

REPORT TO THE SOUTHERN AREA COMMITTEE

Date of Meeting:	7 th March 2013		
Application Number:	S/2012/1809/Full		
Site Address:	Rose Cottage, Berwick Road, Stapleford. SP3 4LJ		
Proposal:	Partial demolition, alterations and construction of two storey extension, together with demolition and replacement of existing single garage.		
Applicant / Agent:	BTA Architects		
City/Town/Parish Council	Stapleford PC		
Electoral Division	Till and Wylve Valley	Unitary Member	Councillor Ian West
Grid Reference:	Easting: 407228.4	Northing: 137076.1	
Type of Application:	Other		
Conservation Area:	Cons Area: Stapleford	LB Grade:- NA	
Case Officer:	Mr Tom Wippell	Contact Number: 01722 434554	

Reason for the application being considered by Committee

Cllr West has asked that the application be considered at Committee due to the amount of local public interest in this application, and the strong support of the Parish Council.

1. Purpose of report

To consider the above application and the recommendation of the Area Development Manager that planning permission be **REFUSED, with reasons**.

2. Report summary

The main issues in the consideration of this application are as follows:

1. Impact on the character and appearance of the dwelling and wider Conservation Area
2. Amenities of adjoining and nearby properties

3. Site Description

Rose Cottage is a brick-fronted cottage at the gateway to the village core, just north of the A36. This location has several historic buildings within close proximity and is part of the Stapleford Conservation Area. Surrounding properties are residential in nature.

4. Relevant Planning History

Application number	Proposal	Decision
S/2012/1122	Partial demolition, alterations and construction of two storey extension, together with demolition and replacement of existing single garage.	Withdrawn

The above application was withdrawn, after the Conservation Officer raised concerns that the scheme would have overwhelmed the historic form of the original dwelling and would have had an adverse impact on the character of the wider Conservation Area. The current

scheme is virtually identical to the previous scheme S/2012/1122, except that the half-hipped gable-ends of the extensions are now full gables.

5. Proposal

The proposal seeks to increase the size of the existing cottage, by creating a two-storey extension to the rear and a first-floor extension towards the side. Materials will be brick and timber cladding, with natural slate for the roof.

An existing detached garage will also be replaced towards the southern boundary.

6. Planning Policy

Local Plan Policies G2, H16, D3, C6, CN8, CN11, Creating Places Design Guide SPG

Central government planning policy: NPPF

7. Consultations

Parish Council

No comments received

Highways

It is considered that the development proposed will not detrimentally affect highway safety and I therefore recommend that no highway objection be raised to it.

Environmental Health

No observations to make

Conservation

This is a nearly-identical resubmission of the earlier proposal. The only differences apparently being the loss of the half-hips and the omission of a flue. My principal objections regarding the scale of the proposals remain, however, so please refer to my comments on S/2012/1122 (see previous comments below*). The photomontage provided of the southeastern view shows a building that clearly suggests its disproportionately large scale, not least because of the visible ridge junction.

Conservation Officer's comments from S/2012/1122:

Rose Cottage is an attractive brick-fronted cottage at the gateway to the village core, just north of the A36. This location has several historic buildings within close proximity and is part of the Stapleford Conservation Area. Policy CN8 seeks to ensure that new development within CAs preserves or enhances the character of the area, reflecting the wording of the 1990 LB&CA Act. In order to assess the proposal, it is clearly necessary to understand something of the specific contribution of the site to the character of the CA. English Heritage provide a list of considerations in assessing whether a building or site contributes positively (CA Appraisal guidance), and it is clear that Rose Cottage meets several of these. Any proposal for its loss or significant harm would therefore be strongly resisted.

This proposal seeks to demolish the existing rear extensions, that are invisible from the public realm, and which are clearly of little architectural or other interest, and replace with a substantial linked two storey building. The existing southern single-storey extension would also have its ridge raised to the same height as the main body of the cottage. Total internal floor space would more than double from 105sqm to 214sqm – is this an entrant in a current tv series?! Our adopted design guidance Creating Places p84 sets out general criteria for extensions, not just in CAs, saying that later extensions should be clearly subordinate, with ridges lower than existing, and not swamp the original. In my view, this application fails on all of these criteria.

