



# Consultation Statement on the Updated Supplementary Planning Document for Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties

**March 2026**



A High Quality Environment

# Contents

---

1.0	Introduction .....	3
2.0	Consultation Process .....	4
3.0	Summary of Responses .....	4
4.0	Conclusion .....	14

<b>Responsible Service</b>	Forward Planning	<b>Version/Status</b>	Version 2
<b>Responsible Author</b>	Forward Planning	<b>Date Agreed/ Agreed At</b>	
<b>Date last Amended</b>	23/03/2026	<b>Due for Review</b>	N/A

Rossendale Borough Council is committed to encouraging equality, diversity and inclusion to eliminate unlawful discrimination. To support this other format of this document are available upon request. Please contact [PeopleandPolicy@rossendalebc.gov.uk](mailto:PeopleandPolicy@rossendalebc.gov.uk).

# Consultation Statement on the Proposed Updated SPD for Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties

---

## 1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Rossendale Borough Council formally adopted the Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on 18<sup>th</sup> June 2008 under Regulations 16 and 19 of the Town & Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.
- 1.2 Since then, there have been a number of changes which relate to policies and guidance on design. These include changes to the General Permitted Development Order (GPDO) 2015 (as amended), the introduction of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in 2012 and subsequent reviews, updates to national Planning Practice Guidance (PPG), and the publication of the National Design Guide in 2019. The Government is consulting on a further review of the NPPF and on the Design and Placemaking Planning Practice Guidance until the end of March 2026. At a local level Rossendale Borough Council formally adopted its Local Plan 2019 to 2036 on 15<sup>th</sup> December 2021.
- 1.4 SPDs are prepared to add detail to the policies contained in the adopted Local Plan. Rossendale Local Plan Policy ENV1 promotes High Quality Design in the Borough and Policy HS9 House Extensions provides guidance on changes to residential properties. The Council has also adopted a Climate Change SPD.
- 1.5 Officers in the Council's Development Control Team advised on proposed updates and changes to the adopted SPD and attended a working meeting with the Forward Planning Team on 21<sup>st</sup> January 2026. This advice took into account issues which have arisen in recent planning applications and appeals.
- 1.6 The key changes in the updated SPD are:
- Updates to the introductory and supporting text to refer to the relevant policies in the adopted Rossendale Local Plan (2019 to 2036), other local planning policy documents and guidance, and national planning policy. Also included is advice on the need for planning permission and the role of Lawful Development Certificates to confirm if consent is required.
  - Updates to the general guidance to refer to situations where high quality contemporary design may be acceptable, details about the colour of render, use of appropriate materials, lighting, re-provision of natural features where they may be unavoidably lost, accessibility, and ensuring bin storage does not detract from the street scene.
  - Various amendments and updates to the detailed guidance including advice on separation distances, appropriate roof styles, conservatories, and scale and proportion.
  - Further detailed guidance for ancillary family annexes and new guidance for garage conversions.
  - The guidance for garages and parking advises that hard, impermeable surfaces should be avoided and planting/landscaping schemes used to reduce flood risk.
  - There is new guidance for storage of refuse bins and recycling containers.

- The sections on 'Other Considerations' and 'Contact Details' have been updated.

1.7 The proposal for updating the SPD was discussed at the [Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting of 9<sup>th</sup> February 2026](#) . The committee agreed to approve the draft proposal for a 4-week public consultation.

## 2.0 Consultation Process

2.1 The procedure to adopt an SPD is set out in the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended). This requires a minimum 4-week public consultation.

2.2 The public consultation started on Thursday 12<sup>th</sup> February 2026 and closed at Midnight on Sunday 15<sup>th</sup> March 2026. Emails or letters were sent to consultees held in the Council's Local Plan consultation database (including statutory consultees) and to agents who responded to the recent consultation on the Council's validation checklist.

2.3 The Draft SPD and an online survey form (SmartSurvey) were published on the supplementary planning documents page of the Borough Council's website. Paper copies were available at the Customer Service Hub at The Business Centre (during normal opening hours). Responses were invited using the online survey form, or by emailing [forwardplanning@rossendalebc.gov.uk](mailto:forwardplanning@rossendalebc.gov.uk) or by writing to Rossendale Borough Council, Forward Planning, The Business Centre, Futures Park, Bacup, Lancashire OL13 0BB.

