

Application Number:	22/01471/HOUS
Location:	Stubley New Barn, Stubley Lane, Littleborough, Rochdale, OL15 8PZ
Proposal:	Single storey front and side extension with alterations to ridge height and alterations to existing porch.
Applicant:	Mr S Scott
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
Recommendation:	Grant subject to conditions

DELEGATION	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	N
	Contrary to previous decision?	N
	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	N

COMMENTS	Planning Panel comments received?	N
	Neighbour comments received?	N

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

Location

The application relates to Stubley New Barn, a two-storey stone-built converted barn located in Littleborough. It is adjacent to Stubley Lodge to the north, adjacent to Stubley Hall Farm to the east, and faces Stubley Lane to the north. The original dwelling appears on the 1851 OS map, though it has been subject to substantial extensions and alterations, most notably an attached double garage to the north and a single-storey front link extension. The property is not considered as a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA).

To the north-west of the host property is Stubley Old Hall, a Grade-II* listed building. Stubley New Hall, a non-designated heritage asset, lies to the west of the property.

Stubley Lane is identified as a public right of way which leads from Featherstall Road to Saw Mill Way.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the enlargement of the existing front extension of the dwelling, which comprises of an approx. 1.39m projection from the side elevation and an approx. 0.29m increase in ridge height. This is accompanied by the addition of two roof lights to north-east facing roof slope. The proposed extension would be constructed from materials matching the host dwelling.

In addition, the application also proposes a stone and oak framed front porch to replace the existing front porch. The proposed porch is characterised by a dual-pitched roof and retains the same dimensions as the existing.

Relevant History

87/D21246 - Change of use from barn to residential - Grant subject to conditions

89/D23688 - Change of use from barn to dwellinghouse - Grant subject to conditions

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Tree Officer

The tree officer raises no objection to the proposed plans.

Conservation and Design

The application site consists of a stone built converted barn located on Stubley Lane, Littleborough. Whilst not considered a non-designated heritage asset, the site itself appears OS map dated from 1851, with a larger footprint appearing in the OS dated 1890.

The barn was one of two farm buildings included within Stubley Farm, with the original farmhouse sited further north along Stubley Lane.

The stone built barn has previously been converted into residential dwellinghouse, along with an extension to the north of the original structure now accommodating a garage and link extension between the garage and main dwellinghouse.

Whilst not listed, due to its appearance, age and representation of a characteristic barn building within the Borough, this site could be considered for listing as a non-designated heritage asset.

Situated to the south of the site is the non-designated heritage asset, Stubley New Hall.

To the east of the site is the Grade II* listed Stubley Old Hall. The significance of this listed building is embodied within its architectural value, originating as a 16th century timber framed building with later additions.

The application seeks permission for the construction of a single storey extension to an existing single storey element, as well as the raising of the ridge height of the existing single storey link extension to the same height as the existing single storey garage.

The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 refers to the 'preservation' or 'enhancement' of the special architectural or historic interest of the heritage asset or its character and appearance. The NPPF sets out in Chapter 16 of the document decision-making policies using different terminology, referring in particular to 'conservation of significance'. It is important to note that 'conservation' and 'preservation' are concerned with the management of change in a way that sustains a heritage asset's special interest or significance. However, 'conservation' has the added dimension of taking opportunities to enhance significance where opportunities arise and where appropriate.

Rochdale CS policy P2 deals with '*protecting and enhancing character, landscape and heritage*'. Paragraph 2a states that the borough's heritage will be protected by conserving, enhancing and promoting key heritage assets, both statutory and non-statutory. Key heritage assets include the borough's listed buildings and Conservation Areas.

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. NPPF paragraph 200 states that any harm to, or loss of the significance of a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification.

Considering the application proposes a minor extension to the site, in conjunction with the distance of the site from the surrounding heritage assets, existing foliage obscuring the development from these assets, siting of the development to the front of the property, and well-chosen materials, it is considered that the proposed development would have a neutral impact on both the non-designated Stubley New Hall and the designed Grade II* listed Stubley Old Hall.

Conclusion

The conservation officer raises no objection to the proposed plans, subject to the materials to match the existing.

