off-street parking space would be retained in the residual hardstanding. The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with Policies T2 and DM1.

**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:

- ☐ Location Plan – received 12/07/2024
- ☐ Existing and Proposed Site Plan – Drawing No. 24.3369.3A received 04/11/2024
- ☐ Existing Floor Plans – Drawing No. 24.3369.1 received 12/07/2024
- ☐ Existing Elevations – Drawing No. 24.3369.2 received 12/07/2024
- ☐ Proposed Floor Plans – Drawing No. 24.3369.SC1.1A received 12/07/2024
- ☐ Proposed Elevations – Drawing No. 24.3369.SC1.2A received 12/07/2024

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, the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan 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. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and to protect the significance of the non-designated heritage asset, in compliance with Policies P2, P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policies JP-P1 and JP-P2 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, 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. 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 heritage asset, in accordance with Policies P2, P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policies JP-P1 and JP-P2 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

5. Notwithstanding any description of materials in the application, no above ground construction works shall take place until details of the roof lights to be installed in the roof of the approved development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. For the avoidance of doubt, roof lights shall be of a 'Conservation Style' and shall be set flush with the roof slope or as close as is practicable. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details thereafter.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and in the interest of preserving the significance of non-designated heritage asset, in accordance with Policies P2, P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policies JP-P1 and JP-P2 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

6. Notwithstanding any details of boundary treatments within the application, the demolition of the existing front boundary wall, or any replacement otherwise, shall not take place until such time as details of its replacement have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The boundary treatments shall be installed in accordance with the approved details and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and in the interest of preserving the significance of non-designated heritage asset, in accordance with Policies P2, P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policies JP-P1 and JP-P2 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, 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.

|                         | <b>Date</b> | <b>Officer</b> |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------|
| <b>Report Completed</b> | 14/01/2025  | Signed: SY     |
| <b>Authorisation</b>    | 16/01/2025  | Signed: RK     |

Report Author Sam Yuen