



Gary Hoerty Associates

320200741P

Suite 9
Grindleton Business Centre
The Spinney
Grindleton
Clitheroe
Lancashire
BB7 4DH

Tel: 01200 449700
www.ghaonline.co.uk
email: info@ghaonline.co.uk

PLANNING STATEMENT

IN RESPECT OF:

**A HOUSEHOLDER AND LISTED BUILDING CONSENT
APPLICATION FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A SINGLE
STOREY EXTENSION FOR RESIDENTIAL ACCOMMODATION**

AT

**MILL HOUSE
LONG BUILDING
SAWLEY
CLITHEROE
BB7 4LE**

**Prepared by: Colin Sharpe
Our Ref: Dow/982/2902/CS
Our Client: Mr M Downey
Date: September 2020**



Chartered Surveyors ■■■ Planning & Development ■■■ Land Agents
Valuers ■■■ Property Agency ■■■ Property Management



CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION	Page 3
2.	THE APPLICATION SITE AND SURROUNDINGS	Page 3
3.	PLANNING HISTORY	Page 3
4.	THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT	Page 5
5.	PLANNING POLICY CONSIDERATIONS	Page 6
6.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	Page 8

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 1.1 Gary Hoerty Associates have been instructed by Mr M Downey of 22 Fairview Drive, Adlington, Chorley, PR6 9SB to submit a Householder Planning and Listed Building Consent application on his behalf for the construction of a single storey domestic extension at Mill House, Sawley, BB7 4LE.
- 1.2 As the property is a Listed Building within a Conservation Area a separate Heritage Asset Statement (H.A.S.) has also been submitted with the application. We would request that the contents of both the submitted Statements are considered in the determination of the application.
- 1.3 In this Planning Statement (as supported by the H.A.S.) we will consider the application against the relevant national and local planning guidance and policies. We will explain why we consider the proposal to comply with all relevant guidance and policies and why, therefore, planning permission and Listed Building Consent should both be granted.

2. THE APPLICATION SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 Mill House is a two storey stone built dwelling that is attached to the western end of a three storey building known as The Long Building on the western side of the main road through the village of Sawley. At the eastern end of the Long Building is another two storey property known as Ivy Cottage. The whole group (including the application property) is a Grade II Listed Building and is within a Conservation Area.
- 2.2 Being at the western end of the row, Mill House has a residential curtilage extending to the north, south and west of the building. There is a detached single storey garage building adjoining the north western corner of the main dwelling, which is presently in use for domestic office and storage purposes. There is an existing conservatory attached to the south elevation of the garage building and the western end elevation of the main dwelling thereby linking the two buildings.
- 2.3 The property is adjoined to the north and south by other built development within the settlement of Sawley and to the west by open agricultural fields. The surrounding built development and the adjoining fields to the west are all within the boundary of the Conservation Area.

3. PLANNING HISTORY

- 3.1 The following applications (all of which were submitted by GHA on behalf of previous owners of the property) are considered relevant to the determination of this current application:

3/2016/0834 – Householder planning application for the demolition of the existing conservatory and erection of a single storey extension on west elevation - REFUSED on 3 November 2016.

3/2016/0835 – Listed Building Consent application for the demolition of the existing conservatory and erection of a single storey extension on west elevation - REFUSED on 3 November 2016.

3/2017/0347 – Householder planning application for the demolition of the existing conservatory and erection of a single storey extension on west elevation (resubmission of application 3/2016/0834) - APPROVED on 16 June 2017.

3/2017/0348 - Listed Building Consent application for the demolition of the existing conservatory and erection of a single storey extension on west elevation (resubmission of application 3/2016/0835) APPROVED on 16 June 2017.

3/2017/0349 – Householder planning application for the demolition of the existing conservatory and erection of a single storey extension on west elevation - APPROVED on 16 June 2017.

3/2017/0350 - Listed Building Consent application for the demolition of the existing conservatory and erection of a single storey extension on west elevation - APPROVED on 16 June 2017.

3/2018/0351 - Discharge of conditions attached to planning permission 3/2017/0347 – Conditions partially discharged on 5 June 2018.

3/2018/0352 – Discharge of conditions attached to Listed Building Consent 3/2017/0348 – Conditions partially discharged on 5 June 2018.