Rose Cottage is primarily viewed from the road, and that from the southern approach sees it set low in a rural landscape, surrounded by the steep banks of the hill and very mature and attractive trees and hedging. The proposed rear extension is a substantial increase in scale over the existing; but not only this, it takes no inspiration from the form or character of the host building, or its neighbours. The use of generic faux-agricultural forms with half-hipped roofs offers a contrast to the original building, but introduces such an extent of contrast that the original is overwhelmed. There is nothing to suggest that this building had any former agricultural function; indeed, there is nothing provided about the history and development of the site, which is not in the applicant's favour. Add to this the raising of the roof of the currently subservient extension, so that it matches the main roof, only serves to enhance the perception of enlargement and modern intervention. The changing of the main roofing material to slate would of course be welcomed.

I have no concerns about the garage replacement.

8. Publicity

The application was advertised by newspaper, site notice and neighbour consultation.

2 letters of support were received, commenting that the proposed alterations will substantially improve the appearance of the property which is very run down – the existing extensions being rather ugly, particularly as seen from the road and the field to the East. The enlargement of the current house which is small will preclude any future development involving the building of a second house on the plot.

9. Planning Considerations

9.1 Impact on the character and appearance of the dwelling and wider Conservation Area

Part 20 of the Creating Places Design Guide states that when planning an extension to a dwelling, you should:

‘Avoid large extensions which overwhelm the original dwelling. As a rule they should be subservient, and this may sometimes be best achieved by setting back the extension behind the wall of the main house with a corresponding drop in the roofline. An extension that is too large will not be in balance with the form of the existing dwelling and may destroy the original character. In all circumstances the key principle is that it will still be obvious what part of the building was original, with later extensions being clearly subordinate.’

It is considered that the proposal will overwhelm the historic form and character of the cottage and have an adverse impact on the character of the Conservation Area.

The extensions are not subservient to the main property, with the extension's height and length not respecting the scale of the original building. The footprint of the development would be disproportionate to that of the existing dwelling, and the architectural merits of the small cottage would be lost. Although the rear extensions will be partially obscured by the existing cottage/ new side extension, the development will still be highly noticeable from the wider area when travelling (down the hill), due to the inappropriate height and depth of the extensions when viewed from the side.

Overall, it is considered that an extension to Rose Cottage could be achieved in a more acceptable way that would limit the harm caused to the historic character of the property and the wider Conservation Area.

9.2 Amenities of adjoining and nearby properties

Although the two-storey rear extension is sited within close proximity to the northern boundary, the roof slopes away from the boundary to its highest point and no first-floor windows are proposed on this elevation. As such, it is considered that no harmful overshadowing, over dominance or overlooking will occur.

There will be no impact on highway safety.

No trees worthy of TPO's will be impacted by this development.

10. Conclusion

Rose Cottage is an attractive brick-fronted cottage at the gateway to the village core, and is considered to be a 'heritage asset' on its own merits. There are also several historic buildings within close proximity to the site and the property is located within the Stapleford Conservation Area.

The proposed development, by reason of its siting, scale and overall design, would represent an overdevelopment of the site, and would have an adverse impact on the historic character of the original dwelling and the character of the wider Conservation Area.

11. Recommendation

Planning Permission be REFUSED for the following reason:

Rose Cottage is a brick-fronted cottage at the gateway to the village core, and is considered to be a 'heritage asset' on its own merits. There are also several historic buildings within close proximity to the site and the property is located within the Stapleford Conservation Area.

The proposed development, by reason of its siting, scale, overall design and visibility would have an adverse impact on the historic character of the original dwelling and the character of the wider Conservation Area, contrary to policies G2, D3, H16, C6, CN8 and CN11 of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan, and the Creating Places Design Guide SPG (part 20), which are 'saved' policies of the South Wiltshire Core Strategy.

INFORMATIVE:

Refusals of planning permission

In accordance with paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), this planning application has been processed in a proactive way. However, due to the proposal's failure to comply with the development plan and/or the NPPF as a matter of

principle, the local planning authority has had no alternative other than to refuse planning permission.