

ITEM 7

APPLICATION NO.	16/00828/LBWN
APPLICATION TYPE	LISTED BUILDING WORKS - NORTH
REGISTERED	15.04.2016
APPLICANT	Mr Graham Stallard
SITE	Rose Cottage, 86 Little Ann Road, Little Ann, SP11 7NW, ABBOTTS ANN
PROPOSAL	Remove part of an internal wall to widen the entrance between the kitchen and adjoining room and install a steel beam
AMENDMENTS	
CASE OFFICER	Mr Oliver Woolf

Background paper (Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D)

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This application is referred to the Planning Control Committee because the Northern Area Planning Committee (NAPC) at their meeting on 02.06.2016 was minded to grant listed building consent where the Head of Planning and Building advised that there was a conflict with policy, with the Officer's recommendation being for refusal contrary to Revised Local Plan policy.
- 1.2 The report to the NAPC is attached as Appendix A. Conditions as advised by The Head of Planning and Building are attached as Appendix B.

2.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

- 2.1 It was recommended to the Northern Area Planning Committee that listed building consent be refused on the basis that the proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the listed building and demonstrates no public benefit to outweigh this harm.
- 2.2 Local Planning Authorities shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings as laid out within section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (RLP) state that where a proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm will be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing a viable use.
- 2.3 The Northern Area Planning Committee were minded to grant listed building consent, subject to conditions (to be advised by the Head of Planning and Building), on the basis that the less than significant harm would be outweighed by securing the listed building's viable use.

2.4 The listed building serves as a dwellinghouse. It is considered that this function is its optimum viable use and that the presence of the wall that is the subject of this application does not prejudice this. As such, the removal of part of the wall would not help to secure the listed building's viable use. It is considered that there would be no public benefit from the works to outweigh the less than substantial harm to the listed building's significance as laid out in policy E9 of the RLP and paragraph 134 of the NPPF.

3.0 **CONCLUSION**

3.1 It is considered that the proposal would have no public benefit to outweigh the less than substantial harm to the significance of the listed building. The proposal is not in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016 policy E9 and chapter 12 of the NPPF.

4.0 **RECOMMENDATION OF NOTHERNA AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE
PERMISSION subject to conditions and notes to be advised by the Head
of Planning and Building
(See Appendix B for conditions advised by the Head of Planning and
Building.)**

5.0 **RECOMMENDATION OF THE HEAD OF PLANNING AND BUILDING
REFUSE for the reason:**

1. The proposal, by virtue of the loss of historic fabric would have a harmful impact on the historic interest of the listed building. The proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the listed building and demonstrates no public benefit to outweigh this harm. As such it would be contrary to policy E9 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016 and chapter 12 of the NPPF.

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 A

Officer's Report to Northern Area Planning Committee on 2 June 2016

APPLICATION NO.	16/00828/LBWN
APPLICATION TYPE	LISTED BUILDING WORKS - NORTH
REGISTERED	15.04.2016
APPLICANT	Mr Graham Stallard
SITE	Rose Cottage, 86 Little Ann Road, Little Ann, SP11 7NW, ABBOTTS ANN
PROPOSAL	Remove part of an internal wall to widen the entrance between the kitchen and adjoining room and install a steel beam
AMENDMENTS	
CASE OFFICER	Mr Oliver Woolf
	Background paper (Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D)

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This application is brought to committee as there is a Member interest.

2.0 SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 Rose Cottage is a Grade II listed building within Abbots Ann Conservation Area. The date of listing is 30.04.1985 and reads *"House. C18, restored. Cob and thatch. 1 storey and attic, 3 above 2 windows. ½-hipped roof, with eaves raised above the upper windows. Rendered walls. Casements. Plain C20 boarded door. At the east side there is a single-storeyed projecting wing (C20) have a tiled roof and rendered walls."*

3.0 PROPOSAL

- 3.1 The proposal is to remove part of an internal wall to the listed building. The 125cm of wall to be removed would be 45cm less than that proposed in application 15/03000/LBWN, with the intention to address feedback given to that application. A steel beam would also be installed.
- 3.2 A Heritage Statement / Design and Access Statement is submitted with the application. This statement includes the following:
'Rose Cottage is an 18th century thatched cottage with a Victorian/Edwardian eastern side extension that has turned one of the original cob walls into an internal wall. There is also a substantial 21st century extension on the western side.

In the mid 20th century the cottage was allowed to decay and became dilapidated with little more than the walls and frame intact. A restoration project, thought to be 1970's, was completed on a low budget – as an example the cob walls were resurfaced with wire and cement render rather than the traditional lime with the result that many do not breathe properly,

blistering and erupting internally in places. The applicant has remedied the worst wall in question – internal, north – with lime, but this has proved too expensive to replicate throughout. This 1970's restoration has therefore already done much to reduce the proportionate importance of the significance of the heritage asset (NPPF Chapter 12 and policy E9 of the TVBC Revised Local Plan)'.

