

## ITEM 8

---

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	12/02138/FULLN
<b>APPLICATION TYPE</b>	FULL APPLICATION - NORTH
<b>REGISTERED</b>	09.10.2012
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Miss Caroline Primrose
<b>SITE</b>	Yonder Dene, Ragged Appleshaw, Andover, <b>APPLESHAW</b>
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Partial demolition of existing rear extension and replace with two storey extension and orangery, new porch and extend cellar
<b>AMENDMENTS</b>	Additional information: 06.12.12
<b>CASE OFFICER</b>	Mrs Kate Chapman / Mr Jason Owen

Background paper (Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D)

---

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The application is referred to Planning Control Committee (PCC) as Northern Area Planning Committee (NAPC), at its meeting on the 6 December 2012, resolved to recommend granting planning permission for the proposed development where the Head of Planning and Building was recommending refusal because of a conflict with Policy.
- 1.2
- A copy of the NAPC Agenda report is attached at **Appendix A**.
  - A copy of the NAPC Update Paper is attached at **Appendix B**.
  - A suggested list of conditions is included at **Appendix C**.
- 1.3 The consultation response of the Conservation Officer is provided, in full, in Para 5.1 of the NAPC agenda report. The Case Officer has undertaken an assessment of the issues, against Policy, in Para 8.4 – 8.6 (inclusive) (Appendix A).
- 1.4 The list of conditions and notes contained at Appendix C has been prepared by the Head of Planning and Building in consultation with the Conservation Officer. The wording of Note to Applicant (No.4) has been formed on the basis of the resolution reached by Members at NAPC.

### 2.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

- 2.1 The main focus of the PCC should be to establish if the proposed works would preserve the special character, appearance and setting of the Listed Building. In doing so the LPA would have discharged its legal duty to consider the effect of works on the special architectural and historic interest of this Listed property.
- 2.2 Each of the following paragraphs identify different aspects of the overall proposal and provide a more detailed explanation of the effect these works would have on the Listed Building. It is concluded when these different aspects are taken either on an individual basis, or cumulatively,

the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character, appearance and setting of the Listed building, to its overall detriment.

### 2.3 Proposed two storey extension

- (i) *The extension will rise to a maximum height of approximately 6.75m to ridge.*

The extension will, for the first time, result in the hipped roof of the main dwelling being affected by works. The form and appearance of the roof is an important feature of this Listed building in that it can be identified as a complete, surviving architectural feature of the building. The height of the proposal will mean that this will be a permanent and deleterious effect on the character and setting of the Listed Building.

- (ii) *The proposal will result in the eaves level of the main dwelling being breached for the first time.*

One of the most identifiable features of the Listed building is that none of the later additions have affected the eaves line of the dwelling. In this respect the eaves line is unobstructed and contiguous around all four elevations of the main dwelling. One of the important features of this Listed building is that the original form of the building can be clearly identified and as such is an important surviving architectural feature of the building worthy of preserving.

- (iii) *The proposed extension will project, at two storey level, from the rear elevation of the main dwelling by a distance of 7m (excluding the porch).*

Excluding the bay windows to the front of the dwelling (which the Conservation officer considers are likely to be later additions) the total depth of the main dwelling is approximately 8.2m. In this respect the proposal represents a very significant addition to the form, layout and proportion of the main dwelling. In this respect Officers consider that the extension would be inconsistent with the massing and detailing of the original dwelling, and, as a consequence, “*overwhelm and dominate*” the original dwelling. Officers consider that one of the important features of this Listed building is that the original form and scale of the building can be identified and, as a consequence, forms an important surviving feature defining the character of the building, which is important to preserve.

- (iv) *The proposed extension would result in a greater proportion of the rear elevation of the main dwelling being covered by later built form than what exist at present.*

The elevation that would accommodate the two storey extension currently includes a range of buildings (a two storey extension and a single storey outbuilding). The form, height and massing of these features suggests that they performed a ‘lower order’ purpose to that of the main dwelling. Consequently much of the rear wall of the original dwelling remains visible and is an important feature worthy of preserving.

## 2.4 **Proposed single storey extension (Orangery)**

- (i) *Design and form is unsympathetic and relate poorly to the Listed building*

The Conservation officer describes the single storey Orangery building as “inelegant and would relate poorly with the existing building”. In this respect he is critical of the high parapet wall and flat roof construction of the structure and how it would relate to the more traditionally detailed main dwelling. The design of the resultant extension in this respect would represent an inappropriate feature to the Listed building that detracts from its special architectural and historic interest.

