

## ITEM 7

---

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	18/01538/FULLN
<b>APPLICATION TYPE</b>	FULL APPLICATION - NORTH
<b>REGISTERED</b>	14.06.2018
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Mr and Mrs MacLachlan
<b>SITE</b>	Willow Cottage, Ibthorpe Road, Hurstbourne Tarrant, SP11 0BD, <b>HURSTBOURNE TARRANT</b>
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Single storey rear extension with internal alterations, and reinstatement of fireplace
<b>AMENDMENTS</b>	
<b>CASE OFFICER</b>	Miss Katherine Dowle

Background paper (Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D)

---

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The application is presented to Northern Area Planning Committee at the request of Councillor Giddings for the Committee to closely consider the heritage aspects of the proposed scheme.

### 2.0 SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 Willow Cottage is a Grade II listed two storey, detached property located in the village of Hurstbourne Tarrant. The site lies within the Hurstbourne Tarrant and Ibthorpe Conservation Area. There is an existing single storey extension to the rear of the property which was granted planning permission and listed building consent in 2004. The gardens are predominantly laid to lawn with mature vegetation along the boundary while to the east and south of the property the garden is bordered by the River Swift.

### 3.0 PROPOSAL

- 3.1 A single storey extension is proposed to replace an existing smaller extension. The extension would be approximately 4.8m deep by 16m wide and in the south-east corner there would be a 1.5m by 1.5m recess adjacent to the rear elevation of the host property. It would have a modern appearance with a flat roof, horizontal timber cladding and large powder coated aluminium windows. The extension would have large windows to the north, east and south with a door onto the garden facing east. There would be a door located in the recess to the south of the extension which would open onto the patio and in the existing dwelling a doorway would be opened to access a boot room.
- 3.2 An existing fireplace is proposed to be opened up and an inglenook fireplace installed.
- 3.3 The current application is slightly different from the previously refused applications (18/00411/FULLN and 18/00412/LBWN). The current application is narrower than the previously refused scheme, it has a recess at the south elevation and includes the opening up of a door in the rear elevation.

4.0 **HISTORY**

4.1 18/00411/FULLN Application refused in May 2018 for a single storey rear extension and internal alterations.

Reason: **The proposed extension would, by virtue of its siting and form, harm the ability to appreciate the historic form and appearance of the listed cottage, which would harm its special interest. The level of harm to the building's special interest is judged to be less than substantial, however, no public benefit has been demonstrated to arise from the scheme which would weigh against this harm. It is therefore considered that the proposed scheme does not meet the requirements of Policies E1 and E9 of the Local Plan.**

4.2 18/00412/LBWN Application refused in May 2018 for a single storey rear extension and internal alterations

Reason: **The proposed extension would, by virtue of its siting and form, harm the ability to appreciate the historic form and appearance of the listed cottage, which would harm its special interest. The level of harm to the building's special interest is judged to be less than substantial, however, no public benefit has been demonstrated to arise from the scheme which would weigh against this harm. It is therefore considered that the proposed scheme does not meet the requirements of Policies E1 and E9 of the Local Plan.**

4.3 16/02724/FULLN Permission granted in 2016 for the use of land for equestrian purposes and the retention of a stable/store building, manure store and footbridge.

4.4 16/01015/FULLN Permission granted in 2016 for the demolition of lean-to, wood store and garage; erection of single storey rear extension to provide kitchen, dining and utility, new garage with ancillary accommodation.

4.5 16/01016/LBWN Consent granted in 2016 for the demolition of lean-to, wood store and garage; erection of single storey rear extension to provide kitchen, dining and utility, new garage with ancillary accommodation and internal layout alterations.

4.6 15/03169/LBWN Application withdrawn in 2015 for the Demolition of utility, kitchen, wood shed, and garage, erection of single storey rear extension to provide kitchen and family room, internal and external alterations including removal of partitions, bricking up existing and provision of new doorways and installation of window in drawing room flank elevation.

