
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 16 February 2021

by Helen B Hockenhull BA (Hons) B. PI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 15 March 2021

Appeal A: APP/W4223/W/20/3261997

1A Lower Tunstead, Tunstead Lane, Greenfield, OL3 7NT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr David Sheldon against the decision of Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref HH/345153/20, dated 12 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 20 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey rear extension.
-

Appeal B: APP/W4223/Y/20/3261996

1A Lower Tunstead, Tunstead Lane, Greenfield, OL3 7NT

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr David Sheldon against the decision of Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref LB/345154/20, dated 12 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 20 October 2020.
 - The works proposed are a two-storey rear extension.
-

Decision

Appeal A

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal B

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

3. As the works affect a listed building, I have had special regard to sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).
4. The Council refers to the appeal property as No.2 Lower Tunstead. However, this differs from that on the original planning application form which states the address as No.1A Lower Tunstead. As I noted this to be the number on the door of the property, I have used this in the heading above.
5. Furthermore, the description of development on the planning application form involves lengthy wording which the Council have shortened to 'a two-storey

rear extension'. As this better reflects the development proposed I have used this wording above.

6. The appeal property lies within the Green Belt. The Council considers that the proposal complies with paragraph 145 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and does not form inappropriate development in the Green Belt. This is because the extension proposed would not represent a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling. I concur with this assessment.

Main Issue

7. In light of the above, the main issue in this case is whether the proposed works would preserve a Grade II listed building, Lower Tunstead (Ref: 1164699) and any of the features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.

Reasons

8. The appeal property forms a semi-detached dwelling located in the small hamlet of Tunstead, just over half a kilometre north east of the village of Greenfield. The proposal comprises the erection of a two-storey rear extension to provide a new kitchen on the ground floor and a bedroom at first floor.
9. Lower Tunstead was originally built as a detached house in the 1730's. It was a part single and part double depth dwelling, constructed in dressed stone with a graduated stone slate roof and stone mullioned windows. In the 1750's the property was extended to create a semi-detached pair, Nos 1 and 1A Lower Tunstead. The quoin detailing of the original dwelling is still evident in the front and rear elevations as is the smaller coursed stonework. At a similar date the eaves and roof height were raised, and a mullion window was re-set which was most likely to incorporate the larger looms being introduced in the weaving industry.
10. A small stone lean to extension was added to the rear of No. 1A in the 19th century to provide a kitchen. This was used until the mid-1970's when a further single storey brick extension was added to the south east gable. In the 1980's, the adjoining semi-detached pair, No. 1 Lower Tunstead, was extended with a large two storey side extension. Whilst these later additions do not make a positive contribution to the special interest, this is not the case for earlier alterations that illustrate the changing functional needs of the occupants as they relate to the wider weaving industry of the Saddleworth area and are of considerable historic importance. The historic extent of the earlier phases and the adaptation of the building is indicative of the greater affluence that this pre-industrialised cottage industry brought to Pennine communities.
11. Given the above, I find that the special interest of the listed building, insofar as it relates to these appeals, to be primarily associated with the legibility of its historic phasing and distinctive materials.
12. The original building would have had a diminutive plan form which later additions have undermined. As a result of cumulative incongruent massing, the proposed extension would further erode the original dwellings diminutive nature.
13. The proposal would be sited in a position where it would obscure part of the

historic fabric of the original 1730's house, in particular the quoin details and areas of smaller coursed stone. In so doing the proposal would negatively impact the legibility of the buildings historic phasing and fail to preserve its special interest.

