



Clark



Planning



Consultants Ltd

14 St. Clements Road • Wigan • WN1 2RU Tel: 01942 511787 • Fax: 01942 511787 Email: info@clark-planning.co.uk

Town & Country Planning Act 1990

Planning and Heritage Statement

**Loe Bank Farmhouse
Bolton Road
Hawkshaw
Bury
BL8 4JA**

**Our Ref:
LPA Refs:
Date:**

**CPC/LoeBank/2021
67419
November 2021**

Contents

- 1.0 Introduction**
 - 2.0 Character of the Area, Site Description and Proposal**
 - 3.0 Planning History**
 - 4.0 Planning Policy**
 - 5.0 Heritage Statement**
 - 6.0 Planning Appraisal**
 - 7.0 Conclusion**
-

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This report sets out the relevant planning policies and planning appraisal. It includes a heritage statement.

2.0 Character of the Area, Site Description and Proposal

- 2.1 The application site is the former farmhouse to Loe Bank farm and is located within a small grouping of buildings that we understand comprised of a former shippon and a piggery. The former farm buildings have been converted to residential properties, now named Shaunings Cottage and Loe Bank Bungalow. There is reference in an application for Shaunings Cottage that the property was once two dwellings. The group is located in a rural area, outside the village of Hawkshaw and accessed from Bolton Road.
- 2.2 Loe Bank Farmhouse is a two storey dwelling that has previously been extended. Typical of farmhouses however, it had historical additions and outbuilding. To date the house has been extended on the eastern end and a conservatory added to the western end. A detached garage is located to the north of the house.
- 2.3 The proposal would extend the house at the western end replacing an existing conservatory with a new garden room with a bedroom above. It would be approximately 3.3 metres wide x 5.2 metres deep and set in from both the front and rear walls. The eaves would be at the same height as the original house and the ridge set somewhat lower. Fenestration would follow the design and positioning of existing windows on the front and rear elevations with a proportionally balanced larger window to the ground floor garden room and a Juliet balcony to the first floor.

3.0 Planning History

- 3.1 Planning permission was granted in 2016 for a single storey side extension and a replacement detached garage¹. The garage has been built and therefore this permission has been implemented and remains extant.
- 3.2 A previous application in 2003 for the conversion of a garage to sitting room and erection of first floor extension above together with replacement conservatory was approved subject to conditions². No plans are available for this but it would appear to relate to the extension

¹ Planning Application Ref: 59850 – Approved subject to conditions 21 April 2016.

² Planning Application Ref: 03/40381 – Approved subject to conditions 21 March 2003.

to the eastern side of the house, the conservatory on the western side and a detached garage.

- 3.3 Regarding neighbouring properties, other than a porch to Loe Bank Cottage³, no other information is available for this property. Shaunings Cottage, however, has been subject to recent planning approvals.
- 3.4 In 2017 planning permission was granted to demolish an existing single storey rear extension and conservatory and erect a first floor side extension and a single storey rear extension and attachment and conversion of existing detached garage at Shaunings Cottage⁴. A second application in 2018 was approved for first floor side extension; demolition of an existing single storey rear extension, conservatory and detached single garage and erection of new single storey rear extension⁵. Extensions to Shaunings Cottage have been carried out.

4.0 Planning Policy

- 4.1 Loe Barn Farmhouse is located in the Green Belt and the National Planning Policy Framework⁶ establishes that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt. The extension or alteration of a building is not considered inappropriate provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. Bury's UDP⁷ Policy OL/1/2 reflects this although its wording quotes previous Green Belt policy and refers to dwellings and not buildings. The thrust of it is the same however.
- 4.2 UDP Policy H2/3 sets out criteria for acceptable house extensions which includes, the size, shape, design and external appearance of the proposal; the character of the property in question and the surrounding area; the amenity of adjacent properties; and visibility for pedestrians, cyclists and drivers of motor vehicles. Appendix 4 of the UDP indicates that two car parking spaces are required for this dwelling.
- 4.3 Policy EN2 establishes that the Council will seek to preserve the Borough's built heritage through the control of development affecting Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings and areas of local historical importance. The status of the building in this regard is discussed below in the Heritage Statement section of this report.

³ Planning Application Ref: 88/21141 – Approved 14 June 1988.

⁴ Planning Application ref; 62160 – Approved subject to conditions 20 December 2017.

⁵ Planning Application Ref; 62633 – Approved subject to conditions 18 May 2018.

