
APPLICATION NO.	23/02924/FULLN
APPLICATION TYPE	FULL APPLICATION - NORTH
REGISTERED	14.11.2023
APPLICANT	Mr & Mrs Martin / Joy Cummings
SITE	Kingfisher Lodge , Longstock Road, Longstock, SO20 6DW, LONGSTOCK
PROPOSAL	Single storey flat roof exercise swimming pool extension and plant room
AMENDMENTS	
CASE OFFICER	Claudia Hurlock

Background paper (Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D)

[Click here to view application](#)

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The application is presented to Southern Area Planning Committee at the request of a Member for the reason “it raises issues of more than local public interest”

2.0 SITE AND SURROUNDING AREA

- 2.1 Kingfisher Lodge is a two storey, Grade II listed property located in Longstock, however is not within the Longstock Conservation Area. The dwelling has a thatched roof and is comprised of brick with leaded light windows. The dwelling has been extended at the rear and has off-road parking with a rear/side garden and is screened from the main road by hedging at the east of the site.

3.0 PROPOSAL

- 3.1 Planning permission is sought for a single storey extension to construct exercise pool with jacuzzi and associated plant room shed.
- 3.2 The design of the proposed extension has been altered from the previous refusal to include a flat roof including three rooflights. The rear wall would also only include one band of flintwork. The width of the extension has also been reduced, the right hand end has also been shortened and it is also proposed to extend the chimney.

4.0 HISTORY

- 4.1 **23/01083/FULLN** - Single storey extension and alterations at Kingfisher Lodge to construct exercise pool with jacuzzi and associated plant room shed, together with workshop extension to existing single storey garage with art studio/annex over – **REFUSED** (July 2023)

Reason for refusal: The proposed rear extension by virtue of its design, scale and mass would disrupt and dominate the historical character and appearance of the listed building and would be an incongruous and unsympathetic addition that would result in less than substantial harm which is not outweighed by any public benefits of the proposal. The design of the proposal is not in keeping with the host property. The proposal is contrary to policies COM2, COM11 and E9 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) and section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act (1990) and paragraphs 199 of the NPPF.

23/01084/LBWN - Single storey extension and alterations at Kingfisher lodge to construct exercise pool with jacuzzi and associated plant room shed, together with workshop extension to existing single storey garage with art studio/annex over – **REFUSED** (July 2023)

Reason for refusal: The proposed rear extension by virtue of its design, scale and mass would disrupt and dominate the historical character and appearance of the listed building and would be an incongruous and unsympathetic addition that would result in less than substantial harm which is not outweighed by any public benefits of the proposal. The internal works would impact harmfully on the significance of the heritage asset, resulting in the loss of historic fabric without any public benefits which would outweigh the harm. The proposal is contrary to Policy E9 of the TVBRLP, section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act (1990) and paragraphs 199 of the NPPF

07/00272/FULLN - Erection of two storey extension on site of existing garage to provide kitchen/dining room with bedroom, en-suite and balcony over together with new entrance canopy and erection detached double garage – PERMISSION subject to conditions and notes (22.03.2007)

07/00275/LBWN - Erection of two storey extension on site of existing garage to provide kitchen/dining room with bedroom, ensuite and balcony over, new entrance canopy together with internal and external alterations – CONSENT subject to conditions and notes (22.03.2007)

06/00828/FULLN - Erection of two storey extension on site of existing garage to provide kitchen with bedroom, bathroom and hall over together with covered verandah and new entrance canopy and erection of detached double garage - PERMISSION subject to conditions and notes (03.05.2006)

06/00836/LBWN - Erection of two storey extension on site of existing garage to provide kitchen with bedroom, bathroom and hall over, covered verandah and new entrance canopy together with internal and external alterations - CONSENT subject to conditions and notes (03.05.2006)

5.0 **CONSULTATIONS**

5.1 **Design and Conservation – Objection, summarised as follows:**

- There is no objection in principle to the removal of the existing extension as it is modern and is of no special architectural merit. However, it is simple and modest in its design and appearance, is visually transparent, and follows the line of the host building for example its pitched roof. In these respects it is more successful than the proposed extension, which would also project much further away from the rear of the cottage and which is a hard box, which would be at odds with the soft lines of the listed building. Whilst improvements have been made from the previously refused applications, it is not considered that the amendments to the scheme have sufficiently overcome the concerns raised that Design and Conservation cannot support the proposals.