4.7 07/00041/FULLN Application refused in 2007 for the erection of double garage, garden room, garden store and sauna together with ancillary living accommodation over.

4.8 07/00038/CAWN Consent granted in 2007 for the demolition of the existing garage.

- 4.9 TVN.09109/2 Permission granted for the erection of stables.
- 4.10 TVN.09109/1 Permission granted for the erection of two-storey extension and single storey extensions to provide additional living accommodation, detached double garage/ log store with storage area over, erection of front porch and replacement porch, conservatory, shed/greenhouse and summerhouse, insertion of new chimney, and alterations to vehicular access.
- 4.11 TVN.LB.00838/1 Consent granted for the demolition of garage and outbuildings and erection of two storey side extension to provide lounge with bedroom over, single storey side and rear extensions to provide log store, conservatory, boot room and extended kitchen, erection of front porch and replacement porch, erection of new chimney and other internal alterations.

## 5.0 CONSULTATIONS

### 5.1 Design and Conservation: Objection

There is an objection to the proposed extension, which, for the reasons set out below would harm the appreciation of the history of the building.

There is no objection to the proposed removal of the internal wall at first floor, which is a modern stud partition, so there would be no loss of historic fabric and no harm to the plan form of the building.

In terms of the proposed works to the fireplace in the kitchen (proposed snug), there is insufficient information to show what is proposed and what the potential impact on historic fabric would be contrary to paragraph 7.75 of the Revised Local Plan. It is appreciated that some opening-up works to inform a final scheme would be needed, but there should be some indication of what the intended finished treatment would be, what is expected to be likely to be found, and a method statement for the opening up/investigative works, and the anticipated methodology for the full works. The application has, therefore failed to demonstrate there will be no harm to the significance of the building and there is currently an objection to the fireplace proposals.

There is also an objection to the currently proposed extension, as it would conceal evidence of previous alterations to the building, which would harm its special interest (see below).

The existing, in-situ, extension is not wholly successful, and there is no objection in principle to its being replaced. Planning permission and listed building consent have recently been granted for a replacement scheme (16/01015/FULLN & 16/01016/LBWN). It is noted, from the heritage statement, that the approved scheme (2004), and what is in situ at present, do not appear to be the same. The approved design appears to be a better response to the building than what is in place.

The existing extension does not cover as much of the historic part of the rear elevation of the building as the currently proposed extension would. The same is true of the more recently approved scheme.

As has been advised in Design and Conservation's responses to previous applications for this site, historically Willow Cottage was a row of terraced cottages, and this is considered an important part of its character and special interest. Though the substantial existing rear extension has caused some harm to the legibility of this, the original form can still be clearly read. Further, the archaeological evidence of past changes to the building evident in the rear elevation helps inform an understanding of the historic uses and phasing of the building. This includes a step in the wall with associated brick quoins which would suggest the building was extended at this point, an arch which the current heritage statement advises may have been a bread oven, and a window which has been infilled and turned into a window. (Fig. 5 of heritage statement). It is considered that it would be harmful to the significance of the listed building to conceal this evidence with a modern extension as is currently proposed.

There are some advantages of the proposed scheme over what is in situ, and the scheme most recently granted permission, and the proposed extension would be considered acceptable if it did not include the 'L' shaped projection housing the laundry room. The amendments to the roof design from the 2016 approved scheme – making it a flat roof which sits below the eaves of the main building – is considered to be an improvement, as it better reveals the form of the historic structure. However, it would be possible to amend the design in this way without needing to bring the extension further along the rear elevation. The amended design would already provide more accommodation as it is a deeper structure.

