

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

<b>Date of Meeting</b>	04 October 2017
<b>Application Number</b>	17/06617/FUL
<b>Site Address</b>	Blarney Cottage Biddestone Lane Yatton Keynell Nr Chippenham SN14 7BD
<b>Proposal</b>	Regularise amendments to the original permission granted by 16/11131/FUL including amendments to the windows, fascia boards and dimensions of the approved extension
<b>Applicant</b>	Mr Hugh Rogers
<b>Town/Parish Council</b>	YATTON KEYNELL
<b>Electoral Division</b>	BY BROOK – Baroness Cllr Jane Scott OBE
<b>Grid Ref</b>	386639 176327
<b>Type of application</b>	Full Planning
<b>Case Officer</b>	Victoria Davis

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

The application has been called into committee by the Local Member, Baroness Cllr Jane Scott OBE in order to consider the objections of Yatton Keynell Parish Council relating to the scale, design and material finish. Issues relating to parking were also raised.

**1. Purpose of Report**

To consider the above application and to recommend that Planning Permission is GRANTED subject to planning conditions.

**2. Report Summary**

The main issues are:

- Principle of development

- Impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area including conservation area and setting of St Margaret's Church
- Parking

The Parish Council have objected to the proposal. Nine further letters of objection were received from six interested parties. One letter expressing support for the development has been received.

### **3. Site Description**

Blarney Cottage is a modest cottage situated off Biddestone Lane in the village of Yatton Keynell which is defined as a Large Village within the Chippenham Spatial Strategy. The application site falls within the framework boundary of this settlement. It is also within a conservation area and an area of outstanding natural beauty. The cottage has been unoccupied for some time and has fallen into a dilapidated state. The applicant intends to refurbish the cottage throughout and obtained planning permission in January 2017 to construct a two storey side extension and to convert the rear garage into additional accommodation. Development at the site has since commenced but not been completed. It has however come to light that several aspects of the work undertaken to date are not in accordance with the previously approved plans. This application seeks permission for a revised proposal taking into account the deviations from the original permission.

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

16/11131/FUL Two storey extension, conversion of existing garage and refurbishment.  
*Approved*

### **5. The Proposal**

The application seeks planning permission for the same two storey side extension to create an entrance hall, WC, upstairs bathroom and new staircase. Also proposed is a single storey rear extension of a revised design. The rear extension is slightly wider than the development previously approved (was 5.3m now 5.5m approx.). The plans also indicate recycled plastic 'eco slate' shingles to the roof of the single storey element. Timber boxed eaves to the front and rear of the two storey extension roof and dormer. An enlarged window is also proposed to the gable of the original cottage with a new recon stone lintel above. UPVC windows were proposed throughout.

Following an initial assessment of the proposal several concerns were raised in relation to the proposed roofing material, the UPVC windows and the boxed eaves. Alterations to the scheme were suggested and revised plans were later submitted. The revised proposal now includes the two storey extension as before with timber windows throughout, an enlarged window in the gable of the original cottage with natural stone lintel above. The rear lean-to extension has a slightly steeper roof with clay pantiles to match the existing cottage and two storey extension. Cast iron effect rainwater goods are proposed.

## 6. Planning Policy

### Wiltshire Core Strategy:

CP 1 Settlement Strategy  
CP 2 Delivery Strategy  
CP10 The Spatial Strategy: Chippenham Community Area  
CP51 Landscape  
CP57 Ensuring High Quality Design and Place Shaping  
CP 58 Ensuring the Conservation of the Historic Environment

### National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF):

Achieving sustainable development – Core Planning Principles (paragraph 17)

Chapter 7 Requiring Good Design, para 64  
Chapter 11 Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment, para 115  
Chapter 12 Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment, para 128, 129, 131, 132, 134 & 135

## 7. Consultations

Yatton Keynell Parish Council: Objection to initial and revised proposal - comments on the revised proposal are summarised below –