- (ii) *Size of the extension is unsympathetic and would relate poorly to the Listed Building.*

The proposal extends across, and therefore obscures the remaining section of the original side wall of the Listed Building. Part of this flank wall has already been obscured by the provision of a single storey extension from the 1930's (pre-Listing) and in this respect any further loss is unacceptable. In addition to this, and when seen in conjunction with the design of the Orangery, (discussed above) the proposal would not relate well to the special architectural and historic interest of the Listed building.

- 2.5 Members will note that plans showing the originally refused planning permission application ref. 12/01287/FULLN were included in the NAPC agenda report (now at Appendix A). The design and size of the single storey extension in that scheme was considered to be acceptable. This was because of its simple lean-to design and that it did not extend across, and therefore obscure, the external wall of the main dwelling.

## 3.0 **RECOMMENDATION OF NORTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE PERMISSION**

## 4.0 **RECOMMENDATION OF HEAD OF PLANNING AND BUILDING REFUSE for the reasons:**

1. **The proposed two storey extension by virtue of its, scale, height, massing would overwhelm and dominate the original dwelling and would therefore change the character and setting of the Listed Building, detracting from its special architectural and historic interest. The development is therefore contrary to policies ENV13 and ENV17 of the adopted Test Valley Borough Local Plan 2006.**
2. **The proposed orangery by virtue of its size and design is considered to be unsympathetic and relate poorly to the listed building and as such would harm the character and setting of the listed building contrary to policies ENV13 and ENV17 of the adopted Test Valley Borough Local Plan 2006.**

## **APPENDIX A**

### **Officer's Report to Northern Area Planning Committee – 6 December 2012**

---

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	12/02138/FULLN
<b>APPLICATION TYPE</b>	FULL APPLICATION - NORTH
<b>REGISTERED</b>	09.10.2012
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Miss Caroline Primrose
<b>SITE</b>	Yonder Dene, Ragged Appleshaw, Andover, <b>APPLESHAW</b>
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Partial demolition of existing rear extension and replace with two storey extension and orangery, new porch and extend cellar
<b>AMENDMENTS</b>	
<b>CASE OFFICER</b>	Mrs Kate Chapman

Background paper (Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D)

---

#### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

1.1 This application is being referred to Northern Area Planning Committee at the request of a Ward Member.

#### **2.0 SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION**

2.1 Yonder Dene is located within the rural village of Ragged Appleshaw in which the building is grade II listed.

#### **3.0 PROPOSAL**

3.1 The application is for the partial demolition of the existing rear extension and replacing it with a two storey extension and orangery. The proposal also includes a new porch and extension of the cellar.

3.2 Yonder Dene is a grade II listed building and comprises of a number of single storey and two storey extensions. The application proposes the removal of an existing two storey rear extension and replacing it with another larger two storey rear extension and single storey orangery. The two storey extension is approximately 7 metres in length, 6.8 metres wide and 6.7 metres in height.

3.3 The application is a resubmission following a previous refusal. The main changes to this scheme include:

- The length of the two storey extension has been reduced by approximately 0.5 metres.
- The width of the two extensions has been reduced by approximately 0.2 metres.
- The height of the two storey extension has been reduced by 0.1 metres.
- The lean-to kitchen extension has been replaced with an orangery.

#### 4.0 HISTORY

4.1 12/01288/LBWN - Part demolition of rear extension and replace with two storey extension with porch, extend cellar and internal alterations – Pending consideration.

12/01287/FULLN - Part demolition of rear extension and replace with two storey extension with porch, single storey side extension and extend cellar – Refused 04.09.2012 for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposed two storey extension by virtue of its, scale, height, massing which is further emphasised by the proposed single storey side extension would overwhelm and dominate the original dwelling and would therefore change the character and setting of the Listed Building, detracting from its special architectural and historic interest. The development is therefore contrary to policies ENV13 and ENV17 of the adopted Test Valley Borough Local Plan 2006.**
- 2. The historic significance of the building has not been sufficiently demonstrated and as such the proposed development may result in the loss of historic fabric which would be detrimental to the historic interest of the listed building. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy ENV13 of the Test Valley Borough Local Plan 2006 and does not adhere to paragraph 128 of the National Planning Policy Framework.**

12/01288/LBWN - Part demolition of rear extension and replace with two storey extension with porch, single storey side extension, extend cellar and internal alterations – Refused 04.09.2012.

