

<b>Application No:</b> 2010/484 & 486LBC	<b>Application Type:</b> Full & LBC
<b>Proposal:</b> One Storey Rear Extension	<b>Location:</b> Carter Place Cottage Hall Park Haslingden
<b>Report of:</b> Planning Unit Manager	<b>Status:</b> For Publication
<b>Report to:</b> Development Control Committee	<b>Date:</b> 8 <sup>th</sup> November 2010
<b>Applicant:</b> Mr P Buckley	<b>Determination Expiry Date:</b> 2 November 2010
<b>Agent:</b> Building Design and Planning Consultancy	

**REASON FOR REPORTING**

**Tick Box**

**Member Call-In**

**X**

Name of Member:

Cllr Jason Gledhill

Reason for Call-In:

I do not believe the proposed extension is detrimental to the surrounding area as the property is sited immediately adjacent to a caravan park.

**More than 3 objections received**

**Other** (please state) .....

**HUMAN RIGHTS**

The relevant provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998 and the European Convention on Human Rights have been taken into account in the preparation of this report, particularly the implications arising from the following rights:-

**Article 8**

The right to respect for private and family life, home and correspondence.

**Article 1 of Protocol 1**

The right of peaceful enjoyment of possessions and protection of property.

## **APPLICATION DETAILS**

### **1. SITE**

The applications relate to an old 2-storey semi-detached dwelling, forming part of a building of traditional design and stone/stone-slate construction that is a Grade II Listed Building.

The building is located in the area of Countryside/Green Belt to the north of the settlement of Haslingden. It faces towards Hall Park Residential Caravan Site.

To the rear of the applicant's house is a 2-storey gabled extension, with abutting 1-storey lean-to, of considerable age. The house is bounded to the front by a stone wall with access at the side to a large detached-garage, with a first floor above, of stone and slate construction. To the rear of the garage is another smaller stone and slate building, also within the curtilage. A 2m high wooden fence runs along the rear boundary.

In short, the Listing Description in respect of the building reads as follows :

Dated 1744 on datestone over door, now house and cottage. Watershot coursed sandstone rubble with quoins, stone slate roof with gable coping and kneelers with ball finials at left gable, chimney at left gable. Three bays. Symmetrical doorway with a square datestone with raised decoration shield with Arms above, and lettering below this" Sir Andrew Chadwick knight 1744"; 2 horizontal rectangular windows on each floor, all now 3-light casements.

### **2. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

2006/236     Demolition of 3 existing buildings and erection of 1 no storage/garage/tractor store  
Approved

2008/234     Two storey extension to the rear  
Refused

2009/417     Two storey extension to the rear  
& 424LBC     Withdrawn; these applications were for exactly the same development as Application 2008/234 and were withdrawn prior to determination.

2010/128     Two storey extension to the rear  
& 130LBC     Refused for the following reasons :

- 1) The proposed extension, in itself and taking into consideration previous extensions and outbuildings erected within the curtilage, would result in disproportionate additions to the original dwellinghouse which, by definition, is inappropriate development within the Green Belt and would erode the essentially open and rural character of the Countryside/Green Belt.

- 2) The proposed extension, by reason of its siting/size/design would detract from the amenities the occupier of the attached dwelling could reasonably expect to enjoy, most particularly diminishing light to/outlook from windows and the amenity value of part of the neighbours rear garden due to proximity to the party-boundary and outward projection.
- 3) The proposed extension, by reason of its siting/size/design, would detract to an unacceptable extent from the character and appearance of this Listed Building.

### **3. THE PROPOSAL**

Planning Permission and LB Consent are now sought for the erection of a 1-storey extension to the rear. The extension would project to a similar extent as the existing 2-storey rear extension, extending between it and the party-boundary with the attached dwelling.

It would have a lean-to roof to a height of 4.5 metres reducing to 3.5 metres at eaves level, with a depth of 3.3 metres and a width of 4 metres. Patio-doors would be sited in its rear elevation, having steps (with hand-rail to each side) leading down to the garden. A rooflight is proposed in the roof of the extension. The existing openings in the original rear elevation where the extension would be sited would be retained, the extension being accessed by removal of the side-wall of the existing rear extension. The extension would be natural stone walls and natural blue slate roof, with UPVC patio doors and a conservation-style rooflight.

### **4. POLICY CONTEXT**

#### **National**

PPS1 Sustainable Development  
 PPG2 Green Belt  
 PPS 5 Historic Environment  
 PPS7 Rural Areas

#### **Development Plan**

##### **Rossendale District Local Plan (1995)**

DS3 Green Belt  
 DC1 Development Criteria  
 DC4 Materials  
 HP2 Listed Buildings

#### **Other Material Planning Considerations**

PPS5 Practice Guide  
 RBC Emerging Core Strategy (2010)  
 RBC Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties SPD (2008)

### **5. CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

RBC (Conservation Officer)

Recommend that the proposal be refused by virtue of its siting/design/massing/detailing/visual impact/loss of original fabric and the unacceptable impact upon the character, appearance and setting of the original listed building, which would be contrary to the provisions of PPS5.

