

ITEM 12

APPLICATION NO.	18/02092/LBWS
APPLICATION TYPE	FULL APPLICATION - SOUTH
REGISTERED	07.08.2018
APPLICANT	Mr And Mrs M Parrott
SITE	29 Jessam Cottage, West Tytherley, Salisbury, SP5 1NF, WEST TYTHERLEY AND FRENCHMOOR
PROPOSAL	Single storey rear extension to provide an extended kitchen
AMENDMENTS	None
CASE OFFICER	Mr Jacob Cooke

Background paper (Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D)

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The application is presented to the Southern Area Planning Committee at the request of a Member for the reason of being more than local interest.

2.0 SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The site is located within the settlement of West Tytherley. The Grade II listed building is a detached two storey property of timber frame and brick infill with thatched roof and white timber. Development has occurred to the rear of the property resulting in a two storey extension with thatched roof, and a single storey slate roof lean-to. Parking is situated to the rear. Boundary treatment to the front and side elevation is hedging of varying heights.

3.0 PROPOSAL

- 3.1 Single storey rear extension to provide an extended kitchen joining onto the existing slate roof lean-to measuring 5.6 metres by 3.8 metres, with a ridge height of 3.8 metres and eaves of 2.2 metres. The applicant has confirmed in writing that the lean-to is slowly deteriorating showing signs of damp and has a parasite infestation.

4.0 HISTORY

- 4.1 **18/01046/FULLS** Single storey rear extension to provide Kitchen and W/C
REFUSE 08.06.2018

Item was presented to the Southern Area Planning Committee on the 6th June 2018.

Reason for refusal: The proposed extension will not make a positive contribution to sustaining the significance of the designated heritage assets (listed building and conservation area) affected, contrary to National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 131, 132 and 134, also Policies E1 and E9 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.

- 4.2 **18/01047/LBWS** Single storey rear extension to provide Kitchen and W/C
REFUSE 08.06.2018

Item was presented to the Southern Area Planning Committee on the 6th June 2018.

Reason for refusal: The proposed extension will not make a positive contribution to sustaining the significance of the designated heritage assets (listed building and conservation area) affected, contrary to National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 131, 132 and 134, also Policies E1 and E9 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.

- 4.3 Figure 1 below shows the proposed plan for the previously refused scheme 18/01046/FULLS and the associated listed building consent application 18/01047/LBWS.




Figure 1: Previously refused scheme under applications 18/01046/FULLS and 18/01047/LBWS.

- 4.4 **18/00294/FULLS** Single storey rear extension to provide Kitchen and W/C **REFUSED** 29.01.2018

Decision was issued under Delegated Authority.

Reason for refusal: The proposed extension will not make a positive contribution to sustaining the significance of the designated heritage assets (listed building and conservation area) affected, contrary to National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 131, 132 and 134, also Policies E1 and E9 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.

- 4.5 **18/00295/LBWS** Single storey rear extension to provide Kitchen and W/C and removal of existing external wall of 'lean to' **REFUSED** 29.01.2018

Decision was issued under Delegated Authority.

Reason for refusal: The proposed extension will not make a positive contribution to sustaining the significance of the designated heritage assets (listed building and conservation area) affected, contrary to National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 131, 132 and 134, also Policies E1 and E9 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.

- 4.6 Figure 2 below shows the proposed plan for the previously refused scheme 18/00294/FULLS and the associated listed building consent application 18/00295/LBWS.




Figure 2: Previously refused scheme under application 18/00294/FULLS and 18/00295/LBWS.

5.0 **CONSULTATIONS**

5.1 **Conservation: Objection:**

The cottage is timber framed and thatched and dates from the C17. At the rear is a small brick wing of the C18, also thatched. At the rear of the timber framed part is a slate-roofed brick lean-to, described as approximately 50 years old. The latter may have replaced a similar earlier lean-to structure as the footprint of the cottage as shown on late C19 OS maps is similar to the present one. This is a traditional means of extending vernacular buildings.

As a listed building the cottage is a designated heritage assets as is the conservation area in which it is situated.

The proposal is to add a single-storey kitchen extension to the rear, attaching it to the existing single-storey lean-to. In itself it would be of traditional form and materials, of painted brick and with a hipped tile roof. However, as a form of extension to such a cottage it would not represent a traditional approach, and in this case would be harmful to the significance of the listed cottage as a heritage asset.

The existing lean-to addition is a traditional method of extending vernacular buildings of this type. The proposals retain this but the addition would be positioned in front of it, largely negating its visual contribution to the building's character. The proposed extension would not be integrated well with the existing building and, indeed, would have the appearance of a free-standing building which happens to be attached to the cottage.

It is considered that it will not be possible to achieve an extension providing the accommodation required by the applicants in this location without resulting in harm to the significance of the heritage assets. There would be no public benefits sufficient to offset this harm.

5.2 **Ecology:** No concerns – subject to note.

6.0 **REPRESENTATIONS** Expired 13.09.2018

6.1 **Parish Council:** No comment.