3.3 It continues to set out how the concerns raised with the previous withdrawn application proposals have, following discussions with the Council's Conservation and Planning officers, been responded to with this application. Reference is made to:

- Exploration establishing the underlying fabric of the wall
- The proposal removing substantially less of the internal wall than was proposed with the withdrawn application, a 125cm length in total (50cm plus 75cm) rather than a 170cm length, a reduction of 26%. So that with an added 45cm of the wall remaining the cellular relatively small room nature of the cottage will still be evident.
- The added 45cm of the wall that will remain acts as a substantial buttress to the stability of the south external wall.
- The heritage window, once external, on the north end of the internal wall will remain undisturbed as a fine feature of the cottage.

3.4 The statement concludes with:

'Consent is now sought on the basis that this new application would make a positive contribution to sustaining and enhancing the cottage (NPPF Chapter 12 and policy E9 of the TVBC Revised Local Plan)'.

4.0 **RELEVANT HISTORY**

4.1 15/03000/LBWN: Remove part of internal wall that separates kitchen and adjoining room to widen entrance. **Withdrawn** 28.01.2016

5.0 **CONSULTATIONS**

5.1 **Conservation Officer**– objection

The conservation consideration here is the significance of the existing building and the impact on that significance of the proposed alteration.

The cottage dates from the C18 and is of cob construction. Investigation has revealed that the wall between the snug and the kitchen is of cob – it is the end wall of the original structure and has an old window in it. There is an existing doorway opening (but without a door) between the snug and the kitchen and it proposed to widen this significantly to create a greater visual and physical connection between the rooms.

The NPPF and Policy E9 of the Local Plan require that any application which would result in harm to the significance of a heritage asset to be refused unless that harm is outweighed by a public benefit.

The significance of this cottage includes its plan-form and the character of the internal spaces, as well as the intrinsic value of the historic fabric. The proposal would significantly widen the existing doorway opening. This will substantially alter the character of the rooms and their relationship, As existing, the rooms are divided by the former end wall which has a doorway opening of conventional width in it; as proposed this balance of wall to void would be significantly changed and the historic separateness of the two spaces would be considerably diluted.

The traditional cellular nature of the interior would be eroded. It would also involve the loss of an amount of historic fabric. Therefore the significance of the asset would be harmed.

Although there is clearly a private benefit in this proposal (the kitchen is relatively small), there would be no public benefit to outweigh the harm to the building's significance, as required by the NPPF and Local Plan Policy.

6.0 **REPRESENTATIONS** Expired 13.05.2016

6.1 None 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)

E9: heritage

7.3 Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)

Abbotts Ann Village Design Statement

8.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

8.1 The main planning considerations is:

- The impact on the significance of the listed building

8.2 **The impact on the listed building**

Policy E9 states that development and/or works affecting a heritage asset will be permitted provided that:

- a) It would make a positive contribution to sustaining or enhancing the significance of the heritage asset taking account of its character, appearance and setting; and
- b) The significance of the heritage asset has informed the proposal through an assessment proportionate to its importance

8.3 Investigation of the wall that is the subject of the proposal has revealed it to be cob under a modern coating. The proposal would see the removal of a total of 1.25m of this wall that is situated between the kitchen and snug within the listed building. This wall is approximately 0.56m thick and would have formed an external wall of the original part of the listed building.

Whilst it is acknowledged that the extent of wall proposed to be removed has been reduced from that previously proposed, it is considered that the removal of part of an original wall as now proposed would still result in the loss of historic fabric and an alteration to the plan form of the listed building that would lead to less than substantial harm to its character and therefore significance. The details of this harm are as set out by the Conservation Officer at para.5.1 of this report.

- 8.4 Policy E9 and paragraph 134 of the NPPF state that less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset will be considered against any public benefits of the proposal, including securing a viable use. It is considered that the proposal would have no public benefit that would outweigh this harm. As such the proposal does not comply with policy E9 of the RLP and chapter 12 of the NPPF.

9.0 **CONCLUSION**

- 9.1 The proposal is considered to be unacceptable, as it would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the listed building that is not outweighed by any public benefit of the proposal. The proposal is not in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016 policy E9 and chapter 12 of the NPPF.

10.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

REFUSE for the reason:

1. **The removal of part of the internal wall involves the loss of historic fabric that would substantially alter the character of the rooms and their relationship, considerably diluting the historic separateness of the two spaces so that the traditional cellular nature of the interior would be eroded. This would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the heritage asset (the listed building), which is not outweighed by any public benefits of the proposal. The proposal is contrary to policy E9 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016 and chapter 12 of the NPPF.**
-

Appendix B

Suggested conditions and notes as advised by the Head of Planning and Building

1.0 SUGGESTED CONDITIONS

- 1. The works hereby consented to shall be begun within three years from the date of this permission.
Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.**
 - 2. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plan, titled “Proposed Plans”.
Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.**
 - 3. No part of the wall shall be removed until details of how the walls and ceiling will be made good after the works have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: To sustain the significance of the listed building having regard to policy E9 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.**
 - 4. The structural beam shall not be inserted into the building until full details showing how it will be fitted into the historic fabric (to include a method statement and scale drawings) have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. All works shall then be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: To ensure the works minimise loss of historic fabric in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016 policy E9.**
-