

REPORT TO THE AREA HUB PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date of Meeting	14th May 2014
Application Number	14/02154/FUL
Site Address	Rose Cottage, Corston, Malmesbury SN16 0HD
Proposal	Side extension, Internal Alterations and Enlarge Front Porch
Applicant	Mr Keith Metcalfe
Town/Parish Council	Malmesbury Town Council
Grid Ref	392459 184060
Type of application	Full Planning
Case Officer	Richard Sewell

Reason for the application being considered by Committee

The application is being presented to Committee at the request of Councillor John Thomson to consider the visual impact on the existing building and the benefit to the community

1. Purpose of Report

To consider the above application and to recommend that permission is refused.

2. Report Summary

The main issues when considering this application are :

- Impact on the existing dwelling and setting of the adjoined Grade II Listed Building
- Personal circumstances of the applicant balanced against the long term harm of the proposed extension

3. Site Description

The proposal site is situated in the village of Corston. The existing dwelling is situated in a prominent location within the village fronting the A429 highway. The proposal site is clearly visible from the highway when travelling through the village from both the north and south directions. The existing dwelling is a two storey semi detached cottage constructed of natural stone walls and interlocking clay double Roman roof tiles. Attached to the dwelling is large, white UPVC conservatory that extends along the side and rear elevations. The conservatory was permitted in 1997 and is a prominent feature of the dwelling despite being of poor aesthetic value. To the rear of the dwelling is a pitched roof, two storey extension with dormer window on the north west elevation. An existing pitched roof entrance porch is located on the front elevation of the dwelling as are two first floor windows and one ground

floor. The dwelling also features a separate pitched roof garage and front garden with patio area at the side.

Rose Cottage is a semi detached undesignated heritage asset adjoined to a house called Lynian, which is Grade II Listed and dates from the C17. The pair are set back from the road behind low stone walls. Lynian is two storeys plus an attic, with a steeply pitched roof. Rose Cottage, which is of a later period than Lynian, is two storeys but a smaller scale than its listed neighbour, so the ridge of the roof to Rose Cottage is not far above the eaves of Lynian. The ridgeline height of Lynian is 7.4m, which is 1.1m higher than Rose Cottage which has a ridge line height of 6.2m. The height of the conservatory is 4.7m and whilst the white frame of the conservatory stands out somewhat, care has obviously been taken to ensure that there was a similar step down in ridge heights from the cottage to conservatory as there was between the cottage and Lynian. This hierarchy of scale is further emphasised by the front elevations of Rose Cottage and the conservatory being set back from the front elevation of Lynian.

4. Planning History

13/04827/PREAPP- Two Storey Extension to Dwelling REFUSED

97/01825/FUL- Erection of Conservatory (Alternative to 96/00721/FUL) PERMITTED

96/00721/FUL- Erection of Conservatory PERMITTED

88/01348/FUL- Extension to Dwelling, Garage and New Access PERMITTED

5. The Proposal

The proposed extension to Rose Cottage is for a two storey side and rear extension and enlarged entrance porch on the front elevation. The proposed will create a living/dining room on the ground floor and two additional first floor bedrooms, one of which will be en-suite with dressing room. The existing conservatory is to be demolished to make way for the proposed extension. This would square off the entire footprint of the cottage, raise the ridge of the extension to match that of the existing dwelling and almost double the side of Rose Cottage and obliterate the existing proportions and floor plan. The proposals will result in a far more dominant structure that will reduce visibility towards the heritage asset when approaching the site from the north and will appear to double the length of the front elevation, dwarfing the front of Lynian.

Four additional windows are proposed on the front elevation with two on the first and two on the ground floors. Further to this, the existing porch will be enlarged by a lean to extension with the front elevation of the porch measuring 3.9m wide. The rear extension will require an additional pitched roof to allow the additional space required for the upstairs bedrooms. A dormer window is proposed on the first floor of the northwest elevation with an additional first floor window proposed at the gable end of the first floor. Below this on the ground floor, double doors and full length windows will look out into the garden. The materials of the proposed extension, doors and windows will match the natural stone, clay double roman roof tiles and UPVC windows the existing.

6. Planning Policy

NPPF Para 17 Core Planning Principles

NPPF Section 7: Requiring Good Design

NPPF Section 12: Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment

C3 Development Control Policy

H8 Residential Extensions

HE4 Development, Demolition or Alterations Involving Listed Buildings

7. Consultations

Malmesbury Parish Council- SUPPORT

Malmesbury & St Paul Without Residents' Association- SUPPORT

Conservation- OBJECTION.

