

68231 – Glenside, St Anns Road, Prestwich

Two storey side extension with gable roof and raised decking at rear.

The application site is within St Mary's Conservation Area and is considered to be a Non-Designated Heritage Asset (NDHA).

A tall late Victorian semi-detached villa, one of a matching pair, red brick Flemish bond with slightly projecting lateral gables, ground floor bays and timber canopy between. Tall multi-pitched slate roof. UPVC windows to upper floors. Original barge boards to the front gable has been replaced.

Section 72 of The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires local planning authorities to give special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Paragraph 203 of the National Planning Policy Framework (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.

The building has been identified as a non-designated heritage asset in accordance with Annex 2 of the NPPF and is considered to be a building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. It includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing). The 'Good Practice Advice Note 2: Managing Significance in Decision-Taking' published by Historic England (2015) clarifies non-designated assets as those "....that have been identified in a Historic Environment Record, in a local plan, through local listing or during the process of considering the application."

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 application site is one of a pair of matching semi-detached dwellinghouses with strong symmetry both of which are considered to be NDHAs. Set in large plots with large open frontages and sides the dwelling as a constituent part of the conservation area that represents a very strong contributor to the character and appearance of it.

The house itself is intact and unaltered and is fine example of a late Victorian villa and references the development of Prestwich Park and evidences the growing influence of Prestwich as suburb of Manchester both during and post the industrial revolution.

The proposed side extension would be lower in height than the main part of the building, it would however be a substantial and dominant structure, its ridgeline would extend to just below the eaves of the existing house. It would fill the space between the house and boundary with the adjacent unattached property and would be of substantial width compared with that of the dwelling. As a result, the extension would significantly widen the property and would be seen as a disproportionate addition. The proposal would harm the legibility of the planform of the house by partly obscuring the side gable projection and cause the total loss of the side entrance and canopy. The garage door that would form the majority of the ground floor front elevation of the extension would also represent poor design in its visual incongruity with regard to the architectural aesthetic of the house. As such the extension would fail to respect and would thereby detract from the symmetry of the building, which is an essential part of its character and appearance, aesthetic and historic value as a heritage asset.

Overall the proposal would represent a direct impact on the dwelling causing an unacceptable loss significance of a heritage asset.

The proposal would also represent, at the higher end of the spectrum, less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area by virtue of the design of the extension with specific regard to the reduction of the openness of the plot, loss of symmetry of the matching semi-detached dwelling houses and unacceptable scale, mass and bulk which provides such a strong contributor to the character and appearance of the conservation area. The proposed garage door would also represent an incongruous utilitarian feature in the street scene and in that part of the conservation area. As such the proposal would neither preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation or better reveal its significance. Nor are there any identified or perceived public benefits that would outweigh the harm caused to the conservation area.

The proposal is not acceptable with regard to heritage issues as it would not comply with adopted UDP policies EN1/1-Visual Amenity, EN2/1-Character of Conservation Areas and EN2/2-Conservation Area Control and paragraphs 194, 197, 199, 202, 203, 206 of the NPPF.

There is no particular concern about the proposed decking element of the proposal as the fences and balustrades would be permitted development as these rights have not been removed under the Article 4 Direct. The decking would not be visible in the street scene or wider distant views within the conservation area.

Mark Kilby PGDip (Building Conservation & Adaptation)

Conservation Officer

27/5/22.

