

|                            |                                                                            |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Application Number:</b> | 23/00593/HOUS                                                              |
| <b>Location:</b>           | 3 Gatehouse, Blackstone Edge Old Road,<br>Littleborough, OL15 0JJ          |
| <b>Proposal:</b>           | Single storey rear extension following demolition<br>of existing outrigger |
| <b>Applicant:</b>          | Mrs K Lee                                                                  |
| <b>Case Officer:</b>       | Sam Yuen                                                                   |
| <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. 3 Gatehouse, Blackstone Edge Old Road, a two-storey terrace dwelling located in Littleborough. The dwelling is adjoined by no. 5 Gatehouse, a Grade-II Listed building, to the east, adjoined by no. 1 Gatehouse to the west, and faces the highway to the south. The rear of the property faces open Green Belt land. Due to its historic and architectural interest, the property, alongside adjoined nos. 1, 7, 9 Gatehouse, have been identified as non-designated heritage assets (NDHAs). Two public right of ways run along the footpaths to the front and rear of the property respectively. The property benefits from a shared rear garden with adjoined no. 1.

### **Description of Proposal**

Planning permission is sought for a single-storey rear extension which projects 3.05m from the rear elevation of the host dwelling, following the demolition of the existing single-storey rear outrigger. It is characterised by a lean-to roof form and has a ridge height of 3.22m and an eaves to height of 2.53m.

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

This application was submitted alongside application ref: 23/00594/HOUS which also comprises an identical single-storey rear extension to adjoined no. 1.

### **Relevant History**

N/A

### **Township/Member comments**

N/A

### **Consultee responses**

#### **Conservation and Design**

The application site is a mid-terrace property located on Blackstone Edge Old Road in Littleborough. No. 5 Gatehouse, which is the central property within the terrace and adjacent to the application site, is listed at Grade-II. The other properties within the terrace are not listed, but are shown on the first edition OS map. The distinctive run of windows along the upper identifies them as former weavers' cottages. Given their age and their vernacular construction, the remaining properties within the terrace meet the criteria for non-designated heritage assets.

Given the proximity to the listed building, the proposed development has the potential to impact on its setting. Additionally, the impact on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset is a material planning consideration. A balanced judgement should be had, having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the asset.

The application is accompanied by a brief heritage statement. This considers only the impact on the listed building and does not consider the impact on the property itself as a non-designated heritage asset.

The proposal is for the demolition of the existing single storey outrigger, and the construction of new flat roof, single storey extension. The existing outrigger does not appear to be of any particular historic or architectural interest, and there is no objection in principle to its demolition.

The proposed rear extension would have a flat roof. Such a feature is not characteristic of the historic properties and the boxy form would relate poorly to the forms and proportions of the terrace. To improve the relationship, the roof should be amended to either a lean-to or dual pitched roof. That being said, it is acknowledged that the extension would be to the rear and not overly visible from public viewpoints. A sample of the stone should be required by condition.

Subject to amendments to the roof design, and materials being conditioned, it is likely that a neutral impact on the significance of the non-designated heritage asset

could be achieved. It is not considered that the proposal would harm the significance of the designated heritage asset.

### Rights Of Way Officer

The proposed extension should not affect the right of way running to the rear labelled as LitFp364.

The route should not be obstructed with any materials or vehicles, nor should the surface be disturbed by any deliveries. Any damage caused by the undertaking of the development should be repaired as soon as possible. The boundary of the property should not be extended across the right of way.

### Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties and a site notice was posted in the immediate vicinity of the property. No comments were received.

### Policy

#### **National**

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

#### **Local**

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:

**G/D/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:

|                   |                                                            |
|-------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>P2</b>         | Protecting and Enhancing Character, Landscape and Heritage |
| <b>P3</b>         | Improving Design of New Development                        |
| <b>DM1</b>        | General Development Requirements                           |
| <b>T2</b>         | Improving Accessibility                                    |
| <b>Appendix 5</b> | Schedule of Parking Standards                              |

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

### Amendments

Amendments were made to alter the roof of the proposed single-storey rear extension from a flat roof to a lean-to roof form.

