

# COPELAND BOROUGH COUNCIL DELEGATED PLANNING DECISION

1.	Reference No:	4/22/2323/0F1	
2.	Proposed Development:	REMOVAL OF EXISTING REAR EXTENSIONS & ERECTION OF PART TWO STOREY & PART SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION	
3.	Location:	BROOKLYN PLACE COTTAGE, BECKERMET, WHITEHAVEN	
4.	Parish:	Beckermet with Thornhill	
5.	Constraints:	ASC;Adverts - ASC;Adverts,  Conservation Area - Conservation Area, Flood Area - Flood Zone 2, Safeguard Zone - Safeguard Zone, Coal - Off Coalfield - Data Subject To Change, DEPZ Zone - DEPZ Zone, Outer Consultation Zone - Sellafield 10KM	
6.	Publicity Representations &Policy	Neighbour Notification Letter  Site Notice  Press Notice  Consultation Responses  Relevant Policies	Yes Yes Yes See Report See Report

# 7. Report:

## **Site and Location**

This application relates to Brooklyn Place Cottage, located within the eastern part of Beckermet. The detached property fronts onto the main road through the village and is located within the Conservation Area.

The historic cottage is currently in a poor state of repair and benefits from single and two storey lean

to extensions attached to the rear elevation of the dwelling. The site also benefits from a garage and parking area on a detached site located to the east of the site.

# **Relevant Planning History**

4/22/2207/0F1 – Proposed alterations to porch, replacement of windows, demolition of utility and a two storey rear extension – Approved at adjacent property.

## **Proposal**

This application seeks planning permission for the removal of the existing rear extensions and the erection of a part two storey and part single storey rear extension on this property.

The proposed stepped two storey extension will project from the rear elevation of the dwelling by a maximum of 4.3m and a minimum of 3.3m, extending along this elevation by 6m. This element of the development will have an eaves height of 5m and an overall height of 6.3m.

The proposed single storey will project from the two storey by 1.7m and will extend by 4.2m, benefitting from a eaves height of 2.6m and an overall height of 3.3m. Internally, the proposed extension will allow the reconfigurement of the property creating a living room, snug, utility room, toilet and kitchen/dining room within the ground floor of the dwelling. Within the first floor three double bedrooms and a bathroom will be created.

Externally the extension will be finished with wet dash render, a slate roof, powder coated aluminium windows, and a timber boarded door. The existing dwelling will also be re-rendered with the existing pebble dash replaced with wet dash render. The existing windows within the front elevation will also be replaced with timber sash windows, and one of the existing ground floor front windows will be enlarged to reflect the length of the other existing window.

## **Consultation Responses**

#### Beckermet with Thornhill Parish Council

Beckermet with Thornhill Parish Council think the extension and refurbishment will enhance the area.

There are no further comments or objections to this application.

#### Cumbria County Council – Cumbria Highways & LLFA

As this falsl under our Service Level Agreement (SLA) with your Council, this application does not need to be submitted to the Local Highway Authority or Lead Local Flood Authority; subject to the

highway and drainage aspects of such applications being considered in accordance with the Agreement.

The highway and drainage implications of this application would therefore have to be decided by the Local Planning Authority.

## Copeland Borough Council – Flood and Coastal Defence Engineer

30<sup>th</sup> August 2022

Can you ask the applicant to provide supporting information for the soakaway that is to be used for surface water disposal please.

20th September 2022

Comments weren't easy to spot on the drawing.

OK with proposals now.

Please note, that if following the percolation testing, should this show that a soakaway is not feasible and the surface water is to be discharged into the watercourse, this will need to be agreed with the statutory body.

This will be Black Beck, which is designated Main River, so it would be the Environment Agency that would need to approve the discharge.

### Natural England

No comments received.

## Copeland Borough Council - Conservation Officer

3<sup>rd</sup> October 2022

Conclusion: Request further information and design revision

#### Summary:

- I have concerns that this proposal is more invasive than ideal. When considered against local and national policy, however, I have not found a case for requesting any more than detail changes and additional information. I would urge the applicant and agent to consider whether a more modest proposal has the potential to meet their needs while being more sensitive to the building's character. The "SPAB approach" is useful to consider as a good practice yardstick, where it can be applied.
  - https://www.spab.org.uk/campaigning/spab-approach
- I would view the proposal as entailing less-than-substantial harm to the character and

appearance of the Conservation Area, towards the negligible end of the scale, and of entailing moderate harm to a non-designated heritage asset. These are justified by giving this dilapidated and vacant building a viable use.

