

Date of Meeting	15th June 2017
Application Number	17/02723/LBC
Site Address	Hillside House, Lockeridge, Marlborough, Wiltshire SN8 4EL
Proposal	Erection of a replacement side extension; glazed link into associated outbuilding and new attached store; and internal and external alterations to main house and outbuilding.
Applicant	Mr Mark Lawson
Town/Parish Council	FYFIELD WEST OVERTON
Ward	West Selkley ED (Cllr Jane Davies)
Grid Ref	414836 167897
Type of application	Listed Building Consent
Case Officer	Lucy Rutter

Reason for the application being considered by Committee:

This application was originally 'called-in' by former Divisional Member, Cllr Milton and is now brought to committee at the request of the current Divisional Member, Cllr Davies.

1. Purpose of Report

To consider the recommendation that the application be refused listed building consent.

2. Report Summary

The key issues for consideration are:

- a) Whether the proposal would preserve the character and setting of the listed building;
- b) Whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Lockeridge Conservation Area.

3. Site Description

As previously reported for planning application ref. 17/02061/FUL.

4. Planning History

As previously reported for planning application ref. 17/02061/FUL.

5. The Proposal

As previously reported for planning application ref. 17/02061/FUL.

6. Planning Policy

Above the various tiers of planning policy and guidance is the over-arching statutory requirement under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to give special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting (S16) and to the desirability of preserving the character and appearance of the conservation area (S72).

Relevant policies within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), namely section 12, and guidance contained within the saved Planning Policy Statement 5 Practice Guide.

The Lockeridge Conservation Area Statement provides additional guidance.

7. Consultations

Wiltshire Council Conservation Officer

Objects to the proposals as they would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the listed building.

Fyfield and West Overton Parish Council

No objection.

8. Publicity

The application has been advertised by way of a site notice and an advertisement in the local newspaper.

9. Planning Considerations

The heritage considerations are as per those set out in the report for the accompanying planning application (17/02061/FUL) but also include an assessment of the proposed internal works at the property. These are set out below:

9.3. Whether the proposal would preserve the character and setting of the listed building

The main underlying principle for assessing this application in terms of the historic environment is the duty placed on the Council under sections 16 and 66 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

The underlying acts are now supported by the National Planning Policy Framework which outlines government policy towards the historic environment. Section 12 “Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment” sets out an overall aspiration for conserving heritage assets, in particular, paragraph 132 which 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.’

The local policy context is the Wiltshire Core Strategy and specifically Core Policy 58 which seeks to ensure the conservation of the historic environment and states that designated heritage assets and their settings will be conserved. Core Policy 57 seeks to ensure high quality design in new developments.

A key consideration is whether the proposed works would preserve the significance of the designated heritage asset (listed building).

Hillside House was originally built in the late 17th/early 18th century - it is constructed of Sarsen stone with limestone dressing (i.e. mullions) and a thatched roof. It was a rectangular two storey cottage with a room either side of a main entrance. The side addition was added at the turn of the 18th/19th century with further brick extensions added to this extension in the 20th century. There is now an entrance hall, sitting room, kitchen, dining room/sitting room and WC on the ground floor, three bedrooms and a bathroom on the first floor and an additional two bedrooms in the attic space. The outbuilding includes a utility room, garage and office.

In considering the proposed internal changes to the house, the conservation officer refers to the guidance from the Historic England document Making Changes to Heritage Assets. Paragraph 45 refers to the fact that plan form is one of the most important elements to the significance of the listed building:

The plan form of a building is frequently one of its most important characteristics and internal partitions, staircases (whether decorated or plain, principal or secondary) and other features are likely to form part of its significance. Indeed they may be its most significant feature. Proposals to remove or modify internal arrangements, including the insertion of new openings or extension underground, will be subject to the same considerations of impact on significance

This is the layout of the rooms which shows how it was designed and used but also the proportions of the rooms. Taking each of the proposals for internal works in turn:

The repositioning of the door between the entrance hall and kitchen

There have clearly been some later alterations to the entrance hall and it is highly likely that the original door to the kitchen was located in the position of the proposed new door. The phasing plans submitted with the previous application suggest that this is 20th century fabric. The conservation officer considers that the relocation of the door is acceptable, as it would not involve removal of historic fabric and it is highly likely that this was the original position.

The removal of the stud partition to the south bedroom

On the first floor, the south bedroom was subdivided with a partition in the 20th century. The proposal is to remove this wall and return the room to its original proportions. The conservation officer welcomes this aspect of the proposal which will reinstate the original plan form in this part of the house.

The insertion of a partition across the existing bathroom to form two small bathrooms with the west bathroom being en-suite to the south bedroom and accessed by a new door in the south wall of the bathroom

The accompanying impact assessment does not refer to this element of the proposals in its analysis, but suggests that the wall where a new opening is proposed is covered in modern plasterboard. The proportions of the existing bathroom are not particularly significant in terms of the evidential and aesthetic value of the house and its subdivision into two bathrooms would not harm the significance of building.

The insertion of a partition to the east side of the north bedroom to form a corridor leading to a new opening in the north gable wall to give access to the proposed extension

The existing first floor north bedroom retains its original proportions and is lit by windows on both the west and east sides. The latter is a later 19th century insertion. The introduction of a new partition wall to create a corridor through to the proposed extension would have an adverse impact on the floor plan and proportions of this room. It is acknowledged that there are benefits in removing the partition in the southern bedroom but in the context of the scheme as a whole, the conservation officer considers that this element does involve some harm to the significance of the listed building.

Internal works to the outbuilding

The conservation officer considers that the reconfiguration of the partitions in the outbuilding to create a new boot room is acceptable.