2.4 The online proforma contained specific questions related to the criteria of the policy, inviting respondents to agree, disagree, state if they were unsure and to record any specific comments. Comments and responses were also invited in writing and by email.

## 3.0 Summary of Responses

3.1 During the public consultation, a total of 17 responses were submitted, 8 from statutory consultees (all submitted by email except for Whitworth Town Council which used the online SmartSurvey response form), 1 from Growth Lancashire and 8 from individual residents including a community campaigner/consultant (all using SmartSurvey). The responses are available to view on the Council's website at <https://www.rossendale.gov.uk/local-plan/supplementary-planning-documents-spds-guidance> .

3.2 The responses from the statutory consultees are summarised as follows:

- Natural England do not wish to comment.
- Active Travel England (ATE) are not a statutory consultee for plan making.
- Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) advise that it is not necessary to consult with them on planning documents other than those with direct aviation involvement.
- Coal Authority records indicate that there are recorded coal mining features present at surface and shallow depth in Rossendale which may pose a threat to surface stability and public safety but have no specific comments to make on this SPD.
- Historic England welcomes reference to exclusions of the document content for heritage assets.
- National Highways have no comments to make as this SPD would have no detrimental effect to the Strategic Road Network.

- United Utilities advised that 1) it is important that designs ensure no adverse impact on the ability to access and maintain existing underground utility services; and 2) they should incorporate sustainable drainage principles by storing and re-using water and directing water to permeable surfaces wherever possible.
- Whitworth Town Council agreed with all the guidance and commented that in relation to 3.3 Front Extensions/Porches and Canopies Part A (which sets out that proposals which project excessively from the original front wall will not be permitted) the term 'excessively' should be clarified as it is ambiguous. The Town Council also requested that when applications are referred to Development Control Committee, responses from statutory consultees are included in the officers' report. (Note the response was submitted using the SmartSurvey online form and therefore it is also included in the headline results in paragraph 3.4 below.)

3.3 Growth Lancashire provided additional detailed text to be added to Part 4.0 Other Considerations, paragraphs 4.6 Conservation Areas / Listed Buildings and 4.7 Non Designated Heritage Assets.

3.4 Headline results from the online questionnaire include the following (note - results may not add up to 100% due to rounding):

- 8 respondents (89%) agreed with General Guidance for All Domestic Extensions and one was unsure (11%). There was a suggestion to use a submitted document 'Traditional Architecture Design Codes' for all new construction with a ban on demolition of all buildings constructed prior to 1950 and to refer to additional Placemaking/Planning and Greenery Proposals (see Appendix 1). This comment was duplicated in response to every question. Other comments referred to the need to maintain sightlines, to protect wildlife habitats and connectivity and to maintain heights of trees and hedges.
- 8 respondents (89%) agreed with the guidance for Separation Distances and one (11%) disagreed. There was a comment that the distances are problematic on modern developments.
- 7 respondents (78%) agreed with the guidance for Single-Storey Side Extensions, one (11%) disagreed and one (11%) was unsure. There was a concern that this would prevent most extensions.
- 8 respondents (89%) agreed with the guidance for Single-Storey Rear Extensions and one (11%) disagreed.
- 7 respondents (78%) agreed with the guidance for Front Extensions/Porches and Canopies, one (11%) disagreed and one (11%) was unsure. There were comments that only properties with large front gardens would be allowed an extension and there is a need to clarify "excessively" as it is ambiguous.
- 9 respondents (100%) agreed with the guidance for Conservatories.
- 7 respondents (78%) agreed with the guidance for Two-Storey/First Floor Side Extensions, one (11%) disagreed and one (11%) was unsure.
- 8 respondents (89%) agreed with the guidance for Two-Storey Rear Extensions and one (11%) disagreed. There was a comment that if a side window was in place prior to an extension, it should be permitted on a new extension.