- 3.2 Following the refusal of the first two applications in the list above, we engaged with the Council's planning officers in order to address their objections to that original proposal. This resulted in the submission of the next four applications which sought planning permission and Listed Building Consent for two alternative designs for the extension (they were basically the same but with different roof designs). Both designs were considered to be acceptable by the Council and all four applications were approved subject to conditions.
- 3.3 The final two applications in the list sought to discharge some of the conditions that had been imposed on the planning permission and Listed Building Consent. The Council's decision on these applications effectively meant that further details needed to be submitted in order for any of the conditions to be fully discharged. In the event, the previous owners of the property had by this time decided that they

wanted to sell Mill House and would not be proceeding with the approved extension.

- 3.4. We consider it important to comment, however, that Condition No. 6 on all the permissions required the submission for the Council's approval of of a programme of archaeological recording and analysis which was to be carried out in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) which would precede a required watching brief. Under references 3/2018/0351 & 0352 that condition was part discharged on the basis of the Written Scheme of Investigation prepared by Mr J.M Trippier (a specialist in Archaeological matters) that we submitted with the Discharge of Conditions Applications.
- 3.5 We have resubmitted the previously approved WSI with this current application and our client (the new owner of the property) is aware of the need to comply with the second requirement of this condition and is in contact with Mr. Trippier in this regard.

4. THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

- 4.1 By virtue of an extension to the standard 3 year commencement condition due to Covid 19, there is an extant planning permission and Listed Building Consent (3/2017/0349 & 0350) for an extension of approximately 6.3m x 6.3m attached to the northern part of the end elevation of the building and attaching the existing detached garage to the main building. That approved extension is to be of stone construction with a pitched slate roof. It is the applicant's intention to construct the development approved under those references but with one small addition and two minor alterations to the approved scheme.
- 4.2 As existing, there is an addition at the northern end of the existing garage with dimensions of 5.9m by 4.0m and a height of 3.2m. which, in the approved development, was to be demolished and not replaced. In the current proposal, however, it is proposed that this part of the building will be replaced by an extension with a slightly larger footprint (6.2m by 4.0m) and with a height of 4.15m. to match the height of the retained garage structure, that itself is a slight increase in the roof height than proposed in the previously approved development. The final alterations to the approved scheme are an increase in the size of the window in the western gable and the replacement of garage doors with a window in the eastern gable.
- 4.3 In granting permission/consent for the previous proposal, we contend that the Council must have been satisfied that the proposal was acceptable with respect to all relevant considerations, including its impacts upon the Heritage Asset. We consider that the relatively minor alterations to the approved scheme will have minimal, if any, different impact with respect to any relevant considerations. If there was any different impact, we contend that it would be an improvement to

the appearance of the property when viewed from the front as the roof of the proposed extension would be a continuation of the roof over the existing garage thereby removing the somewhat discordant feature of the lower roof on the existing structure.

5. PLANNING POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

- 5.1 As a proposal for a relatively small extension to an existing approved extension to a dwelling, we do not consider it necessary or beneficial to examine the proposed development in relation to the majority of the guidance and advice contained in NPPF. As the property is a Listed Building in a Conservation Area, we will, however, of course, pay due regard to the advice in Section 12 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment; and to the associated requirements of Core Strategy Policy DME4: Protecting Heritage Assets.

Listed Building/Conservation Considerations

- 5.2 Paragraph 128 of NPPF requires applicants to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected by a proposal, including any contribution made by their setting. The paragraph explains that the level of detail should be proportionate to the importance of the asset. To comply with this advice a Heritage Asset Statement (H.A.S.) is submitted with the application. This includes an appraisal of the heritage significance of Mill House that has been carried out in accordance with “Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance” (English Heritage, 2008). It also contains an assessment of the impact of the proposal on the heritage asset and concludes that “the heritage impacts have been assessed overall as low”.
- 5.3 We request that the LPA pays due regard to the contents and conclusions of the H.A.S. in the determination of the application, but we will now make further comments in this Planning Statement with regards to Listed Building/Conservation considerations.
- 5.4 The application relates to a very small extension to a detached garage structure at a Grade II Listed Building. Amongst other things, paragraph 132 of 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. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of a grade II Listed Building, park or garden should be exceptional.”*
- 5.5 Paragraph 134 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 securing its optimum viable use.”