The quantity of accommodation proposed will result in a substantial extension to this cottage that will harm the character, appearance and setting of the adjacent Listed Building. There are ways that an additional bedroom could be added to Rose Cottage that would be far less harmful to the heritage assets.

The proposed extensions at Rose Cottage would be contrary to paragraph 131 of the NPPF (2012) as they would not sustain or enhance the significance of the heritage assets and are not necessary for their viable use, they would not make a positive contribution to sustainable communities, including economic vitality and they would not make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

The proposals will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset [Lynian] but there are no public benefits from this proposal and it is not necessary to secure its optimum viable use. The development is therefore contrary to paragraph 134 of the NPPF (2012).

The proposed extensions are over-large and inappropriately detailed. They would harm the significance of the Rose Cottage (undesignated heritage asset) and, due to its close proximity, the significance of the adjoining designated heritage asset (Lynian). This would be contrary to paragraph 135 of the NPPF (2012).

8. Publicity

4 letters supporting the application and 1 list containing 10 signatures also in support.

9. Planning Considerations

Long term impact on existing dwelling and adjoined Listed Building:

The materials of the proposed extension are considered to be an improvement to the white UPVC of the existing conservatory. There will be no significant impact on the privacy or amenity currently awarded to the surrounding properties. However, the size and scale of the extension does not respect the existing proportions of Rose Cottage. The continuous roof scape and extended front elevation will completely alter the external appearance and massing of the cottage and will detract from the visual aesthetic of the attached Listed building and overall street scene. Despite the proposed extension not extending out further than the existing footprint of the conservatory, it will almost double the footprint of the dwelling resulting in an over dominant development that significantly alters the historic cottage appearance. Such an enlargement results in the front elevation appearing stretched and out of proportion and the poor design of the north west elevation will be clearly visible from the highway. The enlarged entrance porch is considered excessive and an unnecessary feature on the front elevation. Both the size and scale of the proposed extension and entrance porch are considered to have a negative impact on the appearance of both the existing dwelling and the setting of the adjoined Grade II Listed Building.

Personal circumstances of applicant:

The applicant has pointed to the need to extend the existing dwelling to provide additional accommodation and living space for their disabled son who suffers from Kabuki Syndrome and autism. The applicant has stated that a master en-suite with dressing room is required for their son together with an additional fourth bedroom to provide accommodation for a carer to stay over when required. The proposed layout of the ground floor is to create a larger family living/dining area which the applicant has stated is also for their son. Pre-Application discussions between the Case Officer and applicant explored various options to provide the required additional living space and accommodation in a way that would be considered more acceptable in terms of design and scale. The applicant was informed that either a single story side extension or a reduction in size and scale of the proposed two storey extension would be the preferred options. Following a discussion with their builder, the applicant feels that neither option can provide the desired amount of additional accommodation or living space and so the proposal has remained the same.

It is not considered that the proposals would result in significant harm to existing residential amenities of neighbouring properties such that consent ought to be refused on this basis..

10. Conclusion

The personal circumstances of the applicant to provide additional living space and accommodation for a family member with unfortunate health complications are appreciated and have been taken into consideration as part of this assessment. The Case Officer is sympathetic to the needs of the applicant but feels that the design of the proposal results in significant harm to interests of acknowledged importance and has suggested to the applicant other alternative and less harmful options. In this case, the personal circumstances of the family have to be balanced against the harm that would arise from the proposed extension as this would continue to exist long after the personal needs of the applicant have ceased. In this instance, it is felt that the personal needs of the applicant do not outweigh the concerns in respect of the harm that would arise to the character and appearance of the existing property and adjoined Listed Building. Due to its prominent location fronting the highway, the proposed extension and alterations will have a detrimental impact on the rural village appearance of the locality. Despite not being a designated Conservation Area, this part of Corston is in an attractive setting and the proposed development is not considered to be in keeping with the character of the historic cottages in this area.

RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

1. The long term visual impact of the proposed extension and entrance porch is considered significant enough to negate the personal circumstances of the applicant. Therefore, by way of its design, scale and location the proposal is not considered to be in keeping with the host dwelling and also not considered to show respect to the local character and street scene and is therefore contrary to Policies C3 and H8 and the NPPF Paragraph 17 and NPPF Section 7: Requiring Good Design.
2. The proposed extension does not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the adjoined Grade II Listed Building or its setting. The public benefit of the proposal is not considered to outweigh the less than significant harm the proposed extension will have on the adjoined heritage asset. Therefore the proposed is considered contrary to Policy HE4 of the adopted North Wiltshire Local Plan 2011 and the NPPF Paragraph 17 and NPPF Section 12: Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment paragraphs 131, 134 and 135

Wiltshire Council **Rose Cottage**

Where everybody matters

1:1250