## **Assessment**

### **Design: DM1 and P3**

- ☐ Paragraph 130 of the NPPF requires new development to be *“visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping”* in addition to ensuring they are *“sympathetic to local character.”*
- ☐ Policy DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy require development proposals to be *“of high quality design and take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area”* and to *“enhance the borough’s identity and sense of place, by respecting context where it is positive and having regard to the scale, density, massing, height, layout, landscape, materials and access of surrounding buildings and areas in general.”* In addition, Section 5.1 of the SPD states development proposals should be *“in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.”*
- ☐ The proposed rear extension is of a single-storey form which would appear subservient to the host dwelling. The use of a lean-to roof would also be in keeping and raises no concern.
- ☐ Matching stonework and slate roof would be used for the proposed extension, which can be achieved via condition as not to harm the character and appearance of the street scene.
- ☐ It is considered the proposed fenestration are sized and positioned appropriately with the existing fenestration.
- ☐ The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

### **Heritage: P2**

- ☐ Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states, *“in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority [...] shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.”*
- ☐ Policy P2 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy strives to *“protect the borough’s heritage by... conserving, enhancing and promoting key heritage assets, both statutory and non-statutory, including consideration of their wider settings.”*
- ☐ Paragraph 197 of the NPPF states, *“in determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:*
  - a) *the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;*

- b) *the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and*
- c) *the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness."*

- ☐ Paragraph 199 of the NPPF states, *"when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance."*
- ☐ Paragraph 200 of the NPPF states *"any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification."*
- ☐ Paragraph 202 of the NPPF states, *"where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use."*
- ☐ Paragraph 203 of the NPPF states *"the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset."*

- ☐ Significance, as defined in the NPPF, is:

*"The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. The interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting."*

- ☐ The setting of a heritage asset, as defined in the NPPF, is:

*"The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral."*

- ☐ The host dwelling forms part of a row of terraced dwellings of stone construction, likely former weavers' cottages circa late 18<sup>th</sup> Century. Given its age and vernacular architecture, nos. 1, 3, 7 and 9 Gatehouse have been identified as non-designated heritage assets by the Council's Conservation Officer.
- ☐ Additionally, the adjoining central dwelling of the terraced properties, no. 5 Gatehouse, is a Grade-II Listed building due to its architectural and historic interest.

- ❑ No objection has been raised by the Conservation Officer with regard to the demolition of the existing rear outrigger, which is not considered to be of any architectural or historic interest and thus would have a neutral impact on the significance of the host dwelling as a non-designated heritage asset.
- ❑ Amendments have been accepted to alter the roof form of the proposed rear extension from a flat roof to a lean-to roof form, which would relate more positively with the built forms and proportions of the terraced dwellings.
- ❑ Suitable matching stonework for the proposed extension can be secured via condition to prevent less than substantial harm to the heritage assets.
- ❑ Given the siting of the extension to the rear, away from view from the street scene, it is considered the proposals would not harm the significance of the designated heritage asset. The proposal would also have a neutral impact on the significance of the non-designated heritage assets. As such, the proposed development would be acceptable, in accordance with Policy P2 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

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

- ❑ Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy states development proposals should ensure they *“do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.”*
- ❑ Section 5.5 of the SPD states *“it is important that single storey extensions are not overbearing and do not result in undue loss of light or privacy for neighbouring occupiers.”* In particular, Section 5.6 states the following maximum standard:
  - ❑ *“For attached properties, a point 3 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s);*
  - ❑ *For detached properties, a point 4 metres along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining or adjacent dwelling(s).”*
- ❑ The proposed rear extension projects 3.05m along the common boundary measured from the rear elevation of adjoining no. 1. The marginal exceedance is not considered to result in material additional overshadowing harm, thus the amenity impacts would be acceptable in this regard.
- ❑ The proposed rear extension projects 1.05m along the common boundary measured from the rear outrigger of adjoining no. 5. Given this, and the siting of no. 5 on a higher level to the host dwelling, the proposal is not considered to result in significant amenity impacts to the neighbouring occupiers.
- ❑ 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 Policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

## Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

- ☐ Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy requires development proposals to *“provide satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking, manoeuvring, and servicing arrangements taking into account of the proposed use and location.”*
- ☐ The proposed development would not impact on the provision of parking spaces for the host property. 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 – dated 04/05/2023
- ☐ Existing Site Plan – dated 04/05/2023
- ☐ Proposed Site Plan – dated 04/05/2023
- ☐ Existing Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. PL.2313.001B dated 08/2023
- ☐ Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing No. PL.2313.002D dated 08/2023

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

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

3. Notwithstanding any description of materials in the application, no above ground construction works shall take place until samples and / or full specifications of materials to be used externally on the building(s) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. For the avoidance of doubt, such details shall include the type, colour and texture of the materials and, where stonework is proposed, a one metre square freestanding panel of stonework showing the type of natural stone, coursing, jointing and mortar mix and finish. Where masonry detailing is required, details drawn at a scale of not less than 1:20 shall also be submitted. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and in compliance with Policies P2, P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. No above ground 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 Assets and in accordance with Policies P2, P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

### **Article 35 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.

|                         | <b>Date</b> | <b>Officer</b> |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------|
| <b>Report Completed</b> | 31/08/2023  | Signed: SY     |
| <b>Authorisation</b>    | 01/09/2023  | Signed: RK     |

Report Author Sam Yuen