

**Item B. 6**                      **06/01075/FUL**                      **Refuse Full Planning Permission**

**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 planning permission for the demolition of 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**                      DC1- Development in the Green Belt  
DC8A- Replacement dwellings and extensions in the Green Belt  
HT2- Alterations and Extensions to Listed Buildings  
PPG2: Green Belts  
PPG15- Planning and the Historic Environment  
House Extension Design Guidelines

**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 replastered. 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 applicant's 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 were allowed 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?

6 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 mother's 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.

## **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 dwellinghouse

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 building has already been extensively altered including both internal and external alterations. The extension subject to this application has already been partly constructed.

As the building is a Listed Building an application for Listed Building Consent (06/01074/LBC) has also been submitted and is reported elsewhere on this agenda. 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, no 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. As such the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policy HT2.

In design and appearance terms it is considered that the proposed extension does not relate well visually to the existing dwelling. The siting, massing and external appearance of the extensions creates a visually intrusive feature to the detriment of the dwellinghouse and the area as a whole. The proposal incorporates windows, which do not replicate the window details on the main dwellinghouse and as such the design details of the proposal are not considered to be appropriate. As such the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policy GN5.

The property is located within the Green Belt. In accordance with Policy DC1 and DC8A limited extensions to dwellinghouses located within the Green Belt are considered acceptable. However it is considered that the siting, design and external materials of the extension create a visually intrusive feature to the detriment of the character and appearance of the Green Belt area. As such the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policies DC1 and DC8A and Government advice contained in PPG2: Green Belts.

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 respect the design and character of the existing property.

It is considered that the proposed extension adversely impacts on the character and appearance of the existing property and the area as a whole. As such the proposal is contrary to Policies DC1, GN5, DC8A, and HT2 of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review and Government advice contained in PPG2: Green Belts.

As the application is retrospective, an associated report can be found later in the Agenda seeking authority for Enforcement Action.

**Recommendation: Refuse Full Planning Permission**

**Reasons**

1. The proposed development is contrary to the Council's approved House Extension Design Guidelines and Policies DC1, DC8A and GN5 of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review by reason of its design, siting, massing and external materials. The proposal would be poorly related visually to the existing dwelling and creates a visually intrusive feature to the detriment of the surrounding Green Belt area.

2. 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

---