

**REPORT OUTLINE FOR AREA PLANNING COMMITTEES****Report No.**

<b>Date of Meeting</b>	23 May 2017
<b>Application Number</b>	17/00420/LBC
<b>Site Address</b>	8 The Forty  Cricklade  Wiltshire  SN6 6HR
<b>Proposal</b>	Removal of existing timber single storey porch to rear of property and the construction of new single storey extension.
<b>Applicant</b>	Mr & Mrs Lally
<b>Town/Parish Council</b>	CRICKLADE
<b>Electoral Division</b>	CRICKLADE AND LATTON – Cllr Bob Jones
<b>Grid Ref</b>	409925 193169
<b>Type of application</b>	Full Planning
<b>Case Officer</b>	Richard Sewell

**Reason for the application being considered by Committee**

Applications called in by Councillor Bob Jones for the due consideration and support of the proposed development and works to the listed building.

**1. Purpose of Report**

To consider the above applications and to recommend REFUSAL.

**2. Report Summary**

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

- Impact on the historic character, appearance, setting and fabric of the Listed Building

Cricklade Town Council supports the application

**3. Site Description**

The submitted Planning and Heritage Statement describes the proposal site as a Grade II Listed property located on the western side of the B4553 towards the southern edge of the existing built-up area of Cricklade but which lies outside of the Conservation Area. The building is set back slightly from the pavement edge behind a low Cotswold stone boundary wall and front garden area. A gravelled driveway/parking area lies immediately to the south of the building which is separated from the private rear garden by both fencing and associated boundary vegetation. The building is physically attached to the neighbouring Grade II Listed residential property although the adjoined dwelling is subordinate in scale, with both lower ridge and smaller overall proportions.

The text of the statutory list description describes the property as “ *House, dated 1837. Limestone rubble to front. Dressed quoins and quoins to opening. Stone slate roof. Two*

*storeys, 2 bays. Central boarded door. Two –light false leaded casements to first floor, 3 – light to ground floor. Gable lit attic. Datestone under eaves”.*

The front of the property remains broadly typical of the period, with the coursed limestone rubble that first featured within the village during the C17th being retained. The rear of the dwelling has seen the addition of a single storey porch extension and the application of white painted cementitious render. A number of windows on the front and rear elevations have been replaced with white UPVC.

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

16/07182/FUL+ 16/07712/LBC- Remove existing single storey rear porch, construction of two storey gable to rear and construction of flat roof extension to rear and internal alterations REFUSED.

The applications listed above were refused at the Northern Area Planning Committee Meeting on the 7<sup>th</sup> December 2016

#### **5. The Proposal**

The application seeks the removal of existing single storey porch to rear of property and the construction of a new single storey flat roof with parapet wall and roof lantern. The extension will provide a dining room and kitchen. The single storey extension will comprise flat roof with roof lantern and bi-fold timber doors to rear and side elevations. The extension will feature rough cast lime render wall elevations above a Cotswold Stone base with dressed stone quoins proposed to the rear corners. The proposal will also involve the replacement of the existing cementitious render on the rear elevation of the dwelling with a new rough finished lime render finish to be applied matching that used on the extension

The existing kitchen window on the rear elevation along with a section of masonry beneath will be removed to create a new opening with French doors into the proposed dining room. Internally, a new stud wall will be erected to the right hand side of the historic beam in order to divide the existing kitchen area to create a playroom and hall way. The existing utility room cupboard is to be retained, but the window opening is to be blocked up so as to allow new high level cupboards in the adjoining kitchen as proposed. The proposed plans also show all internal walls and ceilings at ground and first floor level are to be re-plaster boarded and skimmed but with all historic beams to be retained and remaining visible.

#### **6. Planning Policy**

##### **National Planning Policy Framework 2012 (NPPF)**

Paragraph 7, 14 and 17

Section 6 - Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes

Section 7 - Requiring Good Design paragraphs 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61 and 65

Section 12 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment paragraphs 126, 129, 131, 132 and 134

##### **Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS) (Adopted January 2015)**

CP57 - Ensuring High Quality Design and Place Shaping

CP58 - Ensuring the conservation of the historic environment

## **7. Summary of consultation responses**

Cricklade Town Council - On 6<sup>th</sup> February the Town Council supported an application to construct a single storey rear 'orangery' extension and carry out various internal works to this grade II listed property. The Conservation Officer subsequently raised further concerns and the applicant's agent has now submitted an updated Heritage Statement with slightly amended proposals which the applicant advises will meet those concerns.

Conservation Officer – Objection. The proposed extension would harm the architectural and historic integrity and significance of the heritage asset and its setting and would also result in an unjustified loss of historic fabric.

