

## REPORT TO THE AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

<b>Date of Meeting</b>	<b>14<sup>th</sup> May 2014</b>
<b>Application Number</b>	<b>14/02367/FUL &amp; 14/2730/LBC</b>
<b>Site Address</b>	<b>Church House The Street Grittleton Chippenham SN14 6AP</b>
<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Form New Opening Between Existing Laundry Room &amp; Pool Area, Pool Enclosure &amp; Reroofing of Lean to Roof of Garden Outbuildings (Resubmission of 13/00107/FUL)</b>
<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Mr &amp; Mrs M Fish</b>
<b>Town/Parish Council</b>	<b>GRITTLETON</b>
<b>Ward</b>	<b>BY BROOK</b>
<b>Grid Ref</b>	<b>386016 180077</b>
<b>Type of application</b>	<b>Full Planning</b>
<b>Case Officer</b>	<b>Mark Staincliffe</b>

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

The application has been called into committee at the request of Cllr Scott to discuss the impact of the development on the conservation area and listed building.

### **1. Purpose of Report**

To recommend the planning & listed building applications for refusal

### **2. Report Summary**

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

- Principle of development
- Impact of the development on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area
- Impact of the development on the character and appearance of the Grade II listed building

The applications generated 1 letter of support from neighbours. Grittleton Parish Council supports the planning application.

### 3. Site Description

Church House is a substantial Grade II listed building within the Grittleton Conservation Area. The site is also within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

### 4. Planning History

N/07/02611/LBC	Minor Internal Alterations- APPROVED
N/09/02232/LBC	Demolitions, Internal and External Alterations and Extension to Existing Dwelling- APPROVED
N/09/02230/FUL	Extension Following Demolition of Early 20th Century Additions- APPROVED
N/13/00107/FUL	Proposed Pool Enclosure and Installation of Solar Panels and Associated Works- REFUSED
N/13/00109/LBC	Proposed Pool Enclosure, Installation of Solar Panels and Associated Works- REFUSED
N/13/00577/FUL	Demolition of Two outbuildings; Erection of Three Outbuildings; Re-landscaping of Rear Gardens Including Lawn Terracing; Replacement of Length of Cypress Hedge With Yew; Retrospective Application For Hard Tennis Court Surface Within Domestic Curtilage- APPROVED
N/13/00578/CAC	Demolition of Two outbuildings; Erection of Three Outbuildings; Re-landscaping of Rear Gardens Including Lawn Terracing; Replacement of Length of Cypress Hedge With Yew; Retrospective Application For Hard Tennis Court Surface Within Domestic Curtilage- GRANTED
N/13/00587/LBC	Propose to Demolish a Concrete Shed Attached to a Wall Contiguous With a Listed Building. Proposed to Erect a Glasshouse & a Stone, Potting Shed Against a Listed Kitchen Garden Wall- GRANTED

## **5. The Proposal**

The application seeks consent for the construction of a pool enclosure and the reroofing of a garden outbuilding.

## **6. Planning Policy**

### National Planning Policy Framework

Section 7: Requiring good design

Section 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

### North Wiltshire Local Plan

C3 (Development Control Core Policy)

NE4 (Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty)

HE1 (Development in Conservation Areas)

HE4 (Development, Demolition or Alterations involving Listed Buildings)

### Wiltshire Core Strategy Draft Submission

Core Policy 57: Ensuring high quality design and place shaping

Core Policy 58: Ensuring the conservation of the historic environment

### Planning Practice Guidance

Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

## **7. Consultations**

Conservation: Object for the following reasons:

I do not support the proposals to enclose the swimming pool due to the inappropriate scale and design of the structure, its awkward relationship with existing structures enormity of the built footprint that would connect the house with ancillary structures. These proposals would cause significant harm to the character, appearance and setting of the listed building and would be contrary to NPPF (section 12). I recommend refusal.