Rights Of Way Officer

The proposal should not affect the right of way running adjacent labelled as LitFp243. The route should not be obstructed at any time prior, during and following the works. No machinery, vehicles or materials should be stored on the right of way and any damage to the surface should be repaired immediately. The property owner

and/or the developer are responsible for any injury suffered by any member of the public should they have damaged the surface of the right of way in the location the injury occurred.

No materials should be applied to the surface of the right of way without the permission of the Council, any materials applied that causes difficulty of use for the right of way shall be removed immediately.

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit

Whilst this appears on paper to be only a minor development, given the location (good foraging habitat and records of bat roosts nearby) and having checked from Google Street View a slate roof that may provide opportunities for crevice dwelling species, The GMEU representatives are unable to safely determine whether or not bats may utilise the building proposed for effectively re-roofing. Species such as common pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pipistrellus*) most commonly occur in houses and prefer confined roost sites, such as soffit boxes, eaves or under hanging tiles. The most common roosts are found between underfelt and boards or tiles, and inside cavity walls.

Current guidance states it is essential that the presence or otherwise of protected species and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed development is established before the planning permission is granted otherwise all relevant material considerations may not have been addressed in making the decision (UK Government Guidance within the ODPM Government Circular 06/2005).

There are unlikely to be any other ecological issues associated with this development.

Conclusion

The GMEU representatives recommend that prior to determination, further information is provided, preferably in the form of a bat assessment by a suitably qualified consultant.

Officer's Comment

The GMEU comments notwithstanding, it is noted the site benefits from permitted development rights and works similar to the proposals can be undertaken without the need for planning permission.

The proposed works would not affect the main roof structure of the host dwelling and only relates to a single-storey modern addition of the dwelling, which is considered to have a much lower roosting potential.

On this basis, it is considered a bat survey would not be required prior to determination.

Representations

A site notice was posted within the vicinity of the host dwelling and neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. 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 19th October 2016. The following policies are relevant:

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

- Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework 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.”*

- ② The application relates to works to a converted barn. The SPD provides guidance for barn conversions, in particular, section 4.8 which states, *“to retain the character and architectural integrity of traditional rural buildings, alterations to existing fabric must be kept to the minimum necessary to facilitate residential use. Every effort should be made to ensure that new windows and doors are only inserted into existing openings. Where the introduction of new openings is unavoidable, they should be sensitively positioned and kept to a minimum so that the overall character of the building is not compromised. Proposals which rely on substantial alteration or extension will not normally be permitted. Where an extension is permissible, the new build element should be strictly subordinate in scale to the existing building and respectful of it in the design detailing. Modest alterations such as the introduction of flush ‘conservation type’ roof lights would normally be acceptable, if they are kept to a minimum and placed in the most discreet positions possible. If the overall effect of a particular proposal destroys the essential character of the building, the conversion will not be permitted.”*
- ② The dwelling in question has been subject to substantial extensions and alterations, including but not limited to, an attached double garage to the front; a single-storey link extension; a two-storey hipped roof rear extension; a pitched roof front porch; and a chimney to the side elevation. Whilst the form of the barn building remains somewhat legible, it is considered such domestic additions have considerably detracted the dwelling as a whole from the character of traditional farm buildings.
- ② Considerations have also been given to the surrounding street scene, which is characterised by barn buildings converted into residential use. Adjacent to the host dwelling is Stubley Lodge, a late 20th century residential addition to Stubley Lane. On this basis, given the already residential nature of the street scene, the principle of the extension and front porch would be permissible.
- ② The proposal seeks to extend the existing front link extension by approx. 1.39m and increase the ridge height by approx. 0.29m. Given the insubstantial projection which would not materially alter the scale and massing of the dwelling, the marginal ridge height increase which ensures it remain subservient, and retention of the pitched roof form which would be in keeping, it is considered proposal would not result in undue harm to the visual amenity of the dwelling and the immediate street scene.
- ② The proposal also seeks to introduce new openings to the north-eastern elevation of the existing front extension to accommodate four sets of windows and two roof lights. Given the substantial alterations to the existing dwelling, it is considered the proposed works would not result in unacceptable harm to the character of the host dwelling.
- ② Notwithstanding the domestic nature of porches, the proposed front porch would retain the same dimensions and roof form as the existing, and would on balance, be acceptable.
- ② The submitted plans indicate the proposed extension would reuse the stonework, windows, surrounds and sills from the front elevation of the existing dwelling. The remaining proposed stonework and roof materials

would match the host dwelling. In this respect, the proposed materials would not result in significant harm to the local character and would be acceptable.