## **8. Publicity**

Local Residents – 1 objection letter received from members of the public in respect to this application. The letter raised the following concerns:

- Issues relating to construction traffic and works
- Long term impact on parking provision due to increased size of dwelling
- The proposed development will change the character of a listed building

The applications we advertised in the Wiltshire Gazette and Herald on the 02/02/2017.

## **9. Planning Considerations**

### Impact on the Listed Building

The property is Grade II Listed making WCS Core Policy 58 a key consideration in this assessment of this application. The Policy requires that all development should protect, conserve and where possible enhance the historic environment, and should not have an unacceptable impact on the historic environment, particularly where this could be avoided or mitigated.

In this instance the overall character and style of the proposed flat roof extension with parapet wall and roof lantern is not considered to be an appropriate design as it is better suited to a more modern, executive style dwelling unlike the proposal site which is Grade II Listed rural type cottage.

The application has been considered by the Council Conservation officer who has raised an objection to the proposal. The Conservation Officer has stated that the scale and bulk of the extension as proposed running the full length of the rear elevation is considered excessive and does not respect the current scale, massing and proportions of the historic building. This addition would substantially mask the rear elevation and upper windows and is not in keeping with the historic character and appearance of the designated heritage asset. In addition, the removal of the kitchen window and section of wall below in order to allow for access into the new extension, along with the blocking up of the utility window, would result in an unacceptable loss of historic fabric being the original rear wall of the dwelling.

The Conservation Officer has stated that the principle of removing of the rear porch is acceptable and that a smaller scale rear extension might be considered appropriate and has advised that a lightweight conservatory with a monopitch glazed roof and a significant reduction in the overall width and depth of the extension could be supported subject to detail. However it is considered that the current proposal will not sustain or enhance the significance of the heritage assets nor make a positive contribution to the local character and distinctiveness.

The overall level of harm to the designated heritage asset is considered to be less than substantial. In accordance with paragraph 134 of the NPPF, where a development proposal and proposed works 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.

In this instance, it is considered that the level of public benefit of the proposal would be limited to the removal of the low quality rear porch and cementitious render on the rear elevation. However, this level of public benefit is not considered to outweigh the identified level of harm that would arise from the erection of the rear extension and loss of historic fabric as proposed. The overall scale of the development, combined with the unsympathetic design approach, would significantly mask and detract from the historic and architectural significance of the property and substantially alter the historic the character and appearance of the heritage asset and its setting.

It is considered that more historically sensitive and less harmful design options could be utilised in order to achieve some additional living space at ground floor level (albeit of a smaller scale to that proposed). In addition, it is considered that the optimum viable use of the heritage asset has already been secured, without the addition of the rear extension, as there is adequate usable living space located on all 3 floors of the dwelling as existing.

On balance, the proposed development and works will result in an unjustified loss of historic fabric and will be harmful to the character and appearance of the listed building and its setting. The works will not sustain or enhance the significance of the heritage asset nor make a positive contribution to the local character and distinctiveness. This harm is not sufficiently outweighed by public benefits and the development could be achieved in an alternative manner that would result in less harm to the heritage asset. In addition, the development is not considered to take account of the characteristics of the site and local context meaning the development does not relate effectively to the immediate setting or wider character of the area. Therefore, the proposed development and works are contrary to the NPPF paragraphs 131, 132 and 134, WCS Core Policies 57 (iv and vi), 58 (iii) and S16(2) and 66(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

The applicant has been offered multiple opportunities to submit revised scheme proposals to address the identified concerns but has declined to pursue that approach.

## **10. Conclusion**

Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 require that the determination of planning applications must be made in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The proposed works will result in an unjustified loss of historic fabric and will be harmful to the listed building. The works will not sustain or enhance the significance of the heritage assets nor make a positive contribution to the local character and distinctiveness. The harm caused by these works are not outweighed by any public benefit or by securing the optimum viable use of the heritage asset. In addition, it is considered that the benefits of development could be achieved in a way that does not result in the same level of harm. Therefore, the proposed development and works are contrary to Core Policies 57 (iv and vi), 58 (iii) of the Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS) and paragraphs 131, 132 and 134 of the National Planning

Policy Framework (NPPF) 2012. The proposal is also considered contrary to S16 (2) and 66 of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Listed Building Consent is REFUSED for the following reason:

- 1 The proposed works, by reason of their siting, scale, massing and design and the loss of historic fabric, fail to conserve the character, appearance and setting of the listed building and are not otherwise justified by any wider public benefit. The proposal is therefore contrary to S16(2) and 66 of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.