In amplification:

The extension now proposed is less bulky than the previous two-storey schemes, but many of the same issues remain:

- 1) Full context details are lacking of the existing building and the site's setting and the Design and Access Statement also fails to cover the essential elements required by PPS5, in terms of the statement of significance of the asset and the impact of the proposal upon it.
- 2) The essentially blank rear wall of the cottage to be masked by the extension, with its two small original windows, which represents a significant proportion of the existing character of this elevation, will still be lost to broader public observation and understanding. The detailed nature of the stonework of the original building and of the extension are significantly different, therefore the essential character of the visible stonework will change from historic to modern.
- 3) The large area of blue slate roof at low level will clash with the texture and character of the original higher level stone slates, and the rooflight will be a further incongruous feature, which does not appear to be justified, given the large amount of clear glazing in the proposed French doors. Other aspects of the detailing are clearly of a modern style, whilst the proposal to construct the new stonework on the same plane as the existing suggests an attempt to integrate the proposal into the existing rather than recognise the contrast.
- 4) It is in the massing of the proposal that the greater harm to the original character of the property is most pronounced. The original linear nature of the original building can be clearly seen and read, despite the later 2-storey extension. The proposal would obscure the residual element of that wall and create a different modelling form for the building in an unsympathetic and cluttered manner.
- 5) The impact upon the setting of the listed building as a whole, especially the contrast with the linear nature of the adjacent Chantry Cottage, which is part of the listing, will represent a significant variation in the form and character of the listed building, to its detriment.

## **6. NOTIFICATION RESPONSES**

To accord with the General Development Procedure Order a press notice was published on 24/9/10, site notices were posted on 14/9/10 and 6 neighbours were notified by letter on 9/9/10.

No neighbour responses have been received.

## **7. ASSESSMENT**

Version Number:	DS001	Page:	4 of 6
-----------------	-------	-------	--------

In dealing with this application the main issues which need to be considered are:

- 1) Countryside/Green Belt Policy
- 2) Neighbour Amenity
- 3) Heritage Impact

1) Countryside/Green Belt Policy

In the adopted Local Plan, the application site lies within an area of Countryside designated as Green Belt, wherein residential extensions are acceptable in principle provided that they are 'limited' (i.e. not resulting in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the building as standing in July 1948). The Council's Alterations and Extensions SPD defines 'limited' extensions as those totalling not more than a third of the volume of the original property.

The applicant has provided calculations which suggest that the resulting volume increase over the original property would be in the region of 32%. This calculation, however, does not appear to take into account the large 2-storey building used as a garage to the side and the additional outbuilding behind this garage, both of which are located within the curtilage of the property.

It is considered therefore, that the extension would result in additions to the property significantly over 30% and, as such, cannot be considered limited. However, given the modest volume/1-storey height of the extension now proposed and its siting, I do not consider its construction would unduly harm the essentially open and rural character of the Countryside/Green Belt. The application is therefore considered acceptable in principle.

2) Neighbour Amenity

The extension would be sited close to the party-boundary with the attached property. There are no windows proposed in the side elevation of the extension facing the party-boundary. The neighbours windows at ground and first floor level nearest to the proposed extension serve a dining room and landing respectively. The Council's SPD states that single storey extensions on or close to party boundaries should not project out more than 3 metres beyond a 45 degree angle drawn from the centre of the neighbours nearest ground floor window. The proposal accords with this guideline. Accordingly, the scheme is considered acceptable in neighbour amenity terms.

3) Heritage Impact

Section 66 (1) of the T&CP (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990, 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."*

PPS5 seeks to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance. Their value in terms of local character and sense of place should be recognised and valued. Policy HE9.1 of PPS5 reads as follows:

*“There should be a presumption in favour of the conservation of designated heritage assets and the more significant the designated heritage asset, the greater the presumption in favour of its conservation should be. Once lost, heritage assets cannot be replaced and their loss has a cultural, environmental, economic and social impact. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. Loss affecting any designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building, park or garden should be exceptional...”*

Policy HP2 of the Rossendale District Local Plan states that the Council will strictly control development of listed buildings and approval will not be granted for alterations or additions to a listed building unless there is no adverse effect on its architectural or historic character.

The Council’s Conservation Officer has assessed the proposal having regard also to the Best Practice Guide accompanying PPS5, which states that the main issues for consideration in relation to extensions/alterations are: proportion, height, massing, bulk, use of materials, use, relationship with adjacent assets, alignments and treatment of setting. New work should not dominate the original asset. It also states that *“The fabric will always be an important part of the asset’s significance. Retention of as much historic fabric as possible is therefore a fundamental part of any good alteration or conversion”*.

In comparison with the 2-storey extension previously considered and refused, the current proposal will result in a reduction in loss and masking of existing building fabric. However, I concur with the view of the Conservation Officer that the extension now being proposed will still result in significant loss of historic fabric of the building and would unacceptably detract from its character and appearance as a listed building, appearing of notably different and unsympathetic character.

## **8. Recommendation**

That both Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent be refused for the following reason:

1. The proposed extension, by reason of its siting/size/design/materials/loss of building fabric, would detract to an unacceptable extent from the character and appearance of this Listed Building, contrary to the provisions of PPS5 and the accompanying Best Practice Guide, and Policy HP2 of the Rossendale District Local Plan (1995).

<b>Contact Officer</b>	
Name	Richard Elliott
Position	Planning Officer
Service / Team	Development Control
Telephone	01706 238639
Email address	richardelliott@rossendalebc.gov.uk