

72735 – 23 Rowlands Road, Summerseat, Ramsbottom, Bury.

**Reconfiguration from semi-detached dwelling to a detached dwelling;
Two storey side/rear extension; Front & rear dormers with rear balcony;
Front porch; Render & cladding; Raising ridge height.**

This application was subject of pre-application enquiry 03103/E, for 21 and 23 Rowlands Road.

The application site is within the Brooksbottoms & Rowlands conservation area which is a designated heritage asset.

The proposals subject of the pre-application enquiry 03103/E for No.23 Rowlands Road consisted of front dormers, front and rear facing gable ends, two storey side extension, raising the height of the ridge and fenestration reconfiguration.

The pre-application did not provide a great deal of detail. Advice regarding the proposed front dormers has not been followed at planning application stage and significant design elements of the proposal have been added at application stage including a new front porch, rear box dormer, glass balustrade, a significant increase in the glazed areas and finishing materials consisting of brick, render, UPVc, Marley flat tile and plastic composite cladding.

The following local, regional and national policies and statute are considered to be relevant with regard to heritage conservation.

EN2/1 – Character of Conservation Areas

EN2/2 – Conservation Area Control

Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states:

In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, any of the provisions mentioned in subsection (2), special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

Paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that heritage assets range from sites and buildings of local historic value to those of the highest significance, such as World Heritage Sites which are internationally recognised to be of Outstanding Universal Value. These assets are an irreplaceable resource and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations.

Paragraph 210 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 212 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 213 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. Substantial harm to or loss of:

- a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;
- b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.

Paragraph 214 states where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:

- a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and
- b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and
- c) conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and
- d) the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.

Paragraph 215 of the NPPF states that 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.

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan - Policy JP-P2: Heritage:

We will proactively manage and work with partners to positively conserve, sustain and enhance our historic environment and heritage assets and their settings. Opportunities will be pursued to aid the promotion, enjoyment, understanding and interpretation of heritage assets, as a means of maximising wider public benefits and reinforcing Greater Manchester's distinct character, identity and sense of place.

Conservation Area.

Whilst the proposed separation of the two semi-detached dwellinghouses is acceptable in principle with regard to heritage conservation, the proposals for the box dormer extension to the rear, a single large dormer to the front elevation roof slope, render, cladding and new front porch were not put forward at pre-application stage for assessment and advice.

The proposed alterations and additions would by virtue of their design and materials create an incongruous and contemporising visual impact on the building and on the street scene that would not relate to any historicism or architectural grain and therefore would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area.

The changes as currently proposed would represent less than substantial harm within the terms of paragraph 215 of the NPPF and as such would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area. As such there would need to be an identified public benefit that would outweigh the harm caused in totality to the significance of the conservation area.

There would need to be a significant reduction to the size of the proposed front dormer, a re-design of the extension, removal of rear box dormer and reduction in the amount of additional glazing, with no render and no UPVc.

Conservation Officer

18/02/26