

---

|                         |  |
|-------------------------|--|
| <b>APPLICATION NO.</b>  | 18/02443/FULLS   |
| <b>APPLICATION TYPE</b> | FULL APPLICATION - SOUTH   |
| <b>REGISTERED</b>       | 19.09.2018   |
| <b>APPLICANT</b>        | Mr Norman Oldmeadow  |
| <b>SITE</b>             | Linden House Cottage, Linden Road, Romsey, SO51 8DA, <b>ROMSEY TOWN (ABBEY)</b>  |
| <b>PROPOSAL</b>         | Alterations within wing of house, two storey extension on garden side and enclosed porch at front entrance                                 |
| <b>AMENDMENTS</b>       | Received on 09.11.2018: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Amended Proposed Plans and Elevations (fenestration alterations)</li></ul> |
| <b>CASE OFFICER</b>     | Mr Graham Melton   |

Background paper (Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D)

---

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The application is presented to Southern Area Planning Committee in accordance with the Member and Officer Interests Protocol.

## 2.0 SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 Linden House Cottage is a Grade II listed property, located on the east side of Linden Road in the conservation and settlement area of Romsey.
- 2.2 Linden House Cottage itself is dated 1844 and re-modelled in 1926 as a dwelling, with further alterations of the 1980s and external additions 2006. Its significance lies in its intrinsic interest as a 1840s extension to a late Georgian house, possibly originally a coach house. The 1920s alterations included new windows, re-building of the west elevation, and internal alterations with attractive joinery and other details, including the fireplaces, particularly the one on the first floor with dark glazed faience. The 2006 alterations have not had a significant impact on the historic significance of this part of the building.

## 3.0 PROPOSAL

- 3.1 The proposal is for the erection of a two storey extension, measuring approximately 4.6m by 4.4m by 7.2m, to adjoin the rear (east) elevation of the existing dwelling.
- 3.2 In addition, the proposed scheme includes the addition of a single storey porch, measuring approximately 3.2m by 1.8m by 2.9m to adjoin the front (west) elevation of the host property. In association with the proposed extensions, the proposal includes a number of internal alterations on ground floor and first floor.
- 3.3 The proposed scheme is identical to the applications previously refused at Southern Area Planning Committee (paragraphs 4.4 and 4.5), apart from the following exceptions:

- Removal of a two storey projection adjoining the (south) elevation of the proposed rear (east) extension.
- Omission of a ground floor window in the side (north) elevation and alteration to the style of external doors in the rear (east) elevation.
- Insertion of an internal glazed panel at ground floor level, between the entrance lobby and living area, alteration to the opening between the dayroom and kitchen/dining area.

3.4 The previously refused proposed plans and elevations for application references 17/03232/FULLS and 17/03233/LBWS (paragraphs 4.4 and 4.5) are attached as **Appendix A** to this agenda report.

#### 4.0 **HISTORY**

4.1 **18/02442/LBWS** - Alterations within wing of house, two storey extension on garden side and enclosed porch at front entrance. *Pending Consideration.*

4.2 **18/02444/FULLS** - Alterations within wing of house, two storey extension on North gable end and single storey glazed roof extension on garden side. *Application withdrawn on 19.11.2018.*

4.3 **18/02445/LBWS** - Alterations within wing of house, two storey extension on North gable end and single storey glazed roof extension on garden side. *Application withdrawn on 19.11.2018.*

4.4 **17/03232/FULLS** - Alterations within existing wing of house, two storey extension on garden side and enclosed porch at front entrance. *Application refused on 07.03.2018 for the following reason, as resolved at the 08.03.2018 Southern Area Planning Committee meeting:*

01. The proposed development to the existing dwelling, due to the harm caused by the loss of historic fabric, the alteration to the existing linear built form and the visual impact on the overall character of the listed building and conservation area, would not make a positive contribution to sustaining or enhancing the significance of the heritage asset in accordance with Policy E9 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016. Furthermore, the harm (less than substantial) of the proposed development would not be outweighed by any public benefit, as required by Policy E9 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016 and paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

4.5 **17/03233/LBWS** - Alterations within existing wing of house, two storey extension on garden side and enclosed porch at front entrance. *Application refused on 07.03.2018 for the following reason, as resolved at the 08.03.2018 Southern Area Planning Committee meeting:*

