

REPORT TO THE EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

Report No. 3

Date of Meeting	20 th June 2013
Application Number	13/00067/LBC
Site Address	Homesteads, Rivar Road, Shalbourne, Marlborough, SN8 3QE
Proposal	Single storey extension
Applicants	Mr Philip Newton
Town/Parish Council	SHALBOURNE
Grid Ref	431554 162559
Type of application	Listed Building Consent
Case Officer	Ruaridh O'Donoghue

Background

This is the counterpart application to 13/00054/FUL which appears earlier on this agenda. The application seeks listed building consent for a single storey extension.

Reason for the application being considered by Committee:

This application is brought to committee at the request of Divisional Member, Cllr Wheeler.

1. Purpose of Report

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

2. Report Summary

It is considered that the key issues for consideration are:

- Whether the proposed extension would either preserve the character and setting of the listed building.

3. Site Description

As previously reported under 13/00054/FUL

4. Planning History

As previously reported under 13/00054/FUL

5. The Proposal

The application proposes the erection of a single storey extension. Plans of the development are included in the earlier report on the planning application.

6. Planning Policy

The duty placed on the Council under The Listed Buildings Act 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.

Relevant policies within Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework and guidance contained within the saved Planning Policy Statement 5 Practice Guide.

7. Consultations

Wiltshire Council Conservation Officer – objects to proposed extension (comments reproduced in the report for 13/00054/FUL).

Shalbourne Parish Council

The Shalbourne Parish Council has no objections to these proposals, but, as this is a listed building, we would ask that, as far as is possible, suitable material is used for the work, to blend in with the existing property.

8. Publicity

One letter of support has been received from the owner/occupiers of Shalbourne Cottage.

9. Planning Considerations

The listed building considerations are identical to those set out in the report for the accompanying planning application. The assessment is reproduced below:

The local planning authority has a duty placed upon it to protect the character and setting of the listed building and any features of architectural or historical interest that it may possess.

In this case, the extension will be attached to the modern addition to the historic cottage and therefore there is no issue with the proposal impacting upon any historic fabric. As such, the only consideration is the impact upon the character and setting of Homesteads and in particular the scale of the extension, its positioning on the building and cumulative impact with previous extensions.

Paragraph 178 of PPS5: Planning for the Historic Environment Practice Guide states that the main considerations for additions and alterations to heritage assets are:

“...proportion, height, massing, bulk, use of materials, use, relationship with adjacent assets, alignment 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 acceptable 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.”

It is clear from the above that scale is a particularly important aspect to consider and that any new proposal to extend a listed building should not as a result of its size dominate the original asset or its setting. Paragraph 120 of the same guidance goes on to state that: *“when assessing any application for development within the setting of a heritage asset, local planning authorities may need to consider the implications of cumulative change...”*. In this case, the special interest of the building lies within the original, historic thatched cottage and therefore it is important that the significance of this building is not diminished by further extensions to the building. The current proposal is considered to be of such a scale – in

terms of its 7.2m length, 5.6m height and 1½ storey massing - that it would dominate the original building to the detriment of its character and setting. The cumulative impact with previous extensions is particularly harmful. This goes directly against government guidance.

Further to the above issue, the proposed extension will deviate from the established plan form of the original dwellinghouse. Government guidance contained within the PPS5 Practical Guide states in Paragraph 182 that: *“the plan form of a building is frequently one of its most important characteristics”*. The deviation from this would harm the special interest of the listed building by confusing and obscuring its historic plan form and creating an addition that would be at odds with the original dwelling. Indeed, it is one of the few surviving properties in Shalbourne that has maintained its linear form with a gable end that fronts onto the road.

The NPPF makes a distinction between proposals which cause ‘substantial harm’ to a designated heritage asset and those which lead to ‘less than substantial harm’. The former category is reserved for situations such as the complete demolition of a listed building whereas the latter is more applicable in cases such as this. It does not automatically mean that less than substantial harm is more acceptable, it simply means that a different test is applied. Paragraph 134 of the NPPF states that *“Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use”*.

The current proposal would not give rise to any public benefits. For example, the extension is not required to secure the long term viability of the building as it already functions as a dwelling and has a perfectly workable internal layout. Accordingly, the harm cannot be justified in policy terms.

10. Conclusion

The scale of the extension in relation to the original dwelling and the deviation away from the established plan form would harm the character and setting of the listed building and diminish its significance as a designated heritage asset. As such, the proposal is contrary to government policy contained within Section 12 of the NPPF and guidance contained in the PPS5 Practice Guide.

RECOMMENDATION

That listed building consent be REFUSED for the following reason:

The scale of the extension in relation to the original dwelling and the deviation away from the established plan form would harm the character and setting of the listed building and diminish its significance as a designated heritage asset. As such, the proposal is contrary to government policy contained within Section 12 of the NPPF and guidance contained in the PPS5 Practice Guide.