- Ridge-line of new extension is not subservient
- Scale of extensions swamp original cottage
- Dormer style is out of keeping with conservation area
- Boxed-out fascias and soffits out of contexts on any rubble stone cottage anywhere
- Historic ashlar stone surrounded door blocked up
- Stone garage to rear has been demolished not converted- new construction does not match old
- Too many unnecessary openings in extensions
- Rear fenestration affects setting of Grade I listed St Margaret's Church – openings should be small and 'cottage or Georgian glazed'
- Unique character of small offset window destroyed – concrete lintel
- Inappropriate capped ridge tiles to two storey extension at same height as main roof
- Oak lintels should be more appropriate
- New door opening lacks character and stone surround
- Lintels should be stone not concrete
- Roof covering to rear extension inappropriate, roof pitch too shallow and large area
- Cement pointing out of place
- Parking is affected

Wiltshire Council Archeologist: No Comment

Conservation Officer: Not supportive of initial proposal and suggested revisions to obtain an acceptable scheme – comments are summarised below -

- None of the windows should be UPVC. Sash windows should be replaced like for like.
- Facias should be removed as per previous application but could be painted to allow them to appear less intrusive.
- Cast Iron gutters or CI effect in plastic – existing were poor quality plastic
- First floor window opening is too large and should be made smaller to reflect the proportions of the gable.
- Lintel over should be natural stone
- Roofing material to the rear is inappropriate and is not a good likeness to natural slate. Excessively ridged on edges. This should be slate as approved.
- Eaves of extension could be dropped to achieve steeper roof slope as was previously approved.

Historic England: No Objection to original or revised proposal. The inspector commented as follows -

*On the basis of the information available to date, we do not wish to offer any comments. We suggest that you seek the views of your specialist conservation and archaeological advisers, as relevant*

Further correspondence was received on 6 September 2017 from Historic England which explained that their inspector remained of the opinion that the proposal would not impact the church to any great extent.

Tree Officer: No Comment

## **8. Publicity**

The application was advertised by site notice and neighbour consultation. A second neighbour consultation was carried out (on receipt of revised plans) allowing 14 days for further comments.

Nine letters of objection were received from six interested parties. One letter expressing support was received. The issues raised are summarised below-

- UPVC windows not appropriate
- Imitation slate roof is not in keeping
- Scale of extension is inappropriate
- First floor windows overlooking the churchyard
- Box eaves are not in keeping
- Cast iron gutters and brackets should be used
- Oak lintels should be used
- Window should be re-instated to original size

## 9. Planning Considerations

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.

### Principle of Development

The application site is within the built up part of Yatton Keynell which is defined within the Chippenham Spatial Strategy as a Large Village. The extension falls fully within the curtilage of an existing dwelling where the principle of reasonable residential extensions is acceptable.

### Scale and Design

The extensions and alterations do not create a hugely dissimilar development to what has already been permitted. It is considered that the simple gabled design of the side extension is appropriate and the use of render in combination with the existing stone is an acceptable approach in this case. It is noted that whilst the existing cottage does not feature render it does feature on other properties in the vicinity and this combination of materials is often an effective approach when extending period properties, differentiating the new and older elements. The extension to the rear is also considered to be acceptable in both scale and design. It follows a simple lean to style to replicate the original garage element. Whilst being 200mm wider than previously approved it is still not considered to be unacceptable in relation to the proportions of the original cottage. The revised proposal includes a steeper pitched roof and the use of clay pantiles to match the existing roof rather than the plastic eco slate. Slate was previously approved however clay pantiles are considered to be an acceptable traditional alternative. Cast iron effect gutters and down pipes are proposed – fixed using rise and fall brackets on the original part of the cottage. This is an improvement over the existing gutters which were poor quality plastic. The existing timber sash windows to the front elevation are to be replaced – like for like and all other windows are to be timber. A tilting timber sash window is proposed to the front elevation of the extension which will appear similar to the sash style of the original windows, and flush fit timber casement windows are proposed to the rear elevation. Flush fit timber casement style windows are commonplace in conservation areas and cottage refurbishments and it is acceptable for the rear facing elevation of both extensions to include this simple window style. It would not be necessary to expect Georgian style windows to be installed to the rear elevation.

Other issues raised by the Parish Council included reference to the ridgeline of the extension, removal of the original door, lack of stone surround to new door, preference for oak lintels and excessive number of openings to the extensions. The ridge height of the side extension, removal of door, lack of stone surround to the new door, stone lintels and opening positions are details which were already accepted by the previous permission. In terms of the enlarged gable window, whilst it would have been more desirable to retain the original smaller window, as the building itself is not listed, this modest alteration is considered to be acceptable and would not warrant refusal of the application given as the limited scale of the

alteration and its positioning not being especially prominent would not result in significant harm. It is also noted that the lintel above this window was previously stone (not oak) and so stone is still acceptable and is in itself accepted as a high quality approach. The agent and applicant have agreed to use a natural stone lintel in the original gable rather than recon stone as was originally proposed.