- 6 respondents (67%) supported the guidance for Dormer/Roof Extensions, 2 (22%) disagreed and one (11%) was unsure.
- 7 respondents (78%) agreed with the guidance for Outbuildings (e.g. summer houses, sheds, green houses and garden rooms) and 2 (22%) disagreed. There were several comments including that this is 'big brother legislation', and consideration should be given to proposals in front gardens which do not face a highway and the loss of trees and other vegetation.
- 5 respondents (56% - the lowest level of support) agreed with the guidance for Ancillary Family Annexes, one (11%) disagreed and 3 (33%) were unsure. There were comments that a second bedroom may be needed for a carer to provide overnight support.
- 7 respondents (78%) agreed with the guidance for Garages/Car ports/Parking Spaces and Garage Conversions, one disagreed (11%) and one (11%) was unsure. There were comments suggesting that similar replacement garages should be allowed, off street parking would be impacted and today's cars are often larger.
- 8 respondents (89%) agreed with the guidance for Garden Space and Forecourts and one (11%) disagreed. There were comments about the need for more forecourt parking to accommodate EV charging and that trees can obscure sight lines.
- 7 respondents (78%) agreed with the guidance for Balconies and 2 (22%) disagreed with a comment stating that the Council is overstepping its duties.
- 7 respondents (78%) agreed with the guidance for Storage of Refuse Bins and Recycling Containers, one (11%) disagreed and one (11%) was unsure. There were comments that the guidance is impractical and impossible in terraced housing.
- 6 respondents (67%) agreed with the guidance for Renewable Energy Technologies, one (11%) disagreed and 2 (22%) were unsure. There was a comment that these technologies are essential to build future energy security.
- Other comments included that the guidance is too restrictive and favours the wealthy over ordinary residents and that officers' reports to Development Control Committee should include responses from statutory consultees.

3.5 A summary of the comments received from consultees is outlined in the table below in the first column. The second column sets out the Local Planning Authority's response and any actions undertaken.

Key comments received during the public consultation	Actions the Local Planning Authority is considering
<b>Comments received on the general guidance for all domestic extensions</b>	
<p>Utilise Traditional Architecture Design Codes for all new construction with a ban on demolition of all buildings constructed prior to 1950. See PDF Umbrella Representation for additional Placemaking/ Planning and Greenery Proposals.</p> <p>See also submitted document 'UK &amp; IRELAND PLANNING CONSULTATION(S) Stage: Universal Representation</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The SPD does not address demolition but a complete blanket ban on demolition of all pre-1950 buildings in the Borough would be neither lawful nor appropriate. The submitted Universal Representation report has a strong focus on design and decision making for proposals affecting designated and non designated heritage assets. The Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties SPD does not consider built heritage in detail and refers applicants to other guidance and documents where this is</p>