The main outstanding elements are the demolition of brick structures and part of the 19th century structure of the single storey north addition, followed by its replacement with a new 1.5 storey extension and single storey link to the outbuilding.

With regard to the proposed demolition works, the conservation officer has no objection to the removal of the 20th century brick additions as these have limited architectural or historic interest. The single storey stone built addition dates from the late 18th early 19th century and is a small scale extension to the original house using matching materials. It has, however, been slightly compromised by the 20th century additions. This scheme would involve the removal of most of the stone addition except for the front Sarsen wall which is currently hidden by the brick addition. This side extension was added to provide a service area for the house with the chimney which may have been related to heating water for washing clothes etc. This function is not readily appreciated due to the internal changes and the addition of 20th century extensions. The losses of the evidence to this use i.e. the chimney and the historic fabric will have a slight negative impact on the significance of the house. The loss of the poorly designed 20th century additions such as the WC extension would be an improvement. The main consideration is the proposed replacement extension. The Historic England guidance for new additions in the historic context states:

The main issues to consider in proposals for additions to heritage assets, including new development in conservation areas, aside from NPPF requirements such as social and economic activity and sustainability, are proportion, height, massing, bulk, use of materials, durability and adaptability, use, enclosure, relationship with adjacent assets and definition of spaces and streets, alignment, active frontages, permeability and treatment of setting. Replicating a particular style may be less important, though there are circumstances when it may be appropriate. It would not normally be good practice for new work to dominate the original asset or its setting in either scale, material or as a result of its siting. Assessment of an asset's significance and its relationship to its setting will usually suggest the forms of extension that might be appropriate.

The overall architectural form of the house is typical of the local vernacular. The linear thatched cottage is very typical of the Wiltshire area and where these have been extended, it is often by means of a lower extension to the side, as is the current situation here. This is similar to other cottages and pairs of cottages in the locality. The linearity of their forms contributes positively to their character and appearance with a simple 'two up two down' plan form.



This view of the cottage from the rear shows the main house with the lower extension and then the scale of buildings dropping down to the outbuilding beyond. The rear of the cottage is set into the ground so the garden level is almost at cill level. The windows on the rear also appear to be 19th century insertions and it may have been the case that originally this facade was largely blank.

The conservation officer is of the view that the proposed addition of a 1.5 storey brick and tiled extension, which would project to the rear by approximately 4.6m, would have an adverse impact on the aesthetic value of the listed building and cause harm to its significance and setting. Whilst the applicant's agent has picked out particular elements, where the conservation officer has previously expressed concern, there is a need to evaluate the impact of the extension in terms of the combination of elements. Core Policy 57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy requires a high standard of design in new development which should reflect local distinctiveness and character of Wiltshire by *Responding positively to the existing townscape and landscape features in terms of building layouts, built form, height, mass, scale, building line, plot size, elevational design, materials streetscape and rooflines to effectively integrate the building into its setting and by being sympathetic to and conserving historic buildings and historic landscapes.*

As stated above, the cottage is typical of the local vernacular of Wiltshire which contains a large number of linear thatched cottages. The linearity of the building is part of its aesthetic value. The new extension would at the front respect the linearity, but would project substantially to the rear. The gable end would be a dominant architectural feature of the new addition and although the ridge height is similar to the existing extensions, its overall bulk and massing would be considerably increased. The long vertical windows in the new addition are larger in scale than the main house which has casement with a horizontal emphasis. Whilst it is appreciated that brick and tiles are used in the locality, the expanse of brickwork and large tiled roof seen in conjunction with the Sarsen stone of the main house would increase the prominence of the new addition. Dormers are not a feature of the locality and the addition of two to the front roof of the extension would increase the visual prominence of the roof.



Proposed North Elevation

The conservation officer considers that the glazed linking element to the outbuilding may potentially be achievable in a way that would limit its impact on the significance of the listed building. However, a pitched roof with a flat element is not a form found in the local vernacular houses. The glazed link element could be reduced in depth to remove the flat roof element and thus limit its impact on the roof of the outbuilding.

The proposed extension, due to a combination of elements, including siting, overall bulk, roof form and gable, scale of windows and materials would result in the new addition dominating the original asset, especially when viewed from the rear. The Historic England Guidance states that this is not good practice. It is stated in paragraph 4.5 of the Heritage Impact Statement that the way the existing front addition extends forward of the front elevation of the main part of the house detracts from the attractive appearance of the front elevation of the house. The conservation officer is of the view that the proposed extension which projects 4.6m beyond the rear building line would have a greater adverse visual impact on the rear facade of the building. It is acknowledged that the rear facade has slightly less significance than the front but the scale of the harmful impact of the new extension would be substantially greater.

9.4 Whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Lockeridge Conservation Area

As previously reported for planning application ref. 17/02061/FUL.

10. Conclusion

Overall, it is considered that the proposals would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the listed building. With reference to paragraph 134 of the NPPF, such harm is only acceptable if it is outweighed by public benefits, including securing the building's optimum viable use. The scheme only provides a private benefit to the occupiers of the property and the house is in a viable use. Consequently, there is no justification for allowing a scheme which would cause harm to the significance of the listed building. Recent case law has emphasised that the over-arching 'special regard' required by Section 16 of the Act should be seen as imposing a presumption against the granting of consent.

RECOMMENDATION:

That listed building consent is REFUSED for the following reason:

The demolition of the existing extension would involve some loss of historic fabric which in turn would result in some loss to the value of the listed building. The proposed extension, due to its size, siting, form and materials would have an adverse impact on the architectural value and significance of the listed building. The level of harm would be less than substantial. The subdivision of bedroom 2 would also cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the listed building, due to the impact on the plan form and proportions of the room. As there is no public benefit to outweigh this harm, the proposals would be contrary to Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.