The way the proposed extension has been designed does mean some of the archaeological evidence (Fig. 5 heritage statement) in this part of the wall would not fall within the built envelope of the extension, though the lower, wider arch would still, and it seems a new section of wall could cut into this (plan ref. 17/662/P200). The heritage statement notes this could be evidence of a bread oven, which is quite a significant historic feature of the building, and provides evidence of the way the house was lived in by people in the past. This contributes evidential value towards part of the special interest of the listed building. However, this archaeological evidence would still be screened in most external views (e.g. from most points in the garden) by the return section of the new annexe. One would have to enter the void created in order to view the section of wall. As can be seen in the elevation drawings, from most angles the proposed extension would be seen as a single solid block, covering most of the rear wall of the house. Thus, even though the historic material would not be removed, by partially concealing it, and making it harder to see, there would be harm to the building's special interest.

It is not considered there is any significant advantage in terms of the reading of the building resulting from moving the extension further from the north-east corner of the host (the current scheme would terminate further along the rear wall of the main house at the north-east end than the existing extension). It would not be sufficiently far from the end of the gable end that it would not still be clearly perceptible, so there would be no great advantage to reading the historic plan form. Further, as that end of the building is itself a modern

extension, this limits the effectiveness of such an approach. It would also mean that modern fabric would be exposed at the north-east end of the building at the expense of historic fabric at the south-west end of the extension.

The harm to the building would be considered to be less-than-substantial for the purposes of the NPPF – therefore it should be weighed against any public benefits arising from the scheme.

6.0 **REPRESENTATIONS** Expired 13.07.2018

6.1 **Hurstbourne Tarrant Parish Council: No response received.**

7.0 **POLICY**

7.1 Government Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

7.2 Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016)(RLP)

COM2: Settlement Hierarchy

E1: High Quality Development in the Borough

E2: Protect, conserve and enhance the landscape character of the borough

E5: Biodiversity

E7: Water Management

E9: Heritage

LHW4: Amenity

8.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

8.1 The main planning considerations are:

- The principle of development;
- The impact on the character of the area and conservation area;
- The impact on the significance of the listed building;
- The impact on flooding
- The impact on ecology
- The impact on amenity

8.2 **The Principle of development**

Willow Cottage is within the settlement boundary of Hurstbourne Tarrant and Ibthorpe as shown on the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan Maps. The proposal would be acceptable in principle, with regard to policy COM2, subject to being appropriate to the other policies of the Revised Local Plan.

8.3 **The impact on the character of the area and conservation area**

The proposed rear extension would be situated to the rear of the listed building away from all public vantage points. It is considered that there would be no adverse or significant impact on the character of the wider conservation area, as set out in section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. As the proposal would not be visible from public viewpoints it would conserve the landscape and scenic beauty of the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The proposal would not result in the loss of important local features and would comply with Policy E2.

**8.4 The impact on the significance of the listed building**

Paragraph 193 of the revised NPPF states that '*when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance*'.

**8.5 Rear extension**

Historically Willow Cottage was a row of terraced cottages and this is considered to be an important part of its character and special interest. A two storey side extension was constructed to the north of the original terrace row which extends the linear form of the cottages. There is an existing single storey rear extension with a gently sloping roof which has caused some harm to the appreciation of the original form of the cottages, however this can still be read in the unaffected southern portion of the rear elevation. The archaeological evidence of previous alterations to the building are evident in the rear elevation, especially in the south-east corner of the property; this helps to inform an understanding of the historic uses and phasing of the building. The archaeological evidence includes a step in the wall with associated brick quoins (which would suggest that the building was extended at this point), an arch indicating a former window and a door which has been infilled and turned into a window. It is considered that it would be harmful to the significance of the listed building to conceal this evidence with an extension. The proposal extends further to the south-east than the existing rear extension and, although now set away from the rear elevation with a small recess, views of the historical evidence would be screened and one's appreciation of the property would be disrupted.

8.6 The existing single storey rear extension does not successfully integrate with the character of the existing property and as such there is no objection to the removal of this existing structure.

8.7 It is acknowledged that there are some advantages of the proposed scheme compared to the existing extension and the previously approved scheme. Use of a flat roof set below the eaves would be an improvement compared to the existing extension and would enable the form of the historic roof structure to be revealed. Notwithstanding this benefit identified, these changes do not require an extension to the south-east of the rear elevation and the associated harm identified would not be outweighed by the benefits of the scheme.