01. The proposed development to the existing dwelling, due to the harm caused by the loss of historic fabric, the alteration to the existing linear built form and the visual impact on the overall character of the listed building and conservation area, would not make a positive contribution to

sustaining or enhancing the significance of the heritage asset in accordance with Policy E9 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016. Furthermore, the harm (less than substantial) of the proposed development would not be outweighed by any public benefit, as required by Policy E9 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016 and paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

- 4.6 **17/01226/FULLS** - Alterations within existing wing of house and two storey extension on garden side. *Application withdrawn on 08.08.2017.*
- 4.7 **17/01229/LBWS** - Alterations within existing wing of house and two storey extension on garden side. *Application withdrawn on 08.08.2017.*
- 4.8 **07/00026/LBWS** - Demolition of boundary wall and fencing adjacent to Linden Road and demolition of garage serving Linden House. *Consent subject to conditions and notes, decision issued on 13.04.2007.*
- 4.9 **07/00027/FULLS** - Erection of one 2 bed house, two 3 bed houses and three 4 bed houses, new access and estate road, landscaping and associated works; erection of new garage, garden store, greenhouse and ancillary accommodation to serve Linden House. *Permission subject to conditions and notes, decision issued on 13.04.2007.*
- 4.10 **05/00569/LBWS** - Extensive external and internal alterations to the existing house including reforming the roof construction over the existing west wing, erection of porch to east elevation, erection of extension to cottage and alteration to wall/gate pier and to include erection of rear porch and window alteration to the cottage (Revised scheme to that approved under TVS.LB.00105/2 - 8 September 2004). *Consent subject to conditions and notes, decision issued on 12.12.2005.*
- 4.11 **TVS.LB.00105/2** - Extensive external and internal alterations to the existing house including reforming the roof construction over the existing west wing, erection of porch to east elevation, erection of extension to cottage and alteration to wall/gate pier. *Consent subject to conditions and notes, decision issued on 08.09.2004.*
- 4.12 **TVS.10429** - Extensive alterations to the existing house including reforming the roof construction over the existing west wing, erection of porch to east elevation, erection of extension to cottage and alteration to entrance and gate pier to Linden Road. *Permission subject to conditions and notes, decision issued on 08.09.2004.*
- 4.13 **TVS.LB.00105/1** - Rendering to boundary wall. *Application withdrawn on 02.11.1993.*
- 4.14 **TVS.LB.105** - Summer house. *Consent, decision issued on 18.08.1978.*

## 5.0 **CONSULTATIONS**

5.1 **Archaeology** – No objection.

5.2 **Conservation** – Objection (summarised):

- The proposal would not make a positive contribution to sustaining or enhancing the significance of the heritage asset, contrary to Policy E9.
- The harm (less than substantial) of the proposal would not be outweighed by any public benefit, as required by Policy E9 and paragraph 134 of the NPPF.
- This is an amended scheme to the proposal determined under application references 17/03232/FULLS and 17/03233/LBWS.
- The principal change is the omission of the two-storey gabled bay on the return (south) elevation.
- Previously, it was identified that this bay was a further detractor from the simple linear form of the building and its omission has reduced the level of harm.
- However, the harm resulting from the current proposed extension, as previously identified arises from the principle of extending at right angles at all.

5.3 **Ecology** – No objection subject to note.

5.4 **Trees** – No objection subject to condition.

6.0 **REPRESENTATIONS** Expired 17.10.2018

6.1 **Romsey Town Parish Council** – No objection.

## 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) (TVBRLP)

Policy SD1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Policy COM2: Settlement Hierarchy

Policy E1: High Quality Development in the Borough

Policy E2: Protect, Conserve and Enhance the Landscape Character of the Borough

Policy E5: Biodiversity

Policy E9: Heritage

Policy LHW4: Amenity

Policy T2: Parking Standards

7.3 Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)

Conservation in Romsey (1983)

Look At Romsey: Area 8 Romsey Old Town (2008)

## 8.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

8.1 The main planning considerations are:

- Principle of development
- Impact on the listed building and conservation area
- Impact on the character and appearance of the area
- Ecology
- Impact on the amenity of neighbouring property
- Highways

### 8.2 **Principle of development**

The site lies within the settlement boundary of Romsey as defined on the Inset Maps of the TVBRLP. In accordance with Policy COM2 of the TVBRLP development is permitted provided the proposal is appropriate to other policies of the Revised Local Plan. The proposal is assessed against the relevant policies below.

