

# REPORT TO THE NORTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date of Meeting	23 October 2013		
Application Number	N.13.01436 LBC		
Site Address	Stonehaven, The Green, Biddestone, Wiltshire SN14 7DG		
Proposal	Reinstatement of front boundary wall/railings and gate. Alteration to rear conservation rooflights, insertion of new rooflight and internal alterations.		
Applicant	Mr and Mrs Madley		
Town/Parish Council	Biddestone		
Electoral Division	By Brook	Unitary Member	Cllr. Jane Scott
Grid Ref	386403 173553		
Type of application	Listed building consent		
Case Officer	Sarah Gostling	01249 706 664	Sarah.gostling@wiltshire.gov.uk

## Reason for the application being considered by Committee

Councillor Scott would like the Committee to consider the impact of the proposal on the listed building.

### 1. Purpose of Report

To consider the above application and to recommend that listed building consent be REFUSED.

No comments have been received either from Biddestone Parish Council or in response to the public consultation.

### 2. Main Issues

The main issues in considering the application are:

- Impact on the character and appearance of the area and Conservation Area
- Impact upon the Listed Building

### 3. Site Description

Stonehaven is one of a row of houses lying on the north side of The Green. The property was originally two buildings, the eastern half being the older, dating from late 17thC or early 18thC. Constructed of rubble stone under a natural stone tile roof, the building was re-fenestrated in the early 19thC and faced in stucco, now removed. The front garden was formerly enclosed by a dwarf wall with wrought iron railings and gate, the gate and railings were removed, along with the others around the Green, at the time of World War I.

In 2004 a previous owner carried out a number of alterations to the property, including works on the second floor to improve the access. At that time there were two rooflights, one of medium size and one small, in the rear roof slope at this level. A large rooflight to the kitchen was replaced by two smaller ones and the high-level ones were also replaced, although not covered by the listed building consent, with two smaller, conservation rooflights. These changes represented an enhancement to the architectural and historic interest of the building.

<b>4. Relevant Planning History</b>		
<b>Application Number</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Decision</b>
<b>04/00383 LBC</b>	<b>Internal and external alterations including insertion of rooflight to rear range</b>	<b>Consent granted</b>
<b>04/01395 LBC</b>	<b>Internal alterations, amendment to 04/00383 LBC</b>	<b>Consent Granted</b>
<b>04/01474 LBDC</b>	<b>Discharge of Conditions</b>	<b>Granted</b>

## **5. Proposal**

Listed building consent is sought for the repair of the front, plinth wall and the reinstatement of the railings in this wall. The railings would be of a traditional, curved top design, let into the dressed stone coping. A matching gate would close the garden path.

At second floor level new partitions and boarded doors would be introduced to divide the open landing (currently used as a bedroom) into a shower room and fifth bedroom. One of the CR-1 rooflights installed in 2004 would be replaced by a larger unit, some 700mm wide by 750mm high, and the smaller rooflight would be re-sited, at a high level on the roof slope, to bring natural light to the shower room.

## **6. Consultations**

Biddestone Parish Council – No observations received.

## **7. Publicity**

The application was advertised by site notice and press advert.

No letters of objection or support have been received.

## **8. Planning Considerations**

The reinstatement of the railings to the front of the property would be carried out to a traditional detail in a traditional material and would represent an enhancement to both the listed building itself and to the wider setting of the conservation area.

The internal alterations proposed at the attic level would involve the insertion of partitions and a shower room, which are both considered to maintain the significance of the listed building.

The external alterations at the attic level consist of the insertion of two new roof-lights. One replaces one of the existing with a larger unit, the existing unit itself to be re-sited further up the roof slope. There would then be three roof-lights of varying size in this modest slope.

The proposal to not only revert to a larger roof-light but also to add a third, higher up the roof is considered to be a retrograde step, which will result in a further loss of historic fabric, awkward positioning for the new roof-light and an over-cluttered appearance. The proposed works will thereby cause detriment to the aesthetic and historical value of the heritage asset.

It is considered that this will cause harm to the heritage asset which is contrary to government policy enshrined in the National Planning Policy Framework, wherein paragraph 131 requires that

account is taken of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets. Paragraph 134 specifies that where harm occurs this is weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. In this case it is considered that there are no public benefits to be had from the insertion of an excessive number of roof-lights.

The applicant has referred to a number of listed properties in Biddestone which have larger and/or more numerous rooflights. Researching these it would appear that the vast majority were installed either prior to the listing of the building or without the necessary listed building consent.

Appreciation of the cumulative detrimental impact of comparatively modest changes on the character, appearance and historic interest of listed buildings has grown over the years and it is with the enhanced appreciation that the current proposals are considered.

## **9. Conclusion**

The proposal to not only revert to a larger roof-light but also to add a third, higher up the roof will result in a further loss of historic fabric, awkward positioning for the new roof-light and an over-cluttered appearance. The proposed works will cause detriment to the aesthetic and historical value of the heritage asset.

## **10. Recommendation**

Listed Building Consent be REFUSED for the following reason:

1. The reversion to a larger roof-light and the addition of a third, higher up the roof will result in a further loss of historic fabric, awkward positioning for the new roof-light and an over-cluttered appearance. The proposed works will thereby cause detriment to the aesthetic and historical value of the heritage asset contrary to the paragraphs 131, 132 and 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.