6.0 **REPRESENTATIONS** Expired 07.12.2023

6.1 **Longstock 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 COM11 – Existing Dwellings and Ancillary Domestic buildings in the countryside

Policy E1- High Quality Development in the Borough

Policy E5 - Biodiversity

Policy E9 - Heritage

8.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

8.1 The main planning considerations are:

- Principle of development
- Impact of the resultant dwelling on the character and appearance of the area
- Impact on the fabric, setting and character of the Listed building
- Impact on ecology

8.2 **Principle of development**

The site lies within the countryside as defined on the Inset Maps of the TVBRLP. In accordance with Policy COM2 of the TVBRLP development is permissible provided the proposal complies with Policy COM11.

8.3 **Impact on the character and appearance of the area**

When assessing the proposal against COM11 of the TVBRLP, it is considered that criterion a) is met as the extension would be used solely for the incidental enjoyment of the dwellinghouse to house a swimming pool for the occupants. Criterion b) of COM11 is concerned with the visual intrusion of the proposal.

On visiting the site and assessing it from all of the possible public vantage points, it was confirmed that the proposal site does not have any public views. Therefore, the proposal would not be any more visually intrusive in the landscape as required by the policy. Finally, when considering criterion c) of COM11 which is concerned with the design of the building, whilst it is appreciated that the design is not in keeping with the design of the host building by virtue of its flat roof and use of materials, there would be no harm arising from this design due to its location and lack of available public views. The proposal therefore, is considered to be acceptable and in accordance with Policy COM11 of the TVBRLP.

8.4 **Impact on the fabric, setting and character of the Listed building**

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 194 states that in determining planning applications:

“In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets’ importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary”.

8.5 Paragraph 195 of the NPPF also states:

“Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset’s conservation and any aspect of the proposal”.

8.6 Paragraph 202 of the NPPF states:

“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”.

8.7 There is a duty imposed by Section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, which requires decision makers to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

8.8 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 199 makes clear that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation, and that the more important the asset the greater the weight should be.

- 8.9 Policy E9 of the TVBRPL states that development of 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.
- 8.10 Development which would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset should be considered against the public benefit of the proposal, including securing a viable use.
- 8.11 *Rear extension*
The proposal comprises of a rear extension to accommodate a swimming pool and jacuzzi which would be used by the occupants of the dwelling. It is considered that the proposed design and the substantial expanse of new extension across the rear elevation would be visually incongruous with the traditional appearance of the listed building, dominating it to the rear and creating a contrived appearance between the roof of the extension and the windows, affecting the legibility of the rear elevation and resulting in a harmful impact on its significance and detracting from how the heritage asset is appreciated from within its setting by occupants and visitors to the property. Compared to the previously refused scheme the width of the proposed extension across the rear of the cottage has been reduced and the previously proposed glazed element on the left-hand end omitted. This is considered an improvement on that previously refused. However, the depth of the projection away from the rear wall of the cottage has not been altered, and, as noted, this would still represent an unacceptably large extension to this listed building.
- 8.12 The size of the extension has not been sufficiently reduced and the style of the extension is still seeking to introduce a third design element – rather than take meaningful reference from the core building, the design now includes various different elements such as rooflights, glazing, timber, flint and window treatments which appear at odds with the traditional and simple appearance of the host property. As such it lacks a coherent appearance and would be a detracting element which would draw undue attention away from the original form and appearance of the host building. Consequently it would harm the appearance of the listed building, and, through this, its special interest. The combined depth of the new work would exceed the depth of the whole of the ground floor of the core cottage, and the footprint of the later additions would be at least equivalent of that of the whole historic cottage. It is considered this would have an overbearing and harmful effect on the listed building's significance.
- 8.13 The proposed roof includes the provision of five rooflights. These would, it is considered, appear cluttered and disproportionate for the size of the roof. They also have a poor relationship with the position of the eyebrow dormers, especially the ones set off-centre from the middle dormer which appear visually confused and unbalance the symmetry and form of the existing roof. Any merit to the building which could have arisen from a simple cedar shingle

roof would be negated by these visual interruptions, which draw the eye and additional attention towards the proposed extension. They would cut across views of the eaves of the thatched roof in places interrupting the appreciation of this important element of the building's character and special interest.