The Parish Council, several residents and the council's conservation officer raised concern relating to the boxed eaves detail to the extension and dormer roofs at the rear. It is acknowledged that there are alternative details that may be less prominent, however given that this detail forms part of the modern additions to the cottage, they are not considered to appear unduly out of place. This issue would not warrant refusal of the application. As a compromise, the conservation officer advised that the timber soffits and fascias could be painted in a muted colour to further reduce visual prominence. The agent and applicant agreed to make this change.

Several concerns were also raised in relation to the privacy of visitors to the churchyard. The Core Strategy policies do not specifically refer to churchyards however Core Policy 57 does expect development to have regard to the compatibility of the adjoining buildings and uses in general. In this case whilst it is accepted that the new first floor windows would have oblique views across the churchyard, they do not introduce any additional views of the area which is, in any case, fully accessible to the public and already overlooked by adjacent properties and gardens.

#### Conservation Area and Setting of Listed Building

Sections 66 (1) and 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 require Local Planning Authorities in determining planning applications affecting a Listed Building or Conservation Area to pay special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses; and to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that conservation area.

The site is located within the Yatton Keynell Conservation area where Core Policy 58 is relevant as it states that development should protect, conserve and where possible, enhance the historic environment. The site is located to the west of Biddestone Lane at the edge of the conservation area. Although clearly located within the built up part of Yatton Keynell, the site is close to the edge of the village where development is generally more loose knit creating a sense of openness and transition with the surrounding countryside. Blarney cottage is one of three properties on the west side of the lane backing onto to farmland. The eastern side of Biddestone Lane falls outside of the conservation area and predominantly features relatively modern dwellings of varying styles. Immediately opposite the site are two bungalows featuring recon stone and render. The general make up of the village comprises more traditional dwellings in stone and ashlar however render also appears on a number of prominent buildings at the centre of the village including The Bell Inn and the post office.

In this case, the extensions are visible from within the conservation area and the revisions to the initial proposal have sought to respond to the sensitive location of the site. Timber windows throughout, a muted colour scheme for the timber windows, fascias and soffits, cast iron effect gutters and pantiles to the rear extension are elements designed to assist the

development to integrate effectively. Whilst there may be alternative design approaches that could be considered more desirable, the council must judge the impact of the development as it is now proposed. The proposal must be considered on its own merits and in relation to the existing character and appearance of this part of the conservation area. When considering the existing character, issues such as the dilapidated state of the original building and the surrounding mixture of development are relevant. It is considered that scale and layout of the extensions adequately relate to the proportions of the original cottage and the combination of matching and new materials creates a development which, once completed, would integrate sufficiently within its surroundings. The revised proposal is not considered to be detrimental to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Potential impact on the setting of St Margarets Church has also been considered. The Church is Grade I listed and located approximately 25m to the north of Blarney Cottage. In this case as both extensions are built largely over the footprint of the existing building and are considered in keeping with the original cottage in terms of scale and design. The predominant use of natural stone to the rear with clay pantiles and timber windows as is now proposed, relates well to the existing and neighbouring properties and as such it is not considered that the development would appear incongruous or unduly prominent. For that reason it is not considered that the development would intrude in or obscure any significant views of the Church. Historic England were consulted and raised no objection. The inspector was satisfied that the development would not affect the Church to any great extent.

#### Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty

The site is also located within the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty where Core Policy 51 is relevant as it seeks to protect, conserve and enhance Wiltshire's distinctive landscape character. In this case, the property is located in a built up part of the village and is not in an isolated rural location. The scale of the development proposed is limited and read in the context of the existing built structures. On that basis, it is considered that the development would have a negligible visual impact on the wider landscape and the AONB designation.

#### Impact on residential amenity

The two storey extension will project towards the neighbouring property, Roselea, however it is some distance from the main house or outdoor amenity areas. It is not considered that the extension would result in any significant adverse impacts on the amenities of any near neighbours.