<p>Sections: Conservation Area Appraisal(s), Scoping Document(s), Local Plan, Supplementary Planning Document(s).'</p> <p>This comment was duplicated for all questions on the proforma but it is not repeated in this table as the principal elements relating to extensions apply to the general guidance.</p>	<p>the case. The Universal Representation also contains guidance for Traditional Vernacular Architecture (TVA). The following clauses in the Universal Representation report refer to extensions:</p> <p><b>'SECTION 5: Historic Buildings:-</b> 11. Modern "Carbuncle" extensions should not be permitted at any one area - instead an authentic style addition may be used to retain blending.'</p> <p><b>'SECTION 6: Traditional Vernacular Architecture:-</b> 6. Extensions - there must be a proactive emphasis on in-keeping structural fabric to prevent future errors, such as the Municipal Building depicted in the SPD being replicated again thereby harming the Conservation value.'</p> <p>The General Guidance in the SPD supports designs which complement the original building including the use of natural materials such as stone and slate where this is characteristic. In accordance with national policy and guidance high quality contemporary designs may also be acceptable where they are sympathetic to the original building and respond to local context.</p> <p>No change.</p>
<p>Maintain sight lines unlike on Eden Avenue.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Refer to part L: 'The extension is accessible and does not interfere with the visibility of pedestrians, cyclists and drivers of vehicles.'</p> <p>Adequate sight lines are a consideration in the determination of planning applications.</p> <p>No change.</p>
<p>Amend M or insert new criterion:</p> <p>"The scheme does not result in the loss, degradation or fragmentation of habitats or ecological connectivity (including wildlife corridors and movement routes), and safeguards ecosystem service functions (surface water management/infiltration, flood attenuation, water quality, carbon storage, and pollination). Where impacts are unavoidable, proposals must apply the mitigation hierarchy and provide like-for-like or better habitat re-provision and compensation that replaces ecological function, secured through establishment and management."</p> <p>Consultee suggested that recent developments in Bacup have caused irreparable damage to local wildlife and habitats with no mitigation or re-provision plans to protect wildlife corridors.</p>	<p>Partially accepted.</p> <p>The response recommends adding detailed requirements to protect and enhance wildlife and habitats.</p> <p>Proposals for household alterations and extensions will largely fall within gardens and curtilages of properties but they will be expected to address specific requirements set out in natural environment policies in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Add further supporting text referring to the following Local Plan policies: <u>'Policy ENV4: Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Ecological Networks, Policy ENV5: Green Infrastructure Networks and Policy ENV10: Trees and Hedgerows.</u></p> <p>Add further text to paragraph 4.4 Natural Landscape: <u>'Lancashire Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) 2026 (see <a href="https://www.lancashire.gov.uk/council/strategies-policies-plans/environmental/local-nature-recovery-strategy/">https://www.lancashire.gov.uk/council/strategies-policies-plans/environmental/local-nature-recovery-strategy/</a>) contains useful information about opportunities for nature recovery in Urban Habitats (including Infrastructure Networks). Species such as swifts, bats, swallows, hedgehogs and toads benefit from measures such as creating and improving connections between pollinator and</u></p>

	<u>insect-rich habitats, retaining and planting hedgerows and trees, using green roofs, protecting or providing wetland features in gardens and incorporating swift bricks.'</u>
Planted or existing trees/ hedges should be maintained to legal height limit and not encroach on neighbouring properties denying them light and adding inconvenience of falling leaves/debris on footpaths making them unsafe and slippery especially during wet weather.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The SPD and Local Plan policies generally protect trees and hedgerows or require re-provision where a loss is proposed as they make an important contribution to landscape character and support biodiversity.</p> <p>Proposals for extensions should avoid undue loss of light (see SPD Parts 2.1 Separation Distances and 3.13 Balconies for example) but disputes about maintenance of overgrown trees/hedges between neighbours are a private matter and not something the Council would normally get involved with.</p> <p>No change.</p>
<b>Comments received on the guidance for separation distances</b>	
These distances are problematic on modern developments where original houses do not have these distances.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The separation distances are intended to protect the privacy and amenity of neighbouring occupiers. Where these distances are not achievable (for instance where a garden is too small) an extension could have an unacceptable and overbearing impact and should be avoided.</p> <p>No change.</p>
<b>Comments received on the guidance for single storey side extensions</b>	
This will prevent most extensions.	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The guidance will be used to inform proposals to help ensure single storey side extensions are well designed and respect the street scene.</p> <p>No change.</p>
<b>Comments received on single storey rear extensions</b>	
None	N/A
<b>Comments received on guidance for front extensions/porches and canopies</b>	
Proposals ensure that only properties with large front gardens will be allowed an extension.	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The guidance will be used to inform proposals to help ensure front extensions, porches and canopies are well designed and respect the street scene.</p> <p>No change.</p>
Need to clarify "excessively" as is an ambiguous term.	Not accepted.