Grittleton Parish Council: Support

## **8. Publicity**

One letter of support was received:

We live next door to Church House and don't believe that the proposed development will have an adverse effect on the listed building itself. Furthermore, as it will be largely invisible to the surrounding properties I can see no reason not to support the proposal.

## **9. Planning Considerations**

### Background

The proposal relates to the construction of a pool enclosure and the reroofing of an existing outbuilding. An enclosure over the pool has previously been in situ but this has since been removed.

Planning permission was refused under delegated powers for a similar development in 2013. This decision was not appealed.

## Policy

Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 imposes a statutory duty on decision makers in considering whether to grant permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting 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. Section 16(2) of the same Act imposes a similar duty in respect of applications for listed building consent.

Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires that, when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of listed buildings, great weight should be given to their conservation, and that any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification.

Under section 72 of the Act there is a requirement to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of buildings in a conservation area. Consideration must also be given to the impact of the development on the character and appearance of the conservation area

### Impact on the character and appearance of the listed Building and Conservation Area

The listing description focuses on the fine architectural details of the front elevation whilst the rear elevations are considered to be more modest. Nevertheless, part of the significance of this building, as a designated heritage asset, lies in its remarkably intact overall form.

Although the previous swimming pool enclosure would have appreciably increased this wing's scale as an addition to the building, it has gone and permission is required for its replacement. Moreover, Chapter 12 of the NPPF requires that, when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of listed buildings, great weight should be given to their conservation, and that any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification, the fact that a structure was previously present is not sufficient justification to override established guidance.

As a matter of fact the proposed development would detrimentally alter the character of the property. The outbuildings would no longer be read as outbuildings as they would be linked to the main dwelling. The existing dwelling retains evidence of its origins and original layout, as a distinct separation between the outbuildings and the dwelling remains. The separation of the outbuildings from the principle dwelling clearly sets out the character and relationship and gives meaning to the outbuildings role and position within the layout of this group of buildings. The joining of the outbuildings to the existing dwelling would erode the historic importance of the building.

In addition, the swimming pool enclosure would result in a somewhat awkward appearance where it adjoins and engulfs the existing boot room/laundry room and the variation in eaves/ridge heights between the existing single storey projection and the proposal.

For the reasons set out above the proposed extension would therefore cause harm. Moreover, under section 72 of the Act there is a requirement to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of buildings in a conservation area. In this regard Church House is an important element of the conservation area, and makes a significant contribution to the character and history of this village. Therefore, by harming this listed building in the way described above the proposal must also detract from the character and appearance of the conservation area

## RECOMMENDATION

Planning permission is **REFUSED** for the following reason:

The proposal by reason of the scale, design and awkward relationship with the existing property and outbuildings would cause significant harm to the character, appearance and setting of the listed building. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies HE4 and C3 of the North Wiltshire Local Plan 2011 and advice contained within sections 7 & 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance 'conserving and enhancing the historic environment'.

Listed building consent is **REFUSED** for the following reason:

The proposals will harm the significance of the heritage asset, its setting and its contribution to the local character and distinctiveness of the area. The proposed large flat roof with prominent roof lantern, enveloping the laundry room and uniting the house with its service buildings will be contrary to policies in the NPPF as they will not sustain or enhance the significance of the heritage assets, would not make a positive contribution to the economic vitality of the area or to local character and distinctiveness. The proposals would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset but there are no public benefits of this proposal against which the harm could be outweighed. The proposed development is therefore contrary to paragraph 131 & 134 of the NPPF, Policy HE4 of the North Wilts Local Plan and Policy 58 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy Pre-submission document.

Listed Building Consent is **REFUSED** for the Following Reason:

The proposed development results in harm to the historic fabric, character and setting of the heritage assets at the site including the principle listed building. The development is not justified by any overriding material considerations or identified public interest. The proposals are in conflict with policies C3(ii) and HE4 of the North Wiltshire Local Plan 2011 and paragraphs 17, 131, 132 & 134 and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework and PPS5 Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide paragraphs 79, 85, 87, 114 & 116 and S.66(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

