
| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| APPLICATION NO. | 21/02905/LBWS |
| APPLICATION TYPE | LISTED BUILDING WORKS - SOUTH |
| REGISTERED | 05.10.2021 |
| APPLICANT | Mr and Mrs Savage |
| SITE | Warblers Cottage, Chapel Lane, Timsbury, SO51 0NW, MICHELMERSH AND TIMSBURY |
| PROPOSAL | Alterations and single storey extension |
| AMENDMENTS | None |
| CASE OFFICER | Ms Kate Levey |

Background paper (Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D)

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Delegated Report. The application has been called to Southern Area Planning Committee at the request of a member.

2.0 SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

2.1 The application site is a detached, Grade II listed two storey dwelling located on the north side of Chapel Lane in the settlement area of Timsbury. The existing property also includes a two storey garage outbuilding in close proximity to the side (west) and rear (north) elevation of the main dwelling.

3.0 PROPOSAL

3.1 The proposal is for the erection of a two storey extension measuring approximately 9.1 metres by 6.9 metres by 5 metres. The proposed development would adjoin the rear (north) elevation of the existing dwelling at eastern end, through the erection of a single storey link, measuring approximately 0.7 metres by 1.5 metres by 3.9 metres.

4.0 HISTORY

4.1 **Dismissed appeal: APP/C1760/W/19/3232988** relating to 19/00301/FULLS.

4.2 **Dismissed appeal: APP/C1760/Y/19/323984** relating to 19/00302/LBWS.

4.3 **19/00301/FULLS** Erection of two storey rear extension to provide additional living, and associated works. **Refuse 18.04.2019**

4.4 **19/00302/LBWS** - Erection of two storey rear extension to provide additional living, and associated works. **Refuse 18.04.2019**

4.5 **18/00636/LBWS** - Minor crack repair to front elevation and to the inside of the front porch; painting front elevation and exterior and interior of porch. *Consent subject to conditions and notes, decision issued on 18.04.2019.*

- 4.6 **17/02436/LBWS** - Two storey linked extension to rear of the building to provide kitchen and lounge diner with bedroom and bathroom accommodation over, alterations to the layout of existing listed building, and levelling and refurbishment of floor, alterations and conversion of garage into office/workshop on the ground floor and bedroom on the first floor, including conversion of external staircase to balcony, and erection of covered walkway. *Application withdrawn on 20.11.2017.*
- 4.7 **17/02435/FULLS** - Two storey linked extension to rear of the building to provide kitchen and lounge diner with bedroom and bathroom accommodation over, alterations and conversion of garage into office/workshop on the ground floor and bedroom on the first floor, including conversion of external staircase to balcony, erection of covered walkway from existing cottage to existing garage, and erection of detached garage/store. *Application withdrawn on 20.11.2017.*
- 4.8 **TVS.09426** - Replacement of existing garage and potting shed with oak framed garage, potting shed and garden store and studio at first floor level. *Permission subject to conditions and notes.*

5.0 **CONSULTATIONS**

- 5.1 Conservation – at the time of writing this report no comment has yet been received, however this will be included within the update paper.
- 5.2 Ecology – at the time of writing this report no comment has yet been received, however this will be included within the update paper.
- 5.3 Trees - at the time of writing this report no comment has yet been received, however this will be included within the update paper.

6.0 **REPRESENTATIONS** Expired 05.11.2021

- 6.1 At the time of writing this report no representations have been received

7.0 **POLICY**

- 7.1 Government Guidance
National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)
Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas Act) 1990
- 7.2 Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016)(TVBRLP)
Policy E5: Biodiversity
Policy E9: Heritage
- 7.3 Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)
Michelmersh and Timsbury Village Design Statement (2001)

8.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

- 8.1 The main planning considerations are:
- Heritage
 - Biodiversity

8.2 Heritage

Sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 require special regard to be had to the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historical interest which it possesses.

- 8.3 In relation to the assessment of the proposal on designated heritage assets, Paragraph 193 of the NPPF sets out that great weight should be given to the assets conservation, stating as follows:

When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of the heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

- 8.4 Furthermore, paragraph 196 of the NPPF asserts that any harm to the significance of the heritage asset should be weighed against any public benefits:

Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

- 8.5 In addition, Policy E9 of the TVBRLP is pertinent to development affecting heritage assets and states as follows:

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.*

- 8.6 In this instance, the host property is a Grade II listed dwelling and in addition, the neighbouring properties to the west, Wealden and Elizabethan Cottage are also Grade II listed. Therefore, it is necessary to consider the impact of the proposal on the historical significance of these designated heritage assets.

8.7 Assessment of the impact on Warblers Cottage

Warblers Cottage is listed at Grade II and comprises a 17th century timber-framed building with brick repairs and a brick extension to the eastern end, added in the 1940s. The existing building is mostly painted, although some of the later brickwork is exposed. With the exception of the 1940s extension, which is single-storey, the cottage is 1 and half storeys under a thatched roof with eyebrow dormers. There is a gabled tiled brick porch roof with an old plank door in the centre of the front elevation and chimney stacks on either end.