8.8 It is therefore considered that the proposal would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of Willow Cottage. There is a requirement under the provisions of RLP Policy E9, to assess the harm identified against the public benefits of the proposal, including its optimum viable use. Given the status of the building as a private dwelling it is not considered that there are any public benefits which would arise from the scheme that would outweigh the harm that would be caused to the listed building.

**8.9 Fireplace alterations**

Paragraph 190 of the revised NPPF requires Local Planning Authorities to identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset, taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. The application is not supported by an assessment of what is expected to be found

behind the fireplace, proposed finishes or a method statement for the re-opening of the fireplace. The lack of this information means that we are unable to assess the potential harm of the opening up works on the special interest of the property. As such, based on the information available, the Council's Conservation Officer has insufficient information to assess the impact of the proposal on the significance of the listed building.

- 8.10 In this instance, insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed fireplace opening would not result in harm to the significance of the listed building. As such it is considered that a precautionary approach should be taken and that the proposed fireplace alterations cannot be considered to comply with Policy E9 of the RLP or the provisions of the revised NPPF. The fireplace alterations do not require planning permission but due to the lack of information it is not considered that any weight can be attributed to this in this application decision.
- 8.11 In summary, the design of the scheme is not considered to respect the host building, Consequently, the proposal does not meet the requirements of RLP policy E1. The proposed rear extension would not make a positive contribution to sustaining the significance of the listed building as set out in section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Therefore the proposal would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the listed building. The proposed rear extension is contrary to RLP Policy E9 and the guidance contained in the revised NPPF.
- 8.12 **The impact on flooding**  
The proposal has been supported by a Flood Risk Assessment due to its location within Flood Zone 3. The assessment conclusions accord with the revised NPPF and national guidance and the relevant considerations and tests have been undertaken. The standing advice relating to flooding released by the Environment Agency states that floor levels should either be no lower than existing floor levels or 300 millimetres (mm) above the estimated flood level. The floor levels of the proposed extension would be at the same level as the existing floor levels. Therefore taking this and the proportionally small size of the area to be developed into consideration, the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on flood risk or on the safety of the residents of the property. As such the proposal would comply with Policy E7 and the revised NPPF.
- 8.13 **The impact on ecology**  
The application was supported by a bat survey which confirms that the property supports a bat roost. However the survey work and proposed mitigation measures are considered to avoid impact on the bats and so the proposal would comply with The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 and Policy E5.
- 8.14 **Impact on amenity**  
The proposed extension would lie to the rear of the property within the enclosed rear garden, and is set well back from any neighbouring residential properties. It is not considered that the proposal would have any significant impacts on any nearby properties, with regard to Policy LHW4.

9.0 **CONCLUSION**

9.1 The proposed rear extension would result in less than substantial harm to the Grade II listed building by virtue of the impact of the siting and size proposed. It is not considered that the scheme would have sufficient public benefits to outweigh this harm. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies E1 and E9 of the RLP as well as guidance contained in the revised NPPF. The proposal would comply with Policies COM2, E2, E5, E7 and LHW4.

10.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

**REFUSE for the reason:**

1. **The proposed extension would, by virtue of its siting and form, harm the ability to appreciate the historic form and appearance of the listed cottage, which would harm its special interest. The level of harm to the building's special interest is judged to be less than substantial, however, no public benefit has been demonstrated to arise from the scheme which would weigh against this harm. It is therefore considered that the proposed scheme does not meet the requirements of Policies E1 and E9 of the Local Plan.**

**Note to applicant:**

1. **In reaching this decision Test Valley Borough Council (TVBC) has had regard to the National Planning Policy Framework and takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions. TVBC work with applicants and their agents in a positive and proactive manner offering a pre-application advice service and updating applicants/agents of issues that may arise in dealing with the application and where possible suggesting solutions.**
-