	Proposals will be considered on their own merits and decision makers will take a view on whether they would project excessively from the front wall taking into account such matters as street scene and depth of the front garden.  No change.
<b>Comments received on guidance for conservatories</b>	
None	N/A
<b>Comments received on guidance for two storey/first floor side extensions</b>	
None	N/A
<b>Comments received on guidance for two storey rear extensions</b>	
If a side window is in place prior to an extension, they should be permitted on new extension.	Not accepted.  A pre-existing side window on a house would be in a different location from one on a proposed rear extension. A side window on a large rear extension could lead to overlooking and have an unacceptable impact on the privacy of neighbouring occupiers. The guidance sets out the circumstances where a side window may be acceptable.  No change.
<b>Comments received on guidance for extensions to three storey dwellings or above and apartments</b>	
None	N/A
<b>Comments received on guidance for dormer/roof extensions</b>	
None	N/A
<b>Comments received on guidance for outbuildings</b>	
'Big brother legislation.'	Not accepted.  The SPD updates previous detailed guidance in an SPD which was adopted by the Council. It contains helpful advice to applicants by setting out various criteria which will be used to determine planning applications.  No change.
Garden of respondent's house is on front of property and does not face a street or road. No reason not to have a shed or greenhouse. Modify wording to refer to impact on street scene.	Partially accepted.  Many sheds or greenhouses will fall within Permitted Development rights and would not require planning consent. Where planning permission is required the minimum distance of 2m to the boundary is intended to ensure impacts on street scene are considered and to protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.  Amend part A: A. Outbuildings will not normally be allowed to the front of domestic properties (or the side on corner plots) where they would be within 2m of the boundary. <u>'In cases where a front garden does not adjoin or overlook a public highway, a distance of less than 2m to the front boundary may be acceptable provided that the character and appearance of the streetscene is safeguarded and the amenity of neighbouring occupiers is protected.'</u>
Add: 'A very large outbuilding to the rear of a property, in spite of a large garden to the	Accepted.  Amend part B:

<p>rear of the said property, should also consider effects on neighbouring properties, when there is a consequent loss of trees and other vegetation not only effecting the property in question but also the bordering properties.'</p>	<p>B. They will be considered against the general principles included in this SPD including amenity concerns, <del>and</del> visual dominance <u>'and proposed loss of or damage to mature trees and hedges.'</u></p>
<p><b>Comments received on guidance for ancillary family annexes</b></p>	
<p>Annexe might have to accommodate a carer so two bedrooms would be needed.</p> <p>One-bedroom restriction would not support a vulnerable family member having staff who may need a bedroom. Consideration of need required if this would help the person remain with the wider family.</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>Amend part D: D. It will have only one bedroom <u>'except in cases where suitable evidence is provided that an additional bedroom is absolutely necessary to provide overnight accommodation for a visiting carer or support worker.'</u></p>
<p><b>Comments received on guidance for garages/car ports/parking spaces and garage conversions</b></p>	
<p>Where front garden is large enough and garage of similar materials as main property it should be allowed particularly if it matches the original design of house where the original garage was in front garden.</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>Amend part D: D. Garages should not be sited in the front garden <u>'unless the proposal is to replace an existing or former garage with a new garage on the same footprint and with similar dimensions and materials.'</u> and there should not be an unacceptable loss of garden area, boundary walls, hedges or trees.'</p>
<p>Point F. The lack of off-street parking would be inevitable.</p>	<p>Not necessarily. Many garages are used for storage rather than parking cars. Local Plan Appendix 1: Parking Standards advises that garages will not be counted towards parking provision unless suitable evidence is provided.</p> <p>No change.</p>
<p>Minimum size of garage needs review as lots of cars larger these days.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The minimum size of garages set out in Part C was reviewed when the Draft SPD was updated and the proposed dimensions are appropriate and reflect modern standards.</p> <p>No change.</p>
<p><b>Comments received on guidance for garden space and forecourts</b></p>	
<p>More people will require forecourt parking with increase in electric cars. Focus should be on appropriate drainage.</p> <p>Incorporate sustainable drainage principles by storing and re-using water and directing water to permeable surfaces wherever possible.</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>Amend part A: A. Proposals for new forecourts / front parking areas should aim to minimise areas of hard surfacing by <u>'incorporating permeable surfaces, and'</u> maintaining existing planting or including new planting where possible.</p>
<p>Issue with trees on corner plots obscuring view.</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>Part B sets out that 'Proposals for new or replacement fences, walls or other means of enclosure should minimise their impact on residential amenity, highway safety and respect the visual character of the surrounding area.' It does not refer to existing trees which may cause a visual obstruction.</p>

