

<b>Date of Meeting</b>	3 <sup>rd</sup> April 2014
<b>Application Number</b>	13/07058/LBC
<b>Site Address</b>	Homesteads Rivar Road Shalbourne Marlborough SN8 3QE
<b>Proposal</b>	Single storey extension
<b>Applicant</b>	Mr Phillip Newton
<b>Town/Parish Council</b>	SHALBOURNE
<b>Ward</b>	BURBAGE AND THE BEDWYNS
<b>Grid Ref</b>	431555 162562
<b>Type of application</b>	Full Planning
<b>Case Officer</b>	Ruaridh O'Donoghue

### **Background**

This is the counterpart application to 14/07057/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 preserve the character and setting of the listed building.

#### **3. Site Description**

As previously reported under 14/07057/FUL

#### **4. Planning History**

As previously reported under 14/07057/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.

The Shalbourne Conservation Area Statement provides additional guidance.

The Emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy – CP57 Ensuring High Quality Design and Place Shaping; and CP58 – Ensuring the Conservation of the Historic Environment.

## 7. Consultations

Shalbourne Parish Council - Strongly supports this application which will increase the attractiveness of the building as a family house. The listing has been irrelevant since the changes undertaken by the previous owners and approved by the former Kennet District Council. It is now difficult to discern the older “listed” part of the building. The proposed extension and replacement garage will not detract from the local scene.

Wiltshire Council Conservation Officer Reports having met with the applicants agent on site to fully assess the proposals on 5<sup>th</sup> March 2014n and being aware of the planning history for the site, where previous applications were either withdrawn or resulted in a refusal (at committee level supporting officer recommendation). It is further noted that the former conservation officer involved with applications 13/00054/FUL and 13/00067/LBC provided the following commentary:

*“The conservation considerations are the impact on the listed building and its setting and the impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area. The extension will be located on a modern addition to the historic cottage and therefore there are no issues relating to the alteration of historic fabric. However, the issues are the scale and positioning of the extension and the impact that further extension has on the special interest of the listed building. Although the extension is a continuation of the existing gabled front wing to the modern extension, this extension is significant and brings the wing out to form an L shaped plan to the house. This is at odds with the linear nature of the historic building and the modern extension attached to it. The increase in extension also diminishes the significance of the historic, thatched cottage, which is detrimental to its special interest.*”

*Whilst a small increase in scale of the existing modern garage building does not seem objectionable, that proposed is awkwardly designed (for example, with a concealed flat roof section) and I cannot be convinced that this is appropriate (particularly where the garage is in close visual context with the listed building and also where it is visible from outside the site). However, the overall change may be seen as a relatively minimal alteration to the building, where materials and general form are not significantly different from the existing situation.”*

It is appreciated that the current applications have been amended to try and overcome the previous refusal reason, but unfortunately, they are not significant enough to overcome the concerns previously raised and the scale of the proposals remains virtually unaltered.

Sometimes there are listed buildings that really are limited in the changes or extensions that they are able to withstand without impacting upon their significance as a designated heritage

asset. It is submitted that the extensions which have already been already allowed (and implemented) really are the maximum degree of extension that this building can withstand. Further extension(s) could act as a significant, further addition that would transform the building into something far removed from its humble vernacular origins. The degree and addition of further extensions is likely to have a harmful impact on the special interest of the listed building and therefore, the application should be refused.

## **8. Publicity**

The application has been advertised by way of a site notice and press advertisement. No third party representations were received

## **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 material 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 the 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.”*

The Shalbourne Conservation Area Statement reflects the above advice, stating that *“all extensions should be in scale and character with the building to which they are added and should not dominate”*.

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 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 considered important that the significance of this building is not diminished by further large extensions to the building.

It is instructive to compare the current proposed extension with the earlier one that was considered to be unacceptable. The fact is that both are very similar. The refused proposal was of exactly the same height as now proposed and the length is only 49 cm shorter than the 7.21 metres that was refused, whilst the width of the extension has actually increased to 6.5 metres from the 5.975 metres in the refused application. In short, the reasons for

refusal of the last application considered by the committee have not been addressed and the same issue still exists - the proposal is considered to be of such a scale – in terms of its 6.7m length, 6.5m width, 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.

Furthermore, the proposed extension would 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, officers duly assert that 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. However it is important to stress that the latter 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. 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, officers duly submit that the harm cannot be justified in policy terms.

## **10. Conclusion**

The scale of the proposed 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. The proposal is little different from that refused by the committee last year and has signally failed to address the reasons for refusal. No appeal against the original refusal has been submitted. 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 is **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.