- The building may contain valuable historic features obscured by modern additions; I
  advise the applicant and agent to ensure these have been considered properly before
  stripping out.
- The drawings refer to a 1:10 scale detail drawing of the replacement windows, but I've been unable to find this in the application docs. If this could be sent through it would be helpful. I would be accepting of handling this via a condition, if felt preferable.
- I request that the chimney removal be omitted unless good justification can be provided, to avoid unnecessary impact on the conservation area.
- I request the submission of a more detailed specification for the replacement render as there exists the possibility for this to harm the appearance of the Conservation Area, depending on detailing.
- I request that rooflights be dark in finish and fitted with conservation style flashing kits that mount them flush with the roof surface.

#### 6<sup>th</sup> October 2022

Conclusion: Request further information (see sections in bold below)

#### Assessment:

- ☐ The building may contain valuable historic features obscured by modern additions; I advise the applicant and agent to ensure these have been considered properly before stripping out.
  - An offer has been made to provide a photographic record of the building as the works progress. This could be a valuable insight into the development of one of Beckermet's more historic buildings, and I welcome it.
  - o This will be most useful where it is stored in a way that can be made use of in future, so I would suggest adding a condition to any permission requiring a recording equivalent to a simple Level 2. I suggest including:
    - cover letter describing the circumstances necessitating the recording, location, date and author of report;
    - the "as existing" block plan and elevation/section drawings;
    - and a collection of photographs made during the stripping out of the building.

<ul> <li>This should be deposited with the Council, the local HER and the records office.</li> </ul>				
☐ The drawings refer to a 1:10 scale detail drawing of the replacement windows, but I've been unable to find this in the application docs. If this could be sent through it would be helpful. I would be accepting of handling this via a condition, if felt preferable.				
I have looked at the window details drawings and these appear satisfactory.				
<ul> <li>I request that the chimney removal be omitted unless good justification can be provided, to avoid unnecessary impact on the conservation area.</li> </ul>				
Reasoning has been provided that due to structural and space reasons, the chimney needs to be removed. As the site is particularly compact and the retention of the chimney poses problems that cannot reasonably be skirted. Given that this is one out of four chimneys in total, though the loss is less-than-substantial harm to the conservation area and the assets itself, I would view it as justified.				
☐ I request that rooflights be dark in finish and fitted with conservation style flashing kits that mount them flush with the roof surface.				
I'd be happy to see either a note added to the drawings or a condition adding to the same effect.				
☐ I request the submission of a more detailed specification for the replacement render as there exists the possibility for this to harm the appearance of the conservation area, depending on detailing.				
I'd suggest making use of a lime-based harling, run down to the ground (thicker at the bottom to provide extra protection from rain splashing if necessary). Edge bead and bellcast drip details should be avoided. If assistance is needed specifying, a lime specialist such as Eden Hot Lime, the Scottish Lime Centre, etc. should be able to advise. Use of pozzolan to achieve some hydraulicity would probably be a good idea given the location near to the coast.				
It is necessary to avoid cold weather when applying lime render or pointing.				
I'd be happy to see either a note added to the drawings or a condition adding to the same effect.				
19 <sup>th</sup> October 2022				
Conclusion: No objection				
Assessment:				
$\Box$ I would suggest adding a condition to any permission requiring a recording equivalent to a				

simple Level 2.

- The agent has expressed support for the proposal to document photos of the stripping out process in the form of a lvl.2 recording, and to handle this via the discharge of a pre-commencement condition.
- ☐ I request that rooflights be dark in finish and fitted with conservation style flashing kits that mount them flush with the roof surface.
  - A note will be added to the application stating that the rooflights will be dark grey/black in finish and fitted with conservation style flashing kits that mount them flush with the roof surface.
  - I would be happy to support it.
- ☐ I request the submission of a more detailed specification for the replacement render as there exists the possibility for this to harm the appearance of the conservation area, depending on detailing. I'd be happy to see either a note added to the drawings or a condition adding to the same effect.
  - Information has been supplied. This will be a lime-based harling with three-coat hot lime wash applied on top. This will be run down to the ground. Edge bead and bellcast drip details will be avoided.
  - Making use of cement render with the same finish on the blockwork extension is perfectly reasonable.
  - This should be suitable and I'm happy to support it.

20<sup>th</sup> October 2022

No further comments.