#### Highways

The highways officer noted that the alterations since the previous application proposal would not materially affect the highways aspects of the proposal and reiterated the comments provided during the previous application -

*I note the proposed garage conversion and extension of the existing property into a larger 2 bedroom dwelling, with proposed car parking space at the front. The proposed parking area requires some space from the driveway of Roselea to be able to accommodate a parking space, which would make it more difficult for Roselea to*

*access their driveway when approaching from the south. However, I do note that Roselea is also owned by the applicant and that no boundary treatment is proposed. Additionally, the new access for Blarney Cottage will be sub-standard in terms of visibility and will not be able to accommodate on-site vehicle turning on to a classified road.*

*Despite these concerns, I am aware that currently, parking for Blarney Cottage is cited at the rear of the property and the access that serves the rear of the property is even more sub-standard in terms of visibility than the proposed access.*

The highways officer concluded that on balance a refusal on highways grounds could not be sustained and no objection was raised subject to a condition relating to the surface of the new parking area being consolidated.

## **10. Conclusion**

The proposal is considered to be acceptable in principle and design. The location is considered appropriate for residential extensions. There would be no harm to the setting of the Listed Church or other heritage assets in the locality. The existing character and appearance of the surrounding conservation area would be preserved. It would not cause harm to the amenities currently enjoyed by the occupants of the residential properties to either side or cause undue conflict with visitors to the nearby church. The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Core Policies 51, 57 & 58 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy as well as Sections 7, 11 & 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the provision of the Planning Acts.

## **11. Recommendation**

Planning Permission be GRANTED subject to conditions;

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Site Location Plan YK01 L 001, Proposed Block Plan YK01- L 002 B, YK-01 EX01 A, Proposed Ground Floor and First Floor Plans YK-01 RS-010 A, Existing Elevations YK01 EX02 A (all received 10 July 2017), Proposed Elevation Revisions YK-01 RS-04 H and Proposed Flush Casement Windows YK-01 W-01 A (both received 30 August 2017)

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

- 2 No development shall commence on site until details of the windows and doors to be used on the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: The matter is required to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority before development commences in order that the development is undertaken in an

acceptable manner, in the interests of visual amenity and the character and appearance of the area

- 3 No paint or stain finish shall be applied to external timber (including fascias, soffits, box ends, bargeboards and window joinery, until details of the paint or stain to be applied have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the development being first occupied.

REASON: In the interests of visual amenity and the character and appearance of the area.

- 4 The roof tiles to be used in the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building in terms of their material, colour, texture, profile and pattern of laying.

REASON: In the interests of visual amenity and the character and appearance of the area.

- 5 No render shall be applied to any building or walls on site until a sample panel of the render to be used on the external walls not less than 1 metre square, has been made available on site, inspected and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The panel shall then be left in position for comparison whilst the development is carried out. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved sample.

REASON: In the interests of visual amenity and the character and appearance of the area.

- 6 The development hereby permitted shall not be first occupied until the first five metres of the access, measured from the edge of the carriageway, has been consolidated and surfaced (not loose stone or gravel). The access shall be maintained as such thereafter.

REASON: In the interests of highway safety.

- 7 INFORMATIVE TO APPLICANT:

Any alterations to the approved plans, brought about by compliance with Building Regulations or any other reason must first be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority before commencement of work.

- 8 INFORMATIVE TO APPLICANT:

The applicant is requested to note that this permission does not affect any private property rights and therefore does not authorise the carrying out of any work on land outside their control. If such works are required it will be necessary for the applicant to obtain the landowners consent before such works commence.

If you intend carrying out works in the vicinity of the site boundary, you are also advised that it may be expedient to seek your own advice with regard to the requirements of the Party Wall Act 1996.

9           INFORMATIVE TO APPLICANT:

Please note that Council offices do not have the facility to receive material samples. Please deliver material samples to site and inform the Planning Officer where they are to be found.

10          INFORMATIVE TO APPLICANT:

The applicant should note that the grant of planning permission does not include any separate permission which may be needed to erect a structure in the vicinity of a public sewer. Such permission should be sought direct from Thames Water Utilities Ltd / Wessex Water Services Ltd. Buildings are not normally allowed within 3.0 metres of a Public Sewer although this may vary depending on the size, depth, strategic importance, available access and the ground conditions appertaining to the sewer in question.