⁶ Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government National Planning Policy Framework, 2021 (the Framework).

⁷ Bury Unitary Development Plan, adopted 29 August 1997 (UDP).

- 4.4 The Council's SPD 6 refers to alterations and extensions to residential properties⁸ and amongst other things, requires a high standard of design that complements the original building by reflecting its design, massing, scale and finishing materials. Specific features such as doors, windows and roof styles and eaves should particularly reflect the dwellings original shape and size, alignment and architectural integrity.
- 4.5 SPD 8 relates to new buildings and associated development in the Green Belt⁹. This indicates that extensions should be proportionate to the size of the original dwelling and in general terms, an extension up to a third of the volume of the original dwelling may be acceptable. However, the SPD advises that each proposal will be considered on its own merits.

5.0 Heritage Statement

Introduction

- 5.1 Designated heritage assets include Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas, amongst other things. Loe Bank Farmhouse is neither listed nor is in located in a Conservation Area. It is not therefore a designated heritage asset. The Framework introduces a degree of protection for non-designated heritage assets and the requirement for a Heritage Statement for this application is based on the property being included in the Council's draft local list of buildings of special architectural or historic interest¹⁰. This statement is produced in response to that request.

Non-Designated Heritage Asset

- 5.2 The Framework indicates that the effect of an application on a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining a planning 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 asset¹¹.
- 5.3 The Council's draft list of non-designated heritage assets is simply that i.e., a list of properties. It has no formal approval and so at this point in time carries little weight. The Council indicate that the Greater Manchester Archaeological Unit have been commissioned to undertake

⁸ Bury Council Supplementary Planning Document 6 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties January 2020 (SPD6), adopted 11 December 2019.

⁹ Bury Metropolitan Borough Council Development Control Policy Guidance Note 8 New Buildings and Associated Development in the Green Belt, Adopted 10 January 2007.

¹⁰ Bury Council – Draft local list of buildings of special architectural or historic interest.

¹¹ The Framework – Paragraph 203.

additional survey work with the aim of producing a comprehensive report which will enable the list to be updated and formally adopted as appropriate. The list includes Loe Bank Farm House and Loe Barn/Low Farm Cottage, Bolton Road, Hawkshaw. Other than Loe Bank Farmhouse it is unclear whether this is intended to cover the other buildings in this grouping as the names referred to in the list differs to their postal addresses.

- 5.4 The list includes no plan, description or justification as to why the buildings are included in it although reference is made to the criteria for local heritage listings and the Framework which introduced the concept of a non-designated heritage asset. Also, reference is made to Historic England's Advice Note 7¹².
- 5.5 Advice for the criteria for non-designated heritage assets include age and rarity, historic interest and architectural interest. The following assesses the application site against these criteria.

Loe Bank Farmhouse

- 5.6 Loe Bank Farmhouse is a stone two storey building with a slate roof. The stone had been painted / coated white sometime in the past. The side gables are dressed stone. The previous re-build / two-storey extension is finished to match the original house.
- 5.7 The farmhouse is thought to be dated sometime in the 19th Century but it is not certain when in the 1800's it was built. A date stone has been added in recent years indicating 1711 but this was installed by a previous owner and there is no record as to why this earlier date was selected. There is no evidence to support this.
- 5.8 The farmhouse is a typical stone built agricultural home for the farmer and the small grouping of buildings, i.e., a shippon and piggery indicate a modest but sustainable enterprise. The farmstead has long since gone and the land divided up and the farm buildings converted to residential uses (although there is reference in planning applications for Shaunings Cottage as having been two cottages).
- 5.9 Internally oak beams remain as do fireplaces but none of this are operative and there is just one chimney remaining at the western end of the house. The house has been extensively refurbished and whilst retaining its traditional farmhouse charm now incorporates modern features in terms of modern heating, kitchen and bathroom appliances.

¹² Historic England Local Heritage Listing: Identifying and Conserving Local Heritage. Historic England Advice Note 7 (Second Edition) 2021.