## **Public Representation**

This application has been advertised by way of a site notice, press notice, and neighbour notification letters issued to four properties. Two letters of support have been received for this application raising the following comments:

- As neighbouring property supportive of the application.
- The cottage is a period property but is currently uninhabited and in a poor state of repairs.
- I would welcome its development as a sympathetic addition to the character of Beckermet.
- Will provide a desirable family accommodation to support the lifeblood of the traditional Cumbrian village.

- Will bring the dilapidated building back to being a habitable family home.

# **Planning Policy**

Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

## **Development Plan**

# Copeland Local Plan 2013 – 2028 (Adopted December 2013)

## Core Strategy

Policy ST1 – Strategic Development Principles

Policy ST2 - Strategic Development Principles

ENV3 - Biodiversity and Geodiversity

Policy ENV4 – Heritage Assets

**Development Management Policies (DMP)** 

Policy DM18 – Domestic Extensions and Alterations

Policy DM22 – Accessible Developments

Policy DM25 – Protecting Nature Conservation Sites, Habitats and Species

Policy DM27 – Built Heritage and Archaeology

#### **Other Material Planning Considerations**

National Planning Policy Framework (2021)

Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Conservation Area Design Guide SPD (Adopted December 2017)

Cumbria Development Design Guide

# **Emerging Copeland Local Plan (ELP):**

The emerging Copeland Local Plan 2017-2035 has recently been the subject of a Publication Draft Consultation. The Publication Draft Consultation builds upon the previously completed Issues and Options and Preferred Options consultations. Given the stage of preparation of the Copeland Local Plan 2017-2035 some weight can be attached to policies within the Publication Draft where no objections have been received. The Publication Draft provides an indication of the direction of travel of the emerging planning policies, which themselves have been developed in accordance with the

provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.

#### Assessment

The main issues raised by this application relate to the principle of the development; scale design and impact on amenity; impact on heritage assets; parking/highways issues; ecology; and drainage and flood risk.

## Principle of the Development

The proposed application relates to a residential dwelling within Beckermet and will provide additional living space for the property. The proposal will also see the redevelopment of this historic cottage which is currently in poor state of repair. Policy DM18 supports extensions and alterations to residential properties subject to detailed criteria, which are considered below.

On this basis, the principle of the development is therefore considered to be acceptable, and the extension satisfies Policies ST2, DM18, and the NPPF guidance.

## Scale, Design and Impact on Amenity

Policy ST1 and section 12 of the NPPF seek to safeguard good levels of residential amenity. Policy DM18 seeks to ensure domestic alterations are of an appropriate scale and design which is appropriate to their surroundings and do not adversely affect the amenities of adjacent dwellings.

Concerns were originally raised with this application in relation to the relationship with and the potential impact of the development upon the neighbouring property, Brooklyn Place. Brooklyn Place is a bungalow located to the rear and at a higher level but within close proximity of the application site. It benefits from a glazed conservatory facing directly into the site. Based on these concerns the agent for this application confirmed that both sites are within the applicant's ownership, the neighbouring property had recently benefitted from a planning approval (ref: 4/22/2207/0F1) which is about to be commenced that would remove the existing glazed conservation, replacing this with a solid extension and also extending the property to the rear of the site. Plans were also submitted by the agent to show the proposed development in context with the approved development at the neighbour site. The existing windows facing over the application site have also been fitted with obscuring glazing in order to reduce the potential for overlooking between these two properties until the neighbouring extension is commenced.

Given the existing layout and relationships between the two sites, it is considered that there is already an element of overlooking and impact on each existing property. The impact however is slightly reduced due to the change in levels between the two sites. Based on the information submitted by the agent it is considered that the approved extension at Brooklyn Place will reduce these impacts further, and the installation of obscuring glazing will act as a temporary measure until

works can commence on the site. Whilst there will be some impacts from the proposed development due to the proximity of the neighbouring dwelling, these are not considered to outweigh the benefits of the scheme, which including being back into use a dilapidated vacant building and the significant improvement to the overall streetscene and in particular this part of the Conservation Area.

Whilst the development is large in scale the development is not visible from the front of the application site and is considered to be subservient to the main dwelling with the ridge height lower than the existing dwelling, therefore the development is not considered to have detrimental impact on the overall streetscene. There are no side facing windows therefore the development is not considered to create overlooking concerns for neighbouring dwellings.

On this basis the proposed development is of an acceptable scale and design in relation to the parent property and therefore the development is considered to comply with the requirements of Policy DM18 of the Copeland Local Plan and the provisions of the NPPF.