- 8.14 The design of the rear wall is also not considered to be acceptable. It includes design features such as flint and obscure glazed windows which would appear visually alien to the existing traditional and soft appearance of the host property which is derived from its thatched roof form and traditional architecture.
- 8.15 Due to the flat roof and boxy form of the proposed extension, the proposed use of small obscure glazed windows and strips of flint, and "cassette green roof", would not be in keeping with the host dwelling due to use of these uncharacteristic, unsympathetic and alien use of materials and design elements. The existing soft roof forms which are provided by the use of thatch on the host property would appear visually at odds with the proposed design of the flat-roof extension. The use of the materials proposed, with the exception of the brick, would not be in keeping, nor sympathetic to the historical appearance of the dwelling.
- 8.16 *Existing extension*
Although it is noted that the proposed extension would replace an existing glazed and brick extension, the existing extensions are much smaller in scale, with lean-to roof forms and would not protrude as high nor as far to the west than that currently proposed. As such they do not obscure as much of the original dwelling. Although they do have an impact on the host property, they match in style and are considered subservient in scale, and therefore are considered to have a neutral effect on the setting, character and importance of the Listed building compared to that of the proposed extension.
- 8.17 The cumulative impact of the existing large feature balcony extension and the proposed extension on the appreciation of the host should be taken into account. It is considered that as the building has already been extended in the past, the cumulative impact of the existing extensions plus the proposed extension would result in the loss of the traditional form of the historic dwelling. At present the existing extensions have a considerable effect, but they do, at least, match in style, to the appearance of the host dwelling.
- 8.18 *Proposed plant room*
The proposed plant room would be small in scale and located on the side elevation of the property between the dwelling and the mature hedging to the west. It is small in scale and would appear ancillary in relation to the listed building and there is no objection to this aspect of the proposed scheme. Whilst the proposal would not be in keeping with the host property by virtue of its design and materials as required by Policy COM11 of the TVBRLP, the style of outbuilding is considered appropriate to the context in which it sits and there is no objection to this element of the proposal.

8.19 *Balancing the public benefits of the scheme*

Although there is no objection to the proposed plant room, the extension would not be in keeping with the host dwelling and is also considered to be harmful to the significance of the designated heritage asset by virtue of its scale and design, creating an incongruous and unsympathetic addition to the listed building. Public benefits of the proposal have been suggested, including reducing the dependency/work load on the NHS for specialist services, use of the on-site pool reducing travel/dependency to/on the NHS and, the reduced need to travel to specialist care facilities reducing dependence on using cars to travel to exercise facilities. These benefits are considered speculative and unquantifiable. They are therefore reasons that cannot be given any weight in the planning balance and certainly are not sufficient to overcome the harm identified to the listed building. The building is also already viable and so the addition of a swimming pool would not secure the viability of the property. The harm is therefore not outweighed by any reasonable public benefits. The proposal thereby would cause significant and unreasonable harm to the listed building with insufficient public benefits to outweigh the harm. In consequence, this element of the scheme conflicts with policies E9, E1 and COM11 of the TVBRLP.

8.20 **Impact on ecology**

An Ecological assessment was undertaken by Philips Ecology. No suitable bat roosting locations were located on the northern elevation of the building which is the only elevation which would be affected by the works. Where the thatch was present, chicken wire covered the thatch and extended to the underside and at eave height. The slate roof section was generally in good condition and, whilst some slates had slipped, no potential bat access points were located. A section of lead flashing was located beneath a window above the roof section, but no suitable access features were visible beneath. A wooden fascia is present at eave height, this was tight to the wall and provided no potential access locations. The two glazed section provided no bat roosting opportunity. With regard to the garage, the cedar shingles are tacked directly onto sections of plywood that are visible from the interior, and therefore no potential access or roosting locations were present beneath them. The wooden cladding on the side elevations was in good condition, with no evidence of bowing and therefore no potential bat access or roosting locations were evident. No further surveys were recommended, however mitigation and enhancement measures were included within the report. The scheme is therefore acceptable and in accordance with Policy E5 of the TVBRLP.

9.0 **CONCLUSION**

9.1 Although there is no objection on ecology grounds to the proposal, the proposed rear extension would impact harmfully upon the significance of the listed building with no public benefits that would outweigh the level of harm to the heritage asset in this instance. The scheme is therefore considered contrary to Policy E9 of the TVBRLP, sections 66 the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act (1990) and paragraphs 199 of the NPPF.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE for the reason:

- 1. The proposed rear extension by virtue of its design, scale and mass would disrupt and dominate the historical character and appearance of the listed building and would be an incongruous and unsympathetic addition that would result in less than substantial harm 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 section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act (1990) and paragraph 199 of the NPPF.**

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.**
-