- ☐ Taken as a whole, the proposed works constitute minor alterations to the host dwelling and would constitute a satisfactory level of design and appearance.
- ☐ 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.

Trees: G6 and G7

- ☐ The south-west facing side application of the host dwelling adjoins twelve trees under Tree Preservation Orders. The protected trees comprise of a mix of Sycamore, Horse Chestnut, Beech and Turkey Oak trees.
- ☐ The tree officer has raised no objection to the proposed works. It is also noted the proposed development mainly relates to the north-eastern elevation of the host dwelling and would face away from the protected trees. As such, it is considered the proposal would not cause significant harm to the protected trees.
- ☐ The proposed development would accord with the requirements of policies G6 and G7 of the adopted Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

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.”*

- ❑ Whilst sections of the host dwelling appears on the 1851 OS map, for the purposes of this assessment, the property would not be considered as a non-designated heritage asset and would not be subject to a balanced judgment.
- ❑ The host dwelling is within close vicinity to Stubley Old Hall, a Grade-II* listed building. According to its official list entry, the house exhibits varied types of construction and technology, including a south cross wing of possibly C15, a hall & north cross wing circa 1530, and a hammer-dressed stone front elevation circa 1600.
- ❑ The host dwelling may have been formed as part of the estate with Stubley Old Hall. However, taking into account of the recent developments of buildings associated with Stubley Farm converted to residential use, it is considered the potential historical relationship between the dwelling and the designated heritage asset would have been diminished.
- ❑ The host dwelling is also within close vicinity of Stubley New Hall, a late C18 residence subdivided into three dwellings. The dwelling has been identified

as a non-designated heritage asset due to its architectural and historical interest.

- ② Notwithstanding the close proximity of the host property to Stubley Old Hall and Stubley New Hall, the properties are substantially screened by groups of tall, mature trees along their common boundaries. The proposed development would also be on the north-eastern elevation of the host dwelling, facing away from both properties. As such, the proposed works are unlikely to be read together with its adjacent heritage assets and thus it is considered the proposals would not affect the setting of both assets.
- ② The application proposes a minor enlargement of the existing front link extension and a replacement of the front porch. Given the limited scope of the works, it is considered the proposals would have a neutral impact on the surrounding heritage assets and would not affect the significance of the adjacent designated and non-designated heritage assets.
- ② The proposals would have a neutral impact on its surrounding heritage assets and would accord with policy P2 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ② 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.”*
- ② 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.”*
- ② Given the north-eastern elevation does not directly face any properties, the fact the proposed extension do not project beyond the side elevation of the existing garage, and the marginal increase in ridge height, it is considered there are unlikely to be any significant amenity impacts to neighbouring properties.
- ② 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.
- ② 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

- ② 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.”*
- ② The proposed development would not impact on the provision of parking spaces for the host property, therefore the proposed parking arrangements are 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 and Existing and Proposed Site Plan – Drawing No. SI- 00-DR-A-0800
- ☐ Existing Floor Plans – Drawing No. B1-ZZ-DR-A-0810 Rev. A
- ☐ Existing Front and Side Elevations – Drawing No. B1-ZZ-DR-A-8020
- ☐ Existing Side and Rear Elevations – Drawing No. B1-ZZ-DR-A-8021
- ☐ Proposed Floor Plans – Drawing No. B1-ZZ-DR-A-2000
- ☐ Proposed Front and Side Elevations – Drawing No. B1-ZZ-DR-A-3000
- ☐ Proposed Side and Rear Elevations – Drawing No. B1-ZZ-DR-A-3001

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. The materials used in the construction of the exterior of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the construction of the exterior of the existing building in colour, form, type, size and texture.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with policies P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy 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.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	21/03/2023	Signed: SY
Authorisation	19/04/2023	Signed: RK

INFORMATIVES:

The applicant is reminded that, under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), it is an offence to remove, damage, or destroy the nest of a wild bird, while the nest is in use or being built. Planning consent does not provide a defence

against prosecution under this act. If a birds nest is suspected work should cease immediately and a suitably experienced ecologist employed to assess how best to safeguard the nest(s).

Report Author Sam Yuen