14. Historic fabric would be lost at both ground and first floor to create access to the proposal. At first floor, the appellant advises that the possibility of using an existing first floor window opening could be explored subject to building regulation approval. This appears to be an unsympathetic later addition and whilst this would minimise the impact, it would still result in some loss of fabric. At ground floor an existing bay window would be removed, and the opening widened to access the new kitchen. The loss of this unsympathetic later addition would be a benefit of the scheme, but this would not outweigh the harm caused by the loss of original fabric in the oldest part of the building.
15. The scheme also includes the enlargement of the side window opening to the side kitchen extension and the creation of a pair of full-length timber patio doors. This would replace an existing uPVC window and provide a stone rather than a concrete lintel. While this would be a positive step in terms of using more appropriate materials, the scale and design of the patio doors would fail to respect the historic character of the dwelling.
16. The proposed extension would incorporate part of the single storey rear lean to and have a sloping mono pitch roof with a lower eaves line to the existing dwelling. The roof pitch would not match that of the existing roof, though there would only be a difference of a few degrees. The appellant suggests this would be barely visible, would add character, help future generations read the buildings history and distinguish the extension from the original.
17. I agree that the extension would be read as a later addition to the building. However, it would create a catslide roof over an outshot which would be at odds with the form of the existing roof. In addition, when viewed from the south east, the different roof pitch would result in a discordant addition to the dwelling.
18. The proposed first floor windows would be positioned lower than the existing first floor window and together with the extended sloping roof, would give the extension what the Council describe as a 'squat appearance'. I noted on my site visit that the existing windows in the building are of differing height, including those in the most recent two storey side extension to No 1. However, the small gap proposed between the first floor and ground floor fenestration would give the extension a visually distracting, incongruent appearance.
19. The appellant has argued that whilst the extension would cover some of the rear of the Grade II listed building, it would not impact on the front of the building where its visual story is more clearly observed. However, the building has been listed for its historic and architectural interest as a whole. This is not just confined to the principal elevation. The rear of the building is just as important to its special interest.
20. The appellant also suggests that the extension if constructed could be removed in the future, so that the original fabric of the building could be revealed. However, the proposed works involve structural changes to link the original building with the new extension and the removal of original fabric to

create access to the extension. It is also unclear what treatment or decoration would be proposed for the original rear wall as it becomes an internal wall. I therefore do not consider that the works could successfully be reversed.

21. The appellant has brought my attention to number of other two storey extensions to listed buildings in the local area, some of which are more extensive than that proposed in this case and in the appellant's view incongruous. However, I do not have the full details of these proposals to assess their comparability to the appeal scheme. In any event I must consider the scheme on its merits and the impact on the listed building in question.
22. Given the above, I find that the appeal proposal would fail to preserve the special interest of the listed building. I give this harm considerable importance and weight in the balance of these appeals.
23. Paragraph 193 of the Framework advises that when considering the impact of development on the significance of designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to their conservation. It goes on to advise that significance can be harmed or lost through the alteration or destruction of assets. Given the extent of the proposal, I find harm to be less than substantial in this instance but nevertheless of considerable importance and weight.
24. Under these circumstances, paragraph 196 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, which includes securing the optimal viable use of listed buildings. I have already acknowledged that the works would remove an inappropriate uPVC window and concrete lintel more in keeping with the original property. The dwelling is suffering from damp penetration, the roof on the lean to is bowing and some of the stonework is crumbling. The appellant argues that the proposal would provide the opportunity to rectify these matters, and that the extension would preserve the 1730's stonework by protecting it from the elements. I acknowledge that the property is in need of some renovation and maintenance and the proposed works would have some public benefit in helping to preserve a heritage asset. However, these essential maintenance works could be undertaken without the property being extended.
25. Recycled local stone is being sourced for the works and stone from the removal of the rear lean to would be used to reface the brick side extension. This would be beneficial for the visual appearance of the building. The appellant submits that the proposed works would also improve the energy efficiency of the dwelling and provide a high standard family home. Whilst I agree this would be the case, it would however be of private benefit to the appellant not a benefit to the wider public.
26. Given the above, and the fact that the public benefits would not outweigh the harm I have found, I conclude that the proposal would fail to preserve the special historic interest of the Grade II listed building. The scheme would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act, paragraph 192 of the Framework and Policies 9, 20 and 24 of the Oldham Local Plan 2011. These policies seek to achieve high quality design and protect, conserve and enhance heritage assets.

Conclusion

27. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, including the lack of local objection to the proposal, the appeals are dismissed.

Helen Hockenhull

INSPECTOR