TVN.06541/4 - Erection of stable block – Permission 28.04.2004.

TVN.06541/3 - Erection of detached double garage on site of existing shed (renewal of TVN.6541/2) – Permission 09.02.2004.

TVN.LB.00597/3 - Demolition of existing shed (renewal of TVN.LB.00597/2) – Consent 09.02.2004.

TVN.06541/1 - Erection of detached double garage on site of existing shed – Permission 01.12.1993.

TVN.LB.00597/1 - Demolition of existing shed – Consent 30.11.1993.

TVN.06541 - Erection of porch and covered way and internal/external alterations - 02.09.1993.

#### 5.0 CONSULTATIONS

5.1 **Conservation** – Objection:

- The proposed extension has been slightly reduced in size from the previous proposal, however it would still dominate the rear of the house and be detrimental to its character. The application suggests that the existing two storey kitchen wing is later though no evidence is offered for this assertion, although it is clear that it has been altered in the late C20.

Notwithstanding the significance of this wing, it is perfectly appropriate to the character of the building and the replacement wing would be significantly larger, to the detriment of the character of the building.

- The proposed single storey side extension on the NW front is, with its high parapet and a flat roof, inelegant and would relate poorly to the existing building, such that none of the side wall of the main block nor of the kitchen wing would be visible at ground floor level.
- The application does include some analysis of the historic structure and its development which is helpful, however much of it is assertion without supporting evidence. The existing rear two storey wing may be a later addition but that is not to say it has no significance. If it was a service range as argued, incorporating a pump etc. then that is in itself of some interest, as stated in previous comments, old maps suggest it was part of a longer range of buildings. If it is proposed to demolish it then greater analysis is required, both of the existing structure (e.g. does the roof structure survive?) and documentary sources (the tithe map would be an obvious port of call).
- However should it be shown that the wing was of little significance, the impact of the proposed replacement would remain. The proposed additions would result in substantial harm to the listed building and therefore, as advised in paragraph 133 of the NPPF, the application should be refused.

**Ecology** – No objection.

6.0 **REPRESENTATIONS** Expired 13.11.2012

6.1 **Parish Council** – No objection.

7.0 **POLICY**

7.1 Government Guidance: National Planning Policy Framework.

Test Valley Borough Local Plan: Policies:

SET03 – Development in the countryside

SET06 – Frontage infill policy areas in the countryside

SET12 – The alteration or extension of existing dwellings in the countryside

TRA02 – Parking standards

DES05 – Layout and siting

DES06 – Scale, height and massing

DES07 – Appearance, details and materials

AME01 – Privacy and private open space

AME02 – Daylight and sunlight

ENV05 – Protected species

ENV13 – Alterations to listed buildings

ENV17 – Setting of Listed Buildings.

8.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

8.1 The main planning considerations are:

- The principle of development
- Impact on the surrounding area

- Impact on the Listed Building
- Impact on neighbouring residential amenities
- Impact on protected species
- Impact on highways.

**The principle of development**

- 8.2 The site is located in the countryside and as such policy SET03 of the TVBLP aims to restrict development unless there is an overriding need for the development in this location, or if it is considered to be of a type of development considered appropriate in the countryside, as set out in the other relevant policies within the Local Plan. Policy SET12 of the TVBLP recognises that extensions to existing dwellings in the countryside are a development appropriate in such locations provided that either the dwelling has a curtilage abutting a Frontage Infill Policy Area or is subject to other design criteria. In this instance the dwelling to be extended abuts a Frontage Infill Policy Area and as such, in principle, the erection of an extension is considered acceptable.

**Impact on the character of the surrounding area**

- 8.3 The proposed single storey side extension is located to the rear of the site and therefore views of this development are restricted. The proposed two storey extension due to its siting would not be visible when travelling along the road in a north easterly direction. Views of the extension would be visible when travelling in a south westerly direction however this would be more readily available when in closer proximity to the approach of the site due to vegetation along the road frontage. In addition considering the varying size of properties within the area it is not considered that the proposed development would appear out of keeping within the surrounding area.