- 5.10 The Council set out s criteria for local heritage listing for non-designated heritage assets. In terms of the age and rarity of a property, the following dates may be significant in this case: -
- Buildings constructed before 1840 that survive in anything like their original condition;
 - If built between 1840 and 1919 (late Georgian/Victorian/Edwardian), buildings that retain many of their original and special features, and that are of sufficient quality to distinguish them from other buildings of the period; and
 - Buildings designed by a local or locally important architect.
- 5.11 In terms of historic interest, criteria include: -
- Building or structures associated with an important historic figure or events; and
 - Fine or rare examples of buildings that illustrate social, economic or industrial history or a good example of town planning.
- 5.12 In terms of architectural interest, criteria include: -
- Buildings designed by an architect important to Bury or the region;
 - Buildings designed by an architect of national importance;
 - Buildings that are a good example of a style of building that is unique to the local area; and
 - Groups of buildings that together are a good surviving example of an historic architectural style or have significant group value.
- 5.13 As referred to above, the exact date of construction is not known other than it was sometime in the 1800's. Whilst the building is attractive it is a typical example of farmhouses found throughout the rural areas of the Borough. Stone built dwellings are fairly commonplace and whilst it is clearly part of the farm grouping, the group itself displays no specific or unusual features in terms of their historical context.
- 5.14 This house would have been built as a dwelling and it continues to function as a dwelling. It has no outstanding features that warrant its special attention and its current good condition is down to the improvements carried out by the current owners. Over time, windows have been altered, chimneys removed and a two storey extension erected, which seems to represent the re-building/alteration of an earlier attached structure. A modern conservatory has been added and the detached garage re-built to create a double garage with home

office accommodation above; thus, reflecting modern times rather than those of its historical past.

- 5.15 Farmhouses such as this either fall into general disrepair or require refurbishment to varying degrees. The owners have retained a traditional farmhouse style to the dwelling but have adapted it for modern living. It is suspected that the erroneous date stone of 1711 may have contributed towards its inclusion on the draft local list but as discussed, this is a recent addition that is not based on any available evidence.
- 5.16 There is no evidence regarding its provenance in terms of being linked to a local or national architect nor does it display characteristics that would contribute to it being considered as illustrating Bury's history other than its agricultural history as a typical farmstead. As a group the former farm buildings have been converted, altered and added onto and retain only a tenuous link to their group value in historic terms. Shauning Cottage in particular has been extensively altered and other than the materials of construction, it now bears little resemblance to the former agricultural building (or even pair of cottages) it once was.
- 5.17 We would therefore query the inclusion of Loe Bank Farmhouse in the final list of non-designated heritage assets unless further evidence comes to light indicating that the property has historical value.

Significance of the Heritage Asset

- 5.18 In terms of conserving and enhancing the historic environment, the significance of a heritage asset must be assessed. The Framework suggests that the relevant historical records should be consulted in order to assess the significance of the heritage asset. In this case, Low Bank Farmhouse is not a designated heritage asset and its identification as a non-designated heritage asset is in draft form only with no information available as to why it is included on the list and whether or not an assessment has been made of the property to warrant carrying it forward to an approved list. No local information has come to light that makes specific reference to it or gives any reason to place it in a different category than many similar stone build rural dwellings.
- 5.19 The Framework establishes that in determining applications, account should be taken of the following: -
 - 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.¹³*

5.20 Historic England¹⁴ establishes that ‘significance’ is a guiding principle of heritage-related policy and is based on an assessment in relation to archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic interests, or a combination of these¹⁵. As already discussed, the application property has only limited historic value. It is one of many similar agricultural properties in the Borough and the wider area. On the basis of the information available, we would conclude that the property has very limited significance as a heritage asset.

5.21 Having established that the building has limited historic value and therefore would rank low on an assessment of significance, it is still necessary to assess the effect of the proposal on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset. The framework requires a balanced judgement in weighing the harm to the significance of a non-designated heritage asset.

The proposal

5.22 The proposal is for the replacement of a modern conservatory with a two-storey side extension which would be set back from the front and rear main elevations of the dwelling to ensure that the scale, appearance and the character of the house is retained. The house would still appear as a former farmhouse of modest proportions. Materials of construction would match the existing building and the proposal would represent further investment in the property to maintain a functional and attractive family dwelling. It is also worth noting that the property already has permission for a single storey side extension and this would in effect only add a first floor to that already approved. This is discussed further in the planning assessment below.

Conclusion

5.23 There is limited information upon which to judge whether the property should be included on the Council’s list of non-designated heritage assets. There is certainly no evidence available that justifies this status.

¹³ The Framework – Paragraph 197.

¹⁴ Note 7. See footnote 12.

¹⁵ Historic England Statements of Heritage Significance: Analysing Significance in Heritage Assets – Historic England Advice Note 12 – 2019.

Nevertheless, this statement assesses the significance of the heritage and assesses the effect the proposal would have on it.