### 8.3 **Impact on the listed building and conservation area**

The host property is Grade II listed and located within the conservation area of Romsey. As a result, it is necessary to assess the proposed scheme for the potential impact on the identified heritage assets, in accordance with Policy E9 of the TVBRLP. Policy E9 states:

*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.*

*Development which will result in the substantial harm to or loss of the significance of a designated heritage asset will not be permitted unless:*

- c) *It is outweighed by the substantial benefit to the public of bringing the site back into use; or*
- d) *The nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable use; and*
- e) *its conservation cannot be achieved by either a viable alternative use, support from public ownership or funding from other sources; and*
- f) *the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use*

*Development which will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset will be considered against the public benefit of the proposal, including securing a viable use.*

- 8.4 The application is supported by a Design and Access statement that identifies the history of the property, with Linden House Cottage listed at Grade II and dating back to its construction in 1844. The host building was remodelled in 1926 as a dwelling with further alterations in the 1980s and external additions in 2006. The rationale in the submitted Design and Access statement points to the previous development of the 2006 single storey addition and the erection of detached houses within the grounds of Linden House Cottage as material considerations that weigh in favour of the current proposal.
- 8.5 However, it is considered that the historical significance of the heritage asset lies in its intrinsic interest as a 1840s extension to a late Georgian house, possibly originally a coach house. The 1920s alterations included new windows, re-building of the west elevation and internal alterations with attractive joinery and other details, including the fireplaces, particularly the one on the first floor with dark glazed faience.
- 8.6 Due to the modest single storey scale of the 2006 addition, it is not considered that this previous development has served to substantially alter the character of the rear (east) elevation. In addition, the previously erected three detached houses, built in the grounds of Linden House, are not attached to the listed building. Whether or not they have resulted in harm to the significance of the heritage assets affected (listed building and conservation area) does not form part of the assessment of the current proposal.
- 8.7 Proposed two storey extension  
Linden House consists of a double-pile block facing The Hundred with a long narrow wing projecting at the rear, of which Linden House Cottage forms the end part. The proposed two storey extension, serving to add a wing at right angles at the end of Linden House Cottage, would be contrary to the existing simple, linear character of the rear wing and therefore be a departure from the existing built form. The impact of such a structure would be very evident in views from the garden of the application site itself and to a lesser extent, from The Hundred.
- 8.8 As Linden House and Linden House Cottage are listed, it is the impact on their setting and by extension their significance, including internal views from the residential garden, which is a consideration in assessing the impact of any proposals. It is considered that the scale and siting of the proposed extension, projecting into the residential garden itself will serve to detract from the historical setting of the predominantly linear and simple form of the existing rear (east) elevation.
- 8.9 The consideration of the view from the street is a separate, but not unimportant, matter. However, whilst it is acknowledged that the harm to the significance of the conservation area as a designated heritage asset, would be less than the harm to the significance of the house itself, nevertheless, it will be visible from The Hundred, particularly during the times of the year when there are no leaves on the trees.

- 8.10 In addition and in terms of the historic fabric the proposed extension would also result in the loss of 1840s brickwork and 1920s fenestration, the latter part of the significant re-modelling of the building in that period.
- 8.11 Due to the concerns outlined above, it is considered that there would be harm as a result of this proposal, in terms of its impact of the overall character of the listed building and conservation area and some loss of historic fabric. This would result in less than substantial harm as defined in NPPF and Policy E9 of the Revised Local Plan. The harm to the significance of the listed building would be greater than the harm to that of the conservation area, because of the more limited views from the public realm.
- 8.12 Policy E9 of the TVBRLP requires any harm to be balanced against any public benefit. There are no apparent public or conservation benefits with the proposal. As such, the proposed development would not make a positive contribution to sustaining or enhancing the significance of the heritage asset, contrary to Policy E9 of the TVBRLP. Furthermore, the harm (less than substantial) of the proposed development would not be outweighed any public benefit, as required by Policy E9 of the TVBRLP and paragraph 196 of the NPPF.
- 8.13 Proposed porch  
The proposed scheme also includes the erection of a porch extension, adjoining the front (west) elevation, with a flat zinc roof. After reviewing this element of the proposal, the Conservation Officer has no objection to this part of the proposed development. It follows the linear line of development at Linden House Cottage and given the small size of the extension it is considered that this work to the heritage asset would sustain and enhance the significance of the heritage asset taking into account the character, appearance and setting based on an assessment proportionate to its importance in accordance with Policy E9 of the TVBRLP.
- 8.14 **Impact on the character and appearance of the area**  
Notwithstanding the concerns raised above with regard to the impact on the setting and significance of the heritage assets, it is considered that the layout, scale and design of the proposed development would ensure that the proposal assumes a complementary addition to the existing building. Consequently, it is considered that the proposal will respect and integrate with the settlement character of the area, in accordance with Policy E1 of the TVBRLP.
- 8.15 Trees  
The application site is characterised by a substantial lime tree located in the residential garden area of the application site and subject of a protection order. Due to the siting of the proposed two storey extension on an existing patio area, it is not considered that the presence of the proposal will adversely impact the future health and retention of the protected Lime tree. As a result, the application is in accordance with Policy E2 of the TVBRLP.
- 8.16 In the event that permission was recommended, a condition securing the submission of an up to date protection scheme to cover the associated construction phase would be added.

