



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 5 April 2022

by Ms S Watson BA(Hons), MCD, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 April 2022

Appeal A Ref: APP/W4223/W/21/3283815

1A Lower Tunstead Tunstead Lane, Greenfield, OLDHAM, 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 HOU/346670/21, dated 14 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is extensions at ground floor to each side of rear utility and first floor bathroom extension.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/W4223/Y/21/3283813

1A Lower Tunstead Tunstead Lane, Greenfield, OLDHAM, 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 LBC/346671/21, dated 14 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 July 2021.
 - The works proposed are extensions at ground floor to each side of rear utility and first floor bathroom extension.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. As the proposal relates to development of 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.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the special architectural and historic interest and the significance of the listed building.

Reasons

5. The house is a Grade II listed building. It is one half of a pair of dwellings which were originally built as a single cottage which included a milk pantry and parlour in around 1730. The building was extended in about 1750 to form a separate property which consisted of one room on each floor. Also around this time, alterations were undertaken to the original part of the building, including

- the addition of a storey over the pantry/dairy and extending the roof over the full depth of the building to form a loom room over the pantry, in association with the weaving industry.
6. The building is constructed in watershot hammer-dressed stone with a graduated stone slate roof. It features quoins and stone mullion windows.
 7. The pair of cottages have been extensively altered since the 18th century. This includes a large two storey side extension that was built in the 1980s at the adjoining property (No.1); as well as a 1960/70s single storey side extension and a 1930s single storey rear extension to the appeal property.
 8. The later additions do not make a positive contribution to the special interest of the building. The 18th century alterations illustrate the changing functional needs of the occupants as they relate to the wider weaving industry of the Saddleworth area.
 9. Given the above, the historic significance of the building derives from its age, its former uses, the use of local materials, its local vernacular form at the edge of the moors, and its architectural detailing.
 10. The proposal includes a catslide roof and there are other catslide roofs in the area which I saw at my visit. They are part of the vernacular building design. Nevertheless, the proposed catslide roof would be joined to the existing building by a narrow flat roof. This is not characteristic of the vernacular design of the existing building and I consider that it would be incongruous with the historic form of the building and would harm its significance.
 11. The first-floor extension would obscure some of the smaller coursed stonework of the 1730 element of the building. Nevertheless, the first-floor extension would be very small, covering an area where the stonework has already been removed by a window formed in around 1960. Most of this stonework would remain so that the original 1730s and 1750s elements of the rear elevation would still be differentiated. The previous appeal decisions¹ noted that the obscuring of this stonework would be harmful to the significance of the historic building. However the two schemes are not directly comparable as the previous appeal scheme was much bigger, whereas this appeal scheme would only obscure a very small amount of the stonework. As the extensions are small and would leave most of the smaller coursed stone exposed, I do not consider that the scale of the extension would harm the historic significance of the building.
 12. The plans also show that the quoins would be partially obscured. However, the appellant confirmed in the written evidence that they would not be obscured and this matter could have been secured by a condition.
 13. I note the appellant's comments that the proposals would not be seen in the distance but this factor is not determinative. The appellant also argues that the works would be reversible and has provided plans to show the connection details. However, extensions to buildings tend to be permanent and there is nothing before me to secure their removal. I give this argument very little weight.
 14. Due to the roof form, the extensions would harm the significance of the listed building as a designated heritage asset. I consider the harm caused to its

¹ APP/W4223/W/20/3261997 and APP/W4223/Y/20/3261996

significance would be less than substantial, in the language of the National Planning Policy Framework, and about halfway along the scale of less than substantial harm. This harmful impact is a matter of considerable importance and weight.

15. Paragraph 202 of The National Planning Policy Framework indicates that less than substantial harm must be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing the designated heritage asset's optimal viable use.
16. I accept that the removal of:- the multi-pane window to the utility, the window on the gable of the utility, the timber boarding and door to the utility, the 1960 first floor window, the occasional bricks in the existing utility gable, and the bay window to the dining room and its replacement with a traditional mullioned window, would be an enhancement to the historic significance of the building as all of these features are later additions which are incongruous to the vernacular design. These are heritage benefits which can be considered as public benefits.
17. In addition, the proposal would provide a bathroom at first floor level so that the occupants would not have to go downstairs and through the kitchen to get to the existing bathroom. This would bring the dwelling up to commonly expected modern standards resulting in an improvement to the housing stock and the basic living conditions of the occupiers. Although, I have no evidence that the continued use of the building is dependent upon the extension, this factor is nevertheless a public benefit.
18. However, whilst there are some public benefits to the proposal, similar benefits could be secured by a design more in keeping with the vernacular form of the listed building. Therefore, the public benefits do not outweigh the less than substantial harm that I have identified.
19. The proposal would harm the significance of the Grade II listed building. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies 9, 20 and 24 of the Oldham Local Development Framework². In combination, these policies seek to protect local character, landscape, townscape and the historic environment. I note the appellant's comments that Policy 9 refers to "significant impact", however, I consider that the harm to the significance of the listed building is a significant impact.

Other Matters

20. The site is within the Green Belt. Paragraph 149 c) of the National Planning Policy Framework indicates that the extension or alteration of a building is not inappropriate provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. The Council does not consider the extension to form inappropriate development. Although the building has already been extended, the proposed extensions are small and I agree that cumulatively, the proposals would not result in disproportionate additions.

² Oldham Local Development Framework Development Plan Document – Joint Core Strategy and Development Management Policies, 2011.

Conclusion

21. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised I conclude that the appeals should be dismissed.

Ms S Watson

INSPECTOR