# **Impact on Conservation Area and Heritage Assets**

Policy ST1, ENV4, DM27 of the Copeland Local Plan seek to protect, conserve and where possible enhance the historic, cultural and architectural character of the Borough's historic sites.

The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 establishes a need "in considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works [for the Local Planning Authority to] have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest" [Section 16(2)]. This requirement also applies to the granting of planning permission affecting a listing building or its setting [Section 66(1)].

Section 72 of the 1990 Act states that "special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of [a conservation] area."

Paragraph 194 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that "In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation..."

NPPF para. 199 states, in the case of designated heritage assets, "great weight should be given to the asset's conservation", irrespective of whether potential harm is substantial, less-than-substantial, or total loss. Where harm to a designated heritage asset is less-than-substantial, it should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal (para. 202).

Paragraph 203 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states the effect on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account when making decisions.

Referring to assets in a Conservation Area, NPPF para. 207 states that loss of an element that makes a positive contribution to a conservation area should be treated as either substantial (under para. 201) or less-than-substantial harm (under paragraph 202). In new development, opportunities should be

sought to enhance or better reveal the significance of conservation areas (NPPF para. 206).

The Council's Conservation Officer has confirmed that the proposal is considered to have less-than-substantial harm to the character and appearance on the Conservation Area, towards the negligible end of the scale, and entailing moderate harm to a non-designated asset. However, the Conservation Officer did request additional information regarding internal historic features, justification for the removal of the existing chimney, render specification, and finishes for the proposed rooflights. Based on these comments the agent has agreed to the inclusion of a condition to secure a level 2 survey prior to the commencement of works and has also confirmed the chimney cannot be retained for structural reasons which the Officer has confirmed his agreement to. Furthermore, the plans for this application have also been updated to include additional details of the proposed render and rooflights. On this basis the Officer has offered no objections to the application. It is proposed that these additional details will be secured via an appropriately worded planning condition.

Given the dilapidated vacant state of the building which is located within a prominent location within the Conservation Area, the works are justified as the proposed extension will allow the property to be extended to create a modern family home bringing the site back into use and improving the overall streetscene. On this basis, it is considered that the proposal complies with policies of the Copeland Local Plan and the NPPF.

# Parking/Highway Issues

Policy DM22 of the Copeland Local Plan requires developments to be accessible to all users and to meet adopted car parking standards, which reflect the needs of the Borough in its rural context.

The dwelling fronts onto the main road which runs through Beckermet and has no off-street parking provision within the curtilage of the dwelling. There is, however, significant unrestricted on street parking within the area. The design and access statement for this application also indicates that the dwelling will benefit from an existing garage and parking area detached from the site, currently within the applicant's ownership which will be included within the deeds of the property.

Cumbria Highways have offered no comments on this application.

The proposed extensions will create an additional bedroom at the property, increasing the number of bedrooms for two to three. Although an additional bedroom will be created as part of this development and the site does not provide onsite parking, the site is located within a central location, and therefore it is considered that the development would be in accordance with the aims and objectives of both the adopted Copeland Local Plan and the NPPF.

#### **Ecology**

Policies ST1, ENV3 and DM25 of the Copeland Local Plan and section 15 of the NPPF outline how the Council will protect and enhance the biodiversity and geodiversity within the Borough. These policies

set out the approach towards managing development proposal that are likely to have an effect on nature conservation sites, habitats and protected species.

This application is supported by a bat survey, which concludes that there is no evidence of bats roosting, however there is a possibility of opportunistic use by low number of bats at some times in the year. The level of use is not considered to be likely to be significant and mitigation is proposed, therefore significant disturbance and/or loss of roost site is unlikely to occur. An appropriately worded planning condition will therefore be attached to any decision notice to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the mitigation proposed within this survey.

It is therefore considered that the development complies with policies ST1, ENV3 and DM25 of the Copeland Local Plan and NPPF.

### Drainage and Flood Risk

Policy ST1B(ii) and paragraph 163 of the NPPF seek to focus development on sites that are at least risk of flooding and where development in flood risk is unavoidable, ensure that the risk is minimised or mitigated through appropriate design. Policy ENV1 and DM24 of the Copeland Local Plan reinforces the focus of protecting development against flood risk.

Part of the rear garden of this site is located within Flood Zone 2, however the dwelling and proposed extension is located within Flood Zone 1. Flood Zone 2 is located 15m from the rear of the proposed extensions, therefore the design and access statement for this application includes a brief flood risk assessment. The application also indicates that the foul water from this site will be dealt with by main sewer and the surface water by soakaway.