- 5.6 In the H.A.S. it is stated that Mill House appears to be an addition to the original building comprising Ivy Cottage and The Long Row. We consider that this reduces the importance of Mill House as a heritage asset to less than the importance of the rest of the building. We also consider that the proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the asset for reasons explained below.
- 5.7 The existing structure attached to the front of the garage, has a roof that is separate from, and lower than, the main roof on the garage. The proposal involves the demolition of this structure and the erection on its footprint of an extension to the garage with a roof matching the height and angle of slope of the existing garage roof.
- 5.8 As such, we consider that the very small proposed extension, as a replacement of the existing structure would result in “less than substantial harm” to the heritage asset and will improve the living accommodation thereby enhancing, and securing for the future, the optimum viable use (as a dwelling) of this part of the Listed Building. The proposal, in our opinion, therefore, satisfies the requirement of NPPF. We would add that the proposal under consideration in this application is considerably smaller than the development for which there are extant permissions/consents which the Council must have found to be compliant with NPPF.
- 5.9 Of relevance to the application, Policy DME4 of the Core Strategy makes the following five points:
1. *“In considering development proposals the Council will make a presumption in favour of the conservation and enhancement of heritage assets and their settings.”*
 2. *“Proposals within, or affecting views into and out of, or affecting the setting of a conservation area will be required to conserve and where appropriate enhance its character and appearance and those elements which contribute towards its significance. This should include considerations as to whether it conserves and enhances the special architectural and historic character of the area as set out in the relevant conservation area appraisal. Development which makes a positive contribution and conserves and enhances the character, appearance and significance of the area in terms of its location, scale, size, design and materials and existing buildings, structures, trees and open spaces will be supported.”*

3. *"In the conservation areas there will be a presumption in favour of the conservation and enhancement of elements that make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the conservation area."*
4. *"Alterations or extensions to Listed Buildings or buildings of local heritage interest, or development proposals on sites within their setting which cause harm to the significance or the heritage asset will not be supported."*
5. *"Any proposals involving the demolition or loss of important historic fabric from Listed Buildings will be refused unless it can be demonstrated that exceptional circumstances exist."*

5.10 We will now comment on each of those points as follows:

1. For the reasons that we have given, we consider that the replacement of the existing structure with the proposed extension will lead to an overall enhancement of this Listed Building and its Conservation Area location.
2. As the conservation area extends for some distance to the east of the application site, the proposal will therefore not really have any effects on views into the conservation area. When viewed from within the conservation area we consider that the proposal does enhance its character and appearance.
3. We consider that the proposal will enhance the appearance of this Listed Building which, itself, makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
4. The proposal will not cause harm to the significance of the heritage asset.
5. The structure that is to be demolished and replaced is a relatively recent addition that is not part of the historic fabric of the Listed Building.

5.11 In our opinion, the proposal therefore satisfies all requirements of NPPF and the Core Strategy Policies relating to heritage/conservation considerations.

5.12 With regards to other considerations, the proposal will not have any detrimental effects upon ecology/wildlife, highway safety or the amenities of nearby residents such that the requirements of Policies DMG1 and DME3 are satisfied. We have submitted with the application the Environment Agency Flood Map which identifies the site as being within Flood Zone 1. The proposal is therefore compliant with Policy DME6.

6. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

6.1 In this Statement and the Heritage Statement we consider that we have demonstrated that the proposal would have no detrimental effects in relation to

heritage/conservation considerations, or with regards to ecology/wildlife, highway safety, the amenities of nearby residents or flood risk. The proposal therefore represents sustainable development that would comply with all the relevant Policies of the adopted Core Strategy.

- 6.2 The proposal, therefore, in our opinion, fully accords with the development plan. In accordance with the advice at paragraph 11 of NPPF we can therefore see no reason why planning permission and Listed Building Consent should not both be granted without delay, subject to appropriate conditions.

Signed.....

Colin Sharpe DipTP MRTPI
For and on behalf of Gary Hoerty Associates

Date..... 3/9/2020