	<p>Part L of the general guidance addresses visibility but refers to 'extensions'. This could be amended to 'proposals' so that forecourts are also included in the assessment and a reference to the proposal being 'safe' should be added.</p> <p>Amend General Guidance Part L: 'L. The <del>extension</del> <u>proposal</u> is accessible, <u>safe</u> and does not interfere with the visibility of pedestrians, cyclists and drivers of vehicles.'</p>
<b>Comments received on guidance for balconies</b>	
The council is overstepping duties.	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The SPD updates existing adopted guidance and Councils have powers to prepare new SPDs up to the end of June 2026 if they so wish. The SPD will no longer apply when the new Rossendale Local Plan is adopted but the guidance may be used to inform future design guidance and codes for the Rossendale area.</p> <p>No change.</p>
<b>Comments received on guidance for storage of refuse bins and recycling containers</b>	
Impractical.	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>No change.</p>
Point C is often impossible in terraced housing due to lack of access to rear of properties.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The guidance is for new development proposals rather than existing housing. Proposals for new terraced houses will have to consider suitable external storage facilities for recycling and waste.</p> <p>No change.</p>
<b>Comments received on guidance for renewable energy technologies</b>	
These technologies are essential to build future energy security.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>No change.</p>
<b>Other general comments</b>	
These plans are too restrictive and favour the wealthy over ordinary residents	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The guidance will apply equally to all proposals for alterations and extensions where planning permission is required, irrespective of the personal circumstances of applicants.</p> <p>No change.</p>
When applications are referred to Development Control Committee, responses from statutory consultees should be included in officers' reports.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Officers' reports to Committee include a summary of consultation and publicity responses.</p> <p>No change.</p>

<p>It is important that designs ensure no adverse impact on the ability to access and maintain existing underground utility services.</p>	<p>Accepted. A further point could be added to Part 4.0 Other Considerations:  <u><b>4.12 Utility Services:</b> The curtilages of residential properties can include water and wastewater assets. Building over water assets is not acceptable and building over sewers may not be acceptable without prior agreement. Applicants should check the services maps for water and wastewater assets to confirm whether there are assets within the curtilage of their property. If there are assets, they should engage with the relevant utility provider before commencing any design works as their proposals may not be deliverable.'</u></p>
<p>Incorporate sustainable drainage principles by storing and re-using water and directing water to permeable surfaces wherever possible.</p>	<p>Accepted.  Sustainable drainage is addressed in adopted Local Plan Policies including Strategic Policy ENV1: High Quality Development in the Borough and Policy ENV9: Surface Water Run-Off, Flood Risk, Sustainable Drainage and Water Quality.</p> <p>SPD paragraph 3.12 Garden Space and Forecourts and Part 4.0 Other Considerations (paragraph 4.10) refers to National Guidance on the permeable surfacing of front gardens. Further information could be added to encourage sustainable drainage more generally.</p> <p>Add further text to paragraph <b>4.10 Environmental Efficiency:</b>  <u>'Proposals should incorporate sustainable drainage principles by storing and re-using water and directing water to permeable surfaces wherever possible. The connection of surface water to the public sewer from residential extensions and paving over front gardens do, overtime, have material impacts on flood risk from the public sewer and increase the likelihood of storm overflow activations. Simple design approaches which catch water in rainwater butts, rain gardens and direct water to permeable surfaces are therefore a key requirement to consider in the design process for residential extensions. In this context, where permitted development rights are used to pave over a front garden, the hard surface should be made of porous materials, or provision is made to direct run-off water from the hard surface to a permeable or porous area or surface within the curtilage of the dwellinghouse.'</u></p>
<p>Add additional text setting out detailed advice to Part 4.0 Other Considerations, paragraphs 4.6 Conservation Areas / Listed Buildings and 4.7 Non Designated Heritage Assets.</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>The additional advice provides a useful summary of key issues which would be considered in proposals which affect designated and non designated heritage assets.</p> <p><b>4.6 Conservation Areas / Listed Buildings</b>  [Existing text]  <u>'Rossendale's Conservation Areas are characterized by strong townscape structures, including their distinctive Pennine valley setting, tight urban grain, prominent rooflines, stone-built elevations, and the historic industrial and commercial buildings that define settlement patterns.</u></p>

Proposals should therefore respect these locally distinctive features, particularly the relationship between buildings and the valley topography, the prominence of gables and chimneys in long-distance views, and the continuity of traditional materials such as natural stone. Alterations that erode these characteristics, disrupt important roof silhouettes, or weaken the established urban form identified in the relevant Conservation Area Appraisal will not normally be supported.