### 8.17 **Ecology**

The application is supported by a bat survey report (PV Ecology, March 2017) and after reviewing the submitted information, the County Ecologist has confirmed this represents the current conditions at the application site. No evidence of bats was found and no potential roost locations or access points for bats to gain access to possible roost locations were identified, largely due to the fact that the roof has been replaced relatively recently. As a result, it was concluded that there was negligible potential for bats to be present.

8.18 Bats receive protection under UK law via the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and under EU law by the Habitats Directive, which is transposed into UK law by the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (commonly referred to as the Habitats Regulations). Developments that affect legally protected species are also likely to be contrary to Policy E5 of the TVBRLP.

8.19 Developments that affect bats will need a European Protected Species (EPS) licence from Natural England before any work that affects bats could commence. Local Planning Authorities are required to engage with the Regulations planning permission should be granted (other concerns notwithstanding) unless the development is likely to result in a breach of the EU Directive and, if a breach is considered likely, that the development is unlikely to be granted an EPS licence from Natural England to allow the development to proceed under a derogation from the law. In view of the submitted survey findings, it is considered that the proposed development is unlikely to result in a breach of the law protecting bats and, as such, no concerns have been raised.

8.20 Consequently, the application is in accordance with Policy E5 of the TVBRLP. If permission were being recommended an informative note would be added regarding the necessity for all work must stop immediately if bats, or evidence of bat presence, are encountered at any point during this development.

### 8.21 **Impact on the amenity of neighbouring property**

#### Privacy

The proposed fenestration in both the rear (east) and side (south) elevations of the proposal will look out over the residential garden area of the property and as such, will not materially impact the privacy of any neighbouring dwelling. In addition, the proposed windows in the front (west) elevation will face Linden Road and the side (north) elevation will look over the existing detached garage outbuilding. As a result, it is not considered that the proposal will adversely impact the privacy level of any neighbouring property.

### 8.22 Daylight/Sunlight Provision

Due to the orientation of the proposed development, any additional shadow will fall on an area of hardstanding located at the northern end of the plot and therefore, it is considered that the proposal will not materially alter the existing provision of daylight or sunlight for any neighbouring property. Consequently, the application is in accordance with Policy LHW4 of the TVBRLP.



## 8.23 Highways

The proposed development would result in the provision of 4 bedrooms on site and therefore, it is necessary for 3 car parking spaces to be accommodated on site. The existing on site car parking provision is sufficient to meet the required parking capacity and consequently, the application is in accordance with Policy T2 of the TVBRLP.

## 9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 In light of the concerns raised regarding the impact of the proposals on the historical significance of the identified heritage assets, the application is not considered to comply with Policies COM2 and E9 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) and it is therefore recommended that planning permission be refused.

## 10.0 RECOMMENDATION

**REFUSE for the reason:**

1. **The proposed development to the existing dwelling, due to the harm caused by the loss of historic fabric, the alteration to the existing linear built form and the visual impact on the overall character of the listed building and conservation area, would not make a positive contribution to sustaining or enhancing the significance of the heritage asset in accordance with Policy E9 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016). Furthermore, the harm (less than substantial) of the proposed development would not be outweighed by any public benefit, as required by Policy E9 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016 and paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.**

**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.**
-