**Impact on the character and setting of the listed building**

- 8.4 The existing extensions on the rear elevation are considered to be modest in size to the main dwelling house. They are therefore subordinate to the building. While recognising that the proposed two storey extension has been reduced in size from the previously refused scheme, the extension proposed is nevertheless of a size (scale, height and massing) that is inconsistent with the detailing of the listed building and would therefore overwhelm and dominate the original dwelling, detracting from the character and setting of the listed building.
- 8.5 The proposed orangery is to be sited on the north west elevation of the existing dwelling and the proposed two storey extension. Whilst the orangery is smaller in width compared to the previously refused single storey side extension, by approximately 0.3 metres, it is however longer in length by approximately 3.1 metres, screening the side wall of the main house as well as kitchen wing. Considering this in conjunction with the orangery's design which incorporates a flat roof and a surrounding parapet, it is considered to appear at odds and relate poorly to the character of the existing building and as such detract from its character and setting.



**Impact on the historic fabric of the listed building**

- 8.6 The proposal would require the removal of an existing two storey extension and alterations to the internal layout of the property. Whilst the application has been supported with a Heritage Statement this document does not sufficiently demonstrate the historic significance of the building and as such the Local Planning Authority cannot reasonably conclude that the proposed development would not result in an unacceptable loss of historic fabric to the listed building. In this respect the loss of the existing fabric is not justified and would result in significant harm to the special character of the listed building.

**Impact on neighbouring residential amenities**

- 8.7 The main neighbouring property to consider is 1 Appleshaw Dene. First floor windows are proposed on the north eastern elevation of the two storey extension. Considering the separation between these windows and the neighbouring property and that there is an existing first floor window in the existing two storey extension it is not considered that the proposed development would result in an unacceptable level of overlooking to the detriment of the neighbouring property. In addition, considering the siting of the development in relation to the existing dwelling and the separation of the development from the neighbouring property it is also not considered that the proposed development would appear unduly overbearing or result in an unacceptable level of overshadowing.

**Impact on protected species**

- 8.8 The application has been submitted with appropriate information regarding the developments impact on bats which are legally protected. The findings found no evidence of bats at the site and limiting bat roosting potential. The findings also indicated that the development had the potential to affect nesting birds which are also legally protected, however considering that the proposed development will still provide an open porch structure it is not considered that the proposal would result in a net loss of biodiversity.

**Impact on highways**

- 8.9 There is sufficient space within the site for the parking and turning of vehicles in accordance with the Councils adopted standards, therefore it is considered that the proposed development would not have a significant adverse impact on highway safety.

**Impact on flooding**

- 8.10 The proposed development falls within flood zone 3. The agent has submitted a Flood Risk Assessment. The application proposes to extend an existing cellar and is will not serve as a habitable room. The Environment Agency were consulted on the previously refused application and raised no comment. As such it is considered the proposed development is acceptable with regards to flood risk.



9.0 **CONCLUSION**

9.1 The proposed two storey extension by virtue of its, scale, height, massing would overwhelm and dominate the original dwelling and would therefore change the character and setting of the Listed Building, detracting from its special architectural and historic interest. The development is therefore contrary to policies ENV13 and ENV17 of the adopted Test Valley Borough Local Plan 2006.

9.2 The proposed orangery by virtue of its size and design is considered to be unsympathetic and relate poorly to the listed building and as such would harm the character and setting of the listed building contrary to policies ENV13 and ENV17 of the adopted Test valley Borough Local Plan 2006.

9.3 The historic significance of the building has not been sufficiently demonstrated and as such the proposed development would result in the unjustified loss of historic fabric which would be detrimental to the historic interest of the listed building. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy ENV13 of the Test Valley Borough Local Plan 2006 and does not adhere to paragraph 128 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

10.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

**REFUSE for the reasons:**

1. **The proposed two storey extension by virtue of its, scale, height, massing would overwhelm and dominate the original dwelling and would therefore change the character and setting of the Listed Building, detracting from its special architectural and historic interest. The development is therefore contrary to policies ENV13 and ENV17 of the adopted Test Valley Borough Local Plan 2006.**
  2. **The proposed orangery by virtue of its size and design is considered to be unsympathetic and relate poorly to the listed building and as such would harm the character and setting of the listed building contrary to policies ENV13 and ENV17 of the adopted Test valley Borough Local Plan 2006.**
  3. **The historic significance of the building has not been sufficiently demonstrated and as such the proposed development would result in the unjustified loss of historic fabric which would be detrimental to the historic interest of the listed building. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy ENV13 of the Test Valley Borough Local Plan 2006 and does not adhere to paragraph 128 of the National Planning Policy Framework.**
-