Proposals affecting properties within Conservation Areas or Listed Buildings should be based on a clear understanding of the building's heritage significance, including its plan form, architectural character, historic fabric and wider setting. Applications must demonstrate how this significance is preserved or enhanced and how incremental harm has been avoided.

Extensions in Conservation Areas should be modest, sensitively sited, and designed so that the established street character, roofscape and building line remain visually dominant. Subservience is normally achieved through reduced height, set-backs and careful massing. Extensions that disrupt a coherent frontage, alter important spatial relationships or intrude on significant views will not usually be supported.

Roofscape can contribute strongly to the character of Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings. Dormers, where acceptable, should be discreet, positioned within the roof slope and kept below the ridge to remain recessive. Oversized or box-type dormers, flat-roofed forms or other additions that break an intact historic roofline or introduce intrusive massing will not normally be supported.

Extensions to Listed Buildings must remain clearly secondary in scale and form, be located away from principal elevations, and use materials and detailing appropriate to the host building. Proposals must avoid harm to the building's setting, including curtilage structures and landscape features that contribute to its significance. Where a building or area has experienced several earlier alterations, proposals will also be assessed for their cumulative impact. Even small changes may be unacceptable where, taken together, they would erode the special character of a Listed Building.

Note that listing status applies to the whole building, internally and externally, and may include structures within its grounds. In addition to any planning permission required, Listed Building Consent is necessary for all works that affect a listed building, and carrying out such works without consent is a criminal offence.'

#### **4.7 Non Designated Heritage Assets**

[Existing text]

	<p><u>'Where proposals affect a Non-Designated Heritage Asset (NDHA), applicants should provide a proportionate explanation of the asset's local significance, such as its architectural qualities, historic associations, townscape contribution or community value. In line with the National Planning Policy Framework, any decision will be guided by a balanced judgement, taking account of both the scale of any harm and the importance of the asset. Although NDHAs are not statutorily protected, their role in shaping local character means they will be a material consideration.</u></p> <p><u>Alterations and extensions should respond positively to the features that contribute most to the asset's value. This may include the overall form, massing, roof profile, detailing, or the way the building relates to its surroundings. Proposals should aim to retain these features where possible, while allowing for modern additions that are respectful and clearly secondary to the original.</u></p> <p><u>Extensions should remain subordinate and avoid diminishing the NDHA's contribution to the street scene. Where a building forms part of a historic group, proposals should respect that shared character. If past incremental changes have already weakened the reasons for its local listing, further alterations may be resisted because of their cumulative impact.</u></p> <p><u>Roof changes require care where the roofscape is an important part of the asset's identity or contributes to a wider group. Dormers or roof additions should be modest, sit within the roof slope, and avoid dominating the original roof form. Additions that interrupt a coherent group roofline or introduce visually intrusive massing will not normally be supported.'</u></p>
--	---

## 4.0 Conclusion

- 4.1 The Draft Supplementary Planning Document for Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties was published for 4 weeks public consultation from 12<sup>th</sup> February 2026 until 15<sup>th</sup> March 2026. The intention is to update the adopted SPD so that it remains relevant for the purposes of determining planning applications until the new Rossendale Local Plan is adopted.
- 4.2 In total 17 representations were submitted from statutory consultees, individuals and a community campaigner, through an online consultation form (SmartSurvey) and by email.
- 4.3 The representations have been considered by the Forward Planning and Development Control Teams and a number of amendments are proposed to the guidance set out in the SPD in response to comments submitted.