Initially, the Council's Flood and Coastal Defence Engineer requested additional information regarding the proposed soakaway to be used for surface water disposal. The applicant's agent has therefore amended the submitted plans to include the information requested. Based on this detail the Officer confirmed that the proposal is acceptable, however it should be noted that if a soakaway is not feasible the surface water will need to be discharged into the watercourse and agreed with the statutory body.

The proposal is therefore considered to comply with policies ST1, ENV3 and DM24 of the Copeland Local Plan and provision of the NPPF.

#### Planning Balance and Conclusions

The proposed alterations are of an appropriate scale and design. There will be some impacts on the neighbouring dwelling, however, given the existing layout of the two sites these are not considered to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the reinstatement of this dwelling.

Although large in scale the development is considered subservient to the main dwelling and will not have a detrimental impact on the overall streetscene. Whilst the application site provides no in

curtilage parking, provision is provided within a nearby site within the applicant's ownership and via unrestricted off street parking.

The site is located within the Beckermet Conservation Area and the development is considered to have a less-than-substantial harm on the heritage assets and is justifiable to reinstate this dilapidated vacant building.

The proposals represents an acceptable form of development which accords with the policies set out within the adopted Local Plan and the guidance in the NPPF.

#### 8. **Recommendation:**

Approve (commence within 3 years)

#### 9. **Conditions:**

## **Standard Conditions:**

1. The development hereby permitted must be commenced before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason

To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- 2. This permission relates to the following plans and documents as received on the respective dates and development must be carried out in accordance with them:-
  - Block and Site Location & Typical Sash Window Details, Scale 1:10, 1:250 & 1:1250,
     Drawing No: 22.03.04a, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 4<sup>th</sup> August 2022.
  - Existing Building Plans, Sections & Elevations, Scale 1:50 & 1:100, Drawing No: 22.03.01,
     received by the Local Planning Authority on the 4<sup>th</sup> August 2022.
  - Proposals (Amended), Scale 1:50, Drawing No: 22.03.03c, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 19<sup>th</sup> October 2022.
  - Bat Survey, Prepared by Environtech August 2022, received by the Local Planning

Authority on the 4th August 2022.

- Design and Access Statement, and Conservation Impact and Flood Risk, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 4<sup>th</sup> August 2022.

#### Reason

To conform with the requirement of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

#### Pre Commencement Conditions:

3. Prior to the carrying out of any construction work the existing historic building affected by the proposed development must be recorded in accordance with a Level 1 Survey as described by Historic England's document Understanding Historic Buildings A Guide to Good Recording Practice, 2016. Within 2 months of the commencement of construction works a digital copy of the resultant Level 1 Survey report must be furnished to the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

To ensure that a permanent record is made of the building of architectural and historical interest prior to its alteration as part of the proposed development.

## Other Conditions:

4. The development must implement all of the mitigation and compensation measures set out in the approved document 'Bat Survey, Prepared by Environtech August 2022, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 4<sup>th</sup> August 2022'. These measures must be retained at all times thereafter.

Reason

To protect the ecological interests evident on the site.

5. The development must be carried out in accordance with and implement all of the details and mitigation measures specified within the approved document 'Design and Access Statement, and Conservation Impact and Flood Risk, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 4<sup>th</sup> August 2022. Once installed these measures must be retained at all times thereafter.

Reason

For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that adequate measures are incorporated to protect the occupiers from flooding.

- 6. The proposed render to be utilised within the development hereby approved, and the replacement render for the existing dwelling must be in accordance with the following approved plans:
  - Proposals (Amended), Scale 1:50, Drawing No: 22.03.03c, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 19<sup>th</sup> October 2022.

The development must be retained in accordance with the approved detail at all times thereafter.

Reason

To safeguard the traditional appearance of the buildings in the interests of visual amenity.

- 7. The proposed rooflights to be installed within the development hereby approved must be in accordance with the following approved plans:
  - Proposals (Amended), Scale 1:50, Drawing No: 22.03.03c, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 19<sup>th</sup> October 2022.

The development must be retained in accordance with the approved detail at all times thereafter.

Reason

To safeguard the traditional appearance of the buildings in the interests of visual amenity.

#### Statement:

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received, and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Case Officer: C. Burns	Date: 20.10.2022
Authorising Officer: N.J. Hayhurst	Date: 21/10/2022
Dedicated responses to:-	