## **APPENDIX B**

### **Update Report to Northern Area Planning Committee – 6 December 2012**

---

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	12/02138/FULLN
<b>SITE</b>	Yonder Dene, Ragged Appleshaw, Andover, APPLESHAW
<b>COMMITTEE DATE</b>	6 December 2012
<b>ITEM NO.</b>	9
<b>PAGE NO.</b>	74 - 91

---

#### **1.0 ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

Additional information has been submitted by the applicant's agent on the 6 December 2012. This included an extract from an 1839 Tithe Map which now indicates that the existing two storey rear extension proposed to be removed is a later addition. As such it is considered that the historic significance of the building has been sufficiently demonstrated and now overcomes reason for refusal 3. No objection has been raised by other internal works proposed within this application subject to appropriate conditions being imposed.

#### **2.0 HISTORY**

2.1 Within paragraph 4.1 the first application referred to is:

12/01288/LBWN - Part demolition of rear extension and replace with two storey extension with porch, extend cellar and internal alterations – Pending consideration.

This should however read:

12/02144/LBWN - Partial demolition of existing rear extension and replace with two storey extension and orangery, new porch, minor internal alterations and extend cellar – Pending consideration.

#### **3.0 OTHER MATTERS**

From 1 December 2012 all planning application decision notices are required to have a statement explaining how, in dealing with the application, the local planning authority have worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner based on seeking solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with a planning application. Consequently a suitable note is added to the recommendation.

#### **4.0 AMENDED RECOMMENDATION**

4.1 **REFUSE as per reasons 1 and 2 of the main agenda and additional note 1.**

1. **The proposed two storey extension by virtue of its, scale, height, massing would overwhelm and dominate the original dwelling and would therefore change the character and setting of the Listed Building, detracting from its special architectural and historic interest. The development is therefore contrary to policies ENV13 and ENV17 of the adopted Test Valley Borough Local Plan 2006.**

2. **The proposed orangery by virtue of its size and design is considered to be unsympathetic and relate poorly to the listed building and as such would harm the character and setting of the listed building contrary to policies ENV13 and ENV17 of the adopted Test valley Borough Local Plan 2006.**

**Note to applicant:**

1. **In reaching this decision Test Valley Borough Council (TVBC) has had regard to paragraphs 186 and 187 of 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.**
-

## **APPENDIX C**

### **SUGGESTED LIST OF CONDITIONS**

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun within three years from the date of this permission.  
Reason: To comply with the provision of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
2. No works to the roof of the extension hereby permitted shall commence until such time as samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the roof surface hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out only in accordance with the approved details. The colour of external render to be used on the extensions shall match the existing dwelling.  
Reason: To ensure that harm is not caused to the character and appearance of the listed building in accordance with Test Valley Borough Local Plan 2006 policy ENV13.
3. The new guttering shall match the existing guttering in material and colour found on the main building.  
Reason: To ensure that harm is not caused to the character and appearance of the listed building in accordance with Test Valley Borough Local Plan 2006 policy ENV13.

#### **Notes to applicant:**

1. The following policies in the Development Plans are relevant to this decision: South East Plan – May 2009: BE6; Test Valley Borough Local Plan: SET03 SET06 SET12 TRA02 DES05DES06 DES07 AME01 AME02 ENV05 ENV13 ENV17.
  2. Please ensure that all development/works complies with the approved plans. Any changes must be advised and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority before they are carried out. This may require the submission of a new planning application. Failure to do so may result in enforcement action/prosecution.
  3. In reaching this decision Test Valley Borough Council (TVBC) has had regard to paragraphs 186 and 187 of 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.
  4. The decision to grant planning permission has been taken because, the proposed development would not give rise to an adverse impact on the character, fabric and setting of the Listed Building, would not give rise to an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area, or adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring properties. This informative is only intended as a summary of the reason for grant of planning permission. For further details on the decision please see the application report which is available from the Planning Service.
-