

69736 – Norcot, Moorbottom Road, Ramsbottom

Variation of condition no. 2 (approved plans) 68084 - Single storey side extension.

Change approved aluminium curtain wall glazing to aluminium glazed roof windows set into grey slate and formation of raised garden area at patio level with steps.

Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires Local Planning Authorities in the exercise of their planning functions to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Paragraph 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires 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 (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 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.

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.

The removal of the glass link from between the main house and the extension as part of the approved scheme under 68084 and the extension of the pitched roof of the extension with the introduction of the two rooflights would introduce an urbanising and contemporising feature on a visually prominent building within the conservation area which would not preserve its character or appearance. As such the variation would represent less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Rooflights are not an historic architectural feature of this conservation area in its rural setting. Hey House Mews to the south west of the site was given consent on appeal for the retention of solar panels based on the public benefit of renewable energy outweighing the less than substantial harm identified by the inspector. There are no public benefits in this case that outweigh the harm identified to the conservation area.

The proposed landscaping under the variation of condition would also represent a contemporary urbanising feature with a formality that would be an incongruous feature that would not preserve the character or appearance of the

conservation area. As such it represents less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area without any public benefit that would outweigh the harm identified.

In conclusion the variation of condition cannot be supported in heritage conservation terms.

Mark Kilby

Conservation Officer

18/7/23