- 8.8 It is considered that one of the historical significant characteristics of the cottage is its form, both in terms of its modest size and that it has been largely unaltered, remaining as a simple linear building. However, survival of this plan form is rare and therefore where it has not been compromised as in this case here, it is important that the existing plan form is conserved. In relation to this consideration, it is noted that Warblers Cottage was listed as a nationally important example of a building of its type. The 1940s extension adjoining the side (east) elevation is modest and follows the building line, which keeps its impact to a minimum. So few buildings of this type have survived so unaltered, and this rarity makes it all the more important it is preserved.
- 8.9 For this reason, it would be very difficult to extend the building through a rear (north) projection without harming its significance. The extension as proposed is not considered acceptable, as this would fundamentally alter the character of the cottage from being linear to an 'L'. As a result of the proposed layout and siting of the development, the proposal serves to erode the historically significant plan form of the building, adversely impacting its special interest.
- 8.10 In addition to the direct impact on the cottage, the proposed extension would also have an effect on its setting, especially as it would be visible in views of the front of the building from Chapel Lane. Traditionally, it would not possible to see a rear extension in context with the front elevation. The visibility of the proposed extension from the front draws attention to the size of the extension, and prevents it appearing subservient because it appears too large to be hidden by the host building. As a result, the proposed extension affects all areas of the listed cottage, including the principle elevation whereas a more proportionate rear extension would at least be screened by the building from the front. Consequently, there is harm to the appearance of the whole of the cottage and for the purposes of the NPPF, this harm is considered to be less than substantial.
- 8.11 In addition, it is not considered that the proposal assumes a wholly 'traditional' appearance although it is proposed to be finished in weather boarding, which is common for ancillary buildings in this area. However, the proposed glazing present including the apex window in the rear (north) elevation, the domestic style of the other windows, and the large amount of glazing on the side (west) elevation, the glass within the roof of the link and the form of the building cumulatively prevent the proposal from assuming a convincing appearance as an outbuilding. The proposed detailing and materials of the extension draws more attention to it, detracting from the setting of the historic cottage and again resulting in adverse harm considered to be less than substantial.
- 8.12 The existing property may well have been some form of agricultural labourer's dwelling, however, it is unlikely that it was ever a farmstead in its own right given its style and modest size. The historic mapping does not appear to show any outbuildings associated with it. Consequently, there is no precedent for barn-type buildings, as the style of the proposed extension might be argued to be, in this location, and it would either be an incongruous feature or would

have the potential to be misleading. Either would be harmful to appreciating the special interest of the site especially combined with the existing outbuilding which does not serve to set a precedent for extensions to the cottage or other buildings on site.

- 8.13 It is noted that the proposed extension would be attached to the 1940s extension by a narrow link and would therefore not conceal or damage any historic fabric. As such, the proposal is considered to have a neutral impact on the historic fabric of the designated heritage asset.
- 8.14 With regard to any potential public benefits to outweigh the harm identified, as directed by the NPPF, this has not been demonstrated. It is acknowledged that the use of the existing property to serve a local housing need would constitute a public benefit. However, it is understood from the supporting statement and previous planning history (application reference 18/00636/LBWS), that the cottage has recently been repaired and refurbished. However, it does not appear the need for work resulted from the cottage not being viable as a dwelling and having therefore remained unoccupied for a protracted period with associated decay. Rather, the building was in the same ownership for a protracted period, and very little significant work has been done to it for some time.
- 8.15 The existing dwelling comprises two bedrooms, two reception rooms, a kitchen, and an upstairs bathroom. It would be difficult, therefore, to argue it is not a viable dwelling not capable of serving a local housing need in its current state. The property has also benefitted from a substantial outbuilding to the left, which provides additional domestic accommodation. If a case for the site needing to increase its offer can be made, then options for improving and potentially extending, the existing outbuilding would be preferable to extensions to the cottage and subject to appropriate detailing avoid the harm to the designated heritage asset incurred by the current proposal.
- 8.16 The Inspector's recent decision for the appeals (APP/C1760/W/19/3232988 and APP/C1760/Y/19/323984) are important material considerations. The Inspector commented in paragraph 6 of the decision notice that due the scale and design of the proposed extension would not 'be either physically or visually subsidiary to the listed cottage. Whilst it would be located to the rear it would still dominate the proportions and plan form of the existing vernacular cottage'. The Inspector did not find any significant public benefit arising from the proposal and that securing a more viable family house would not outweigh the harm to the listed building. As a result, the Inspector concluded that the proposal would fail to comply with the requirements of policy E9, and the appeals were dismissed.
- 8.17 Consequently, as a result of the assessment above it is considered that the proposed extension would, by reason of its size, design, siting, use of materials and impact on the building's plan form, have a harmful impact on the special interest of Warbler's Cottage. This harm would be less than substantial for the purposes of the NPPF and is not outweighed against any public benefit.

As a result, the application is contrary to Policy COM9 of the TVBRLP in addition to paragraph 196 of the NPPF and therefore a reason for refusal has been attached.

8.18 Assessment of the impact on Wealden and Elizabethan Cottage

Due to the intervening distance between the siting of the proposed extension and both listed properties of Wealden and Elizabethan Cottage, in addition to the intervening boundary treatment it is not considered that the proposal will adversely impact the historic significance or setting of either designated heritage asset.

8.19 **Ecology**

The proposal is supported by an ecological appraisal (Pro Vision, October 2021) and the survey identified that the proposal would not adversely impact any protected species and proposed a series of measures to enhance biodiversity on site. No further ecological survey work is proposed. Therefore, subject to a condition securing the implementation of the proposed enhancement measures in the event that the proposal was acceptable, it is considered that the application is in accordance with Policy E5 of the TVBRLP.

9.0 **CONCLUSION**

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

10.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

REFUSE for the reason:

1. **The siting, scale, form and appearance of the proposed development is detrimental to the special architectural and historic importance of the heritage asset and therefore, would result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the designated heritage asset. The proposal would not result in any public benefits to outweigh this harm. As such, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policies E9 and COM2 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016), in addition to paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework.**

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.**
-