


**Application for change of use from a mixed commercial use with associated living accommodation above to a mixed use comprising the commercial use of the ground floor and an apartment at first floor, plus a replacement single storey rear extension.**

**No 7 Church Street , Ainsworth BL2 5RA,**

**Design and Access Statement**

Amended November 2024

Ref: GS/161124.A



**November 2024**

**Prepared by Hartley Planning and Development Associates Ltd**

## The proposed development

No. 7 Church Street, Ainsworth is a two storey property with a double pitched roof, situated in the middle of a terraced row which faces directly onto Church Street. It is vacant and was last used as a post office with residential space above.

The proposed use is to the continuation of the ground floor for commercial purposes within the existing Use Class and for the first floor to be an apartment.

The proposed development includes a single storey, replacement, rear extension on the same footprint and the existing extension and which it would replace. It would have a similar height as the existing extension. There would be no extension at first floor level.

The application lies within the green Belt: -



The application property also lies within the Ainsworth Conservation Area. (CA)

While the CA contains several listed buildings, as shown below, these are sufficiently

removed from the application proposal such that the latter would have no impact upon their settings.

## **The Main Issues**

The main issues are (i) whether the proposed development is inappropriate development within the Green Belt; (ii) whether the development preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Ainsworth CA and (iii) if the proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt, whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to very special circumstances to justify development.

### *Whether inappropriate development*

Paragraph 152 of the Framework states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt, and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 154 makes it clear that, other than in specified circumstances, the construction of new buildings is inappropriate development. The exceptions include at paragraph 154 (c) the extension or alteration of a building, provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. Annex 2 of the Framework defines 'original building' as a building as it existed on 1 July 1948 or, if constructed after 1 July 1948, as it was built originally.

The Framework does not include a definition of what constitutes a disproportionate addition. However, the Councils New Buildings and Associated Development in the Green Belt Supplementary Planning Document 2007 (SPD) states that (para.4.25) *'Residential extensions should be proportionate to the size of the original dwelling, excluding any previous extensions carried out under permitted development rights or with planning permission. In general terms, the Council may allow an extension to be up to a third of the volume of the original dwelling. However, each proposal will be considered on its own merits and even an increase up to a third may not be appropriate in certain situations (e.g. if the site is a particularly sensitive area or if there are other amenity issues).'*

In this instance, there would be no change to the volume of the building as it currently exists.

Therefore, the proposed development would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would accord with Policy JP-G9 of the Greater Manchester Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document (PfE), the Framework and SPD.

Therefore, it is not necessary to demonstrate whether any harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to very special circumstances to justify development

#### *Effect upon the Conservation Area*

The Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (CAAMP) describes the village as having a loose, linear form straddling the B196. The village centre, of which the host property can be said to form a part, is described as having a varied grain where the dense grain of terraced houses is interspersed with a high proportion of loosely connected open spaces. *'The eastern approach to the village and along Church Street has a dense, enclosed spatial character due to the terraced housing built close to the road'.*

These matters add significantly and distinctively to the character and appearance of the CA.

The proposed development would not alter the front elevation of the host property. The proposed extension is to the rear where the existing appearance of the terrace, both as a whole and also for the host building, detracts from the character or appearance of the CA.



The development would involve the removal of the existing single storey extension and its replacement with a similar, single storey extension on the footprint of the extension which it would replace and with a similar height.. The extension would be white rendered (RAL 9018 ), reflecting the appearance of the front of the property, and the roof would be blue slate.

Provision would be retained for one off-road parking space.

The proposed development would bring back into use a vacant property in the CA and would also enhance and protect it.

Therefore, it would accord with Policy JP-P2 of the JDP and with chapter 16 of the Framework which aim to conserve, sustain and enhance the historic environment.

## **Other Matters**

*Carbon reduction and also digital connectivity*

Please see separately submitted report

## **Conclusion**

The proposed development would not be inappropriate in the Green Belt, and it

would help to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the CA.  
Therefore, we consider that the application should be supported.