

**Item B. 5**                      **06/01074/LBC**                      **Refuse Listed Building Consent**

**Case Officer**                      **Mrs Nicola Hopkins**

**Ward**                                      **Adlington & Anderton**

**Proposal**                              **Retrospective application for the demolition of a single storey flat roof building and replace with a pitched roof single storey extension**

**Location**                              **Allanson Hall Farm Westhoughton Road Adlington Chorley PR7 4DG**

**Applicant**                              **Mrs E Manley**

**Proposal**                              The application is a retrospective application for listed building consent to demolish a single storey flat roofed building and the erection of a pitched roofed single storey extension.

The property is a Grade II Listed Building and the extension is attached to the east elevation of the building. The extension incorporates access to the main dwellinghouse through the extension. The extension was constructed prior to obtaining both planning permission and listed building consent.

The extension measures 6.3 metres by 5.6 metres by 4 metres high. The extension has a pitched roof. The roof has been tiled with Marley Dalestone tiles and has been constructed out of blockwork. The intention is to clad the exterior walls of the extension.

**Planning Policy**                      HT2- Alterations and Extensions to Listed Buildings  
PPG15- Planning and the Historic Environment

**Planning History**                      There is no planning history in respect of the application site.

**Applicant's Case**                      Various letters of support have been received in respect of the application two of which are from the applicant and raise the following points:

- Most parts of the house are not original. Walls have been stripped and re-plastered. The roof was removed and replaced with corrugated sheets because of the ingress of water. The outer walls were tied and rendered to hide the cracks, which had developed.
- The house came into the applicant's possession two years ago. The interior walls had been stripped and patched up in a poor way it was inhabitable.
- The staircase was built on an earth floor and the dampness has rotted the supports. The floor -boards and some of the stair treads have been replaced with oak boards.
- After the war a bomb was detonated in the village and some of the walls of the attached single storey building were blown out. The extension was rebuilt however when the property came into the applicant's ownership the extension had no foundations and was in a poor

state. When the corrugated sheets were removed from the roof part of the building collapsed.

- Details of the roof slates were attached to the letter stating that the slates 'faithfully recreate a traditional appearance'
- A letter from Mr Hoyle MP accepted the use of modified materials on other dwellings in the Borough.
- The applicants intention is to preserve the building and retain the original features. Many features however were long gone before we started the recent repair work.
- Draws our attention to work, which has been done to a 17<sup>th</sup> Century barn in Suffolk where the owners will allow to insert modern features.
- Was under the impression that replacing like for like is acceptable.

## **Representations**

**Adlington Town Council** object to the application as it is inappropriate development and have made the following comments:

- The purpose would appear to provide a downstairs bathroom to serve the bedrooms upstairs
- What is a building with a flat roof and a pitched roof?
- The building is 4.5 metres by 5.6 metre covering 25.2 square metres floorspace. Is this too large to be considered an extension?
- The extension is block work with a rendered finish and has windows of a modern design. Is this in keeping with and appropriate to a Listed Building?

8 additional letters have been received in support of the application in addition to the two letters received from the applicant. The letters raise the following points:

- The original extension was unsafe and an eyesore
- The replacement extension is the same size as the original with a pitched roof
- Crumbling plaster was removed and the building is no longer a health hazard.
- Rotten windows have been replaced. The work is entirely in keeping with the original.
- A letter from the daughter of the applicant requests that the repair work is allowed to continue due to her mothers poor health. The intention is for the whole family to occupy the property.
- A letter from the applicant's son states the work has been done to a good standard and the period features have been retained. The attached extension was in a poor condition and the replacement extension is the same size with a pitched roof, which it had on many years ago. The extension is now structurally sound.
- Will not affect the neighbours in any way in terms of their light and view. The extension will improve the building
- Due care and attention has been taken on the building and effect on nature with care to surrounding trees.

## **Consultations**

**British Waterways** have no comments to make

## **Assessment**

The main issues to consider are the impact of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the Listed Building

and the area as a whole.

The property is a two storey Grade II Listed Building which is located at the end of a private driveway. The property was originally one dwellinghouse, which has been split into 3 dwelling units. The building has already been extensively altered including both internal and external alterations. The extension subject to this application has already been partly constructed.

The extension exceeds the 50 cubic metres permitted development allowance and as such requires planning permission. A separate planning application has been submitted (06/01075/FUL) and is reported elsewhere on this report. The applicant has stated that the extension replaces a previous extension and is the same size and located on the same footprint as the previous extension. The previous extension had a flat roof, which was existing when the building was listed. However the applicant has stated that the previous extension originally had a pitched roof.

Although the applicant states that the extension replaces an existing extension no evidence has been provided to support this. It is evident that there was an extension originally attached to the east elevation of the building however it appears that this extension was of a modest size and was not attached to, nor accessed directly from, the house. The current extension is attached to the building adversely affecting its character and historic fabric by 'wrapping around' one corner of the building.

In design and appearance terms it is considered that the proposed extension creates a very modern extension, which detrimentally impacts on the historic character and appearance of the Listed Building. The proposal incorporates inappropriate massing, window designs and fixings and proposed facing materials.

It is considered that the design of the proposed windows is very modern which fail to preserve the historic significance of the Listed Building. Modern Marley Dalestone interlocking slates have been used on the roof. This too is considered to be a very modern material, which is not appropriate to the Listed Building.

It is not considered that the proposal preserves the special architectural and historic character of the Listed Building and as such the proposal is contrary to Policy HT2 of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review.

As the proposal replaces an existing extension there may be some potential to construct an extension on the east elevation of the property. However evidence is required detailing the previous extension and the size, design, siting and proposed facing materials should preserve the historic character of the Listed Building and should take into account the historic fabric of the Listed Building.

It is considered that the proposed extension adversely impacts on the special architectural and historic character of the Listed Building and as such is contrary to Policy HT2. As the application is retrospective, an associated report can be found later in the Agenda seeking authority for Enforcement Action.

**Recommendation    Refuse**

**Recommendation:    Refuse Listed Building Consent**

**Reasons**

1. The proposed extension by virtue of its massing, design, use of materials and impact on the original building has failed to respect the special architectural character and historic interest of the Listed Building. As such the proposal is contrary to Policy HT2 of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review and Government advice contained in PPG15: Planning and the Historic Environment

---