- 5.24 In conclusion, the proposal would not harm the significance of a non-designated heritage asset, it would be consistent with the objectives of the Framework and has taken into consideration the published advice of Historic England.

6.0 Planning Appraisal

Green Belt

- 6.1 The site is within the Green Belt and the Framework establishes that the extension or alteration to a building that does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building is not considered inappropriate. The Council advise that as a guideline, a third of the house could be considered acceptable.
- 6.2 The house has been previously altered and extended but these have largely comprised of re-building elements. There was a former dairy for example attached to the eastern side of the house, a typical annexe to farmhouses on a functioning farm. The existing two-storey extension occupies this side of the house. The existing conservatory has permission and the footprint of the proposed extension would be no greater than this.
- 6.3 Planning permission in 2016 (referred to in the planning history section of the report above) has allowed the conservatory to be replaced by a smaller single storey extension. This formed part of an application for a replacement detached garage which has been completed. The single storey extension is therefore extant and therefore there is a reasonable likelihood that it would be constructed particularly given that the conservatory is far from an energy efficient structure and is particularly exposed to the elements from a westerly direction.
- 6.4 The exact calculation has not been carried out as previous building works have involved re-building original structures. However, it is important to consider the five purposes of Green Belt and the impact of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt.
- 6.5 Green Belt principles are set out in the Framework and include checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; prevention of major towns merging into one another; safeguard the countryside form

encroachment¹⁶. The Framework also establishes that the fundamental aim of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence¹⁷.

- 6.6 The proposal would in effect add a first floor to the already approved single storey extension, replacing the conservatory. It would be wholly within the existing footprint of the building and well within the defined curtilage of the property. The extension would be viewed against the existing two-storey property and as it would be set in from both the rear walls of the house and have a lower ridge it would appear subservient to the house and not detract from the original style, scale or form of the dwelling. It would not be disproportionate to the original dwelling and even taken together with previous alterations, the effect would not be disproportionate.
- 6.7 The integrity of the original house would be retained, it would not be viewed in any direction as anything other than a modest addition, notwithstanding that it would be two-stories high. Proportionally as an addition to the existing ground floor extension, adding another floor above would blend in with the house and not conflict with the purposes of Green Belt listed above or with its openness.
- 6.8 Whilst every application should be assessed on its own merits, and we have shown that this proposal would be acceptable in its own right, its setting amongst the grouping of dwellings is significant. The proposal would not extend outside this group but appear as a smaller extension than the extensions and alterations permitted at Shaunings Cottage where alterations and additions are much more evident at close quarters.
- 6.9 Loe Bank Farmhouse is set well back from the road and the extension is on the other side of the public footpath so it would not be seen from public vantage points. Rather, the grouping as a whole would be seen as a former farm holding of stone built properties in a rural setting. The proposal would not conflict way with the objectives of Green Belt Policy, it would not be inappropriate and therefore would be acceptable.

Other Matters

- 6.10 The proposal would be comply with UDP Policy H2/3 and SPD6 regarding design and impact.
- 6.11 The proposal would not affect the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. Shaunings Cottage is the closest but the

¹⁶ The Framework – Paragraph 138.

¹⁷ The Framework – Paragraph 137.

proposal would not affect them in any way. Nor would the occupiers of Loe Bank Bungalow be affected by the proposal.

7.0 Conclusion

- 7.1 The proposal would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, it would not harm openness or conflict with any of the purposes of Green Belt. It would be a modest extension, especially given that the ground floor, with a pitched roof has already been approved. Together with other alterations it would not be a disproportionate addition to the original dwelling and it would not detract from the traditional farmhouse design in size, proportion, scale or form.
- 7.2 Whilst the local listing of buildings of historic importance is in draft form, the application site is included on it and so the effect of the proposal on a non-designated heritage asset has been assessed. This has shown that the proposal would have little to no effect on the significance of the heritage asset.
- 7.3 The effect of the proposal has been considered in terms of its design and appearance and effect on the wider character of the area. It has been explained that the proposal would represent a high quality design and its implementation would be carried out sensitively utilising appropriate materials that reflected the character and appearance of the existing dwelling.
- 7.4 The proposal would not have a detrimental effect on the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties and the living conditions of the occupiers of the nearest property, Shaunings Cottage would not be adversely affected.
- 7.5 The proposal would comply with the local and national policy and therefore is considered a modest and reasonable improvement to this dwelling.