6.2 **5 x letters of support (summarised):**

- No visual impact on any neighbouring properties or the road.
- Current kitchen not suitable as cold and damp.
- Improving the listed cottage will ensure its survival.
- Opposite application site is a modern utilitarian residential social housing block and village shop.
- The proposal has no real impact on our local landscape.
- Proposal represents a significant improvement to the essential amenities of the cottage.
- Support the application as a sensible compromise between the quality demands of sustainable modern family life and the aesthetic demands of the local development plan.
- Wholly appropriate improvement to a building which is in essential need of improvement to its basic facilities.
- Proposed upgrade is absolutely essential to create a viable living space and modern family home, whilst maintaining the listed property as an asset to the village and the local community.
- Crucial for houses this age to be updated to meet the needs of family life.
- Without updating there is a real danger that these houses will fall into disrepair, as they will not be suitable for modern family living.
- Without us looking after these character properties village characteristics are in danger of being lost forever.
- The proposal will have minimal visual impact on the house from most aspects but will make it a much more viable family home.

7.0 **POLICY**

7.1 Government Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

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

Policy E5 – Biodiversity

Policy E9 – Heritage

7.3 Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)

West Tytherley – Conservation Area Policy

8.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

8.1 The main planning considerations are:

- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990
- Impact on the Conservation Area
- Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Listed Building
- Impact on biodiversity

8.2 **Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990**

Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 imposes a statutory duty on decision makers in considering whether to grant consent for works that affect 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 interest which it possess.

8.3 Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires the decision maker to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a Listed Building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possess. Considerable weight must therefore be given to the preservation of the listed building, including its setting.

8.4 The House of Lords in *South Lakeland District Council v Secretary of State for the Environment* case decided that the “statutorily desirable object of preserving the character or appearance of an area is achieved either by a positive contribution to preservation or by development which leaves character of appearance unharmed, that is to say preserved.

8.5 **Impact on the Conservation Area**

The proposal would only achieve glimpsed public views from the adjacent highway of The Village. Views of the ridge would be possible from Chalkpit Lane, however as this would also be a glimpsed view, on balance, the proposal would not have a detrimental impact to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Therefore, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policy E9 of the TVBRLP for this aspect.

8.6 **Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Listed Building**

The character and appearance of the area is traditional in the use of materials and building style. The neighbouring properties of Nutshall Cottage, The Dove House, Collarmakers, and Village Farm are examples of this whereby the use of timber frame with white brick infill is prominent with roof types of thatch and clay tile. The current proposal features brick painted white with reclaimed red/brown clay tiles. The white painted brick will match the existing dwelling house, while the red/brown tile is a material not used on the existing thatched dwelling house but is present on the outbuilding to the rear.

- 8.7 The proposed roof design is considered to adversely impact the character and appearance of the existing dwelling house. It is acknowledged that any roof to the proposed extension should not be a replication of the thatch to the existing dwelling house. However, the proposed roof design is considered to be an unsympathetic feature to the dwelling detrimentally impacting its appearance. It is also apparent that the ridge height has not been informed by an assessment of what the visual impact would be on the listed building. The proposed roof, in considering its ridge height, would interrupt an important view of the buildings historic features. This is unacceptable as the proposed roof would not enhance, sustain, or converse the listed building.
- 8.8 The proposed extension greatly impacts views of the rear of the dwelling due to its positioning. When compared to the previously refused schemes, the proposal has been shifted north with a marginal decrease in footprint. The 5.6 metre span for the extension has resulted in it becoming a dominant feature to the rear elevation.
- 8.9 The existing dwelling features a strong rectangular plan form. As shown on the proposed north elevation, the rear extension goes beyond the existing building line of the 18th century two storey extension. Therefore, this is considered to have a detrimental impact on the regular, rectangular plan form which would not compliment the character and appearance of the building.
- 8.10 The proposed development, due to its roof design and attachment to the existing lean-to creates an unsympathetic and unusual juxtaposition creating the appearance of linking an outbuilding to the listed building, rather than a sympathetically designed extension which does not detract from the dominance of the existing dwelling house.
- 8.11 The proposal is considered to be harmful to the significance of the Listed Building. The proposed design does not compliment, integrate or respect the listed building. As such, the proposed is considered to be of poor design and would not make a positive contribution to sustaining the significance of the designated heritage asset. While the proposed materials are traditional per se, the design of a hipped roof and clay tile are not methods which conserve the listed building. The existing lean-to demonstrates the traditional method of extending a historic building such as this. Therefore, the attachment of a disjointed outbuilding to the existing lean-to would not integrate well with the existing building resulting in an adverse impact significantly harming the listed building. The harm created by the proposal is not outweighed by any public benefit due to remedial works can be carried out to the existing lean-to for damp issues, thermal efficiency to be improved, and parasite infestation. No loss of historic fabric would occur as the area affected is a relatively modern rear extension. The proposal does not comply with Policy E1 and E9 of the TVBRLP.
- 9.0 **CONCLUSION**
- 9.1 Under such circumstances, paragraph 196 of the NPPF and Policy E9 advises that the harm created by the proposed design, appearance and plan form should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, which includes

the securing of optimal viable use of listed buildings. The applicant is of the opinion that the proposal would be beneficial because it would enable an inclusive and accessible home with better thermal efficiency. However, the viable use of the property as a residential dwelling is not dependent on the proposal as the building has an ongoing residential use that would not cease in its absence. The issues raised under the previously refused applications has not been addressed as the proposed plan form and roof design also adversely impacts the existing listed building due to the projection beyond the rear building line of the existing two storey extension and the dual pitch hipped roof.

10.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

REFUSE for the reason:

- 1. The proposed extension will not make a positive contribution to sustaining the significance of the designated heritage asset (listed building) affected, contrary to National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 192, 193 and 196 also Policies E1 and E9 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.**

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.**
-