

230

Item No 10:-

15/02167/LBC (CD.2483/M)


**Dower House
Maugersbury
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL54 1HR**

Item No 10:-

**Family room extension
at Dower House Mangersbury Cheltenham**

| | |
|---|-------------------------|
| Listed Building Consent 15/02167/LBC (CD.2483/M) | |
| Applicant: | Mr & Mrs Matthew Totham |
| Agent: | Eastabrook Architects |
| Case Officer: | Alison Hall |
| Ward Member(s): | Councillor Barry Dare |
| Committee Date: | 9th March 2016 |

Site Plan



© Crown copyright and database rights 2011 Ordnance Survey, SLA No. 0100018800

RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE

Main Issues:

(a) Impact upon the Listed Building

Reasons for Referral:

Councillor Dare has requested that the application be referred to committee for the following reasons:

1. Given the restrictive attitude towards development in the village by the local community and the Parish Council, it is refreshing to register Parish Council support.
2. The former Lord Lieutenant of Gloucestershire always stressed that the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty is in fact a misnomer; it is an area of man-made beauty, in respect of which man's management of the environment is an overwhelming influence.
3. The current application is sympathetic to the wishes of the local community in terms of both materials and the vernacular.
4. The application is seen to improve the applicant's quality of life and ecological sustainability and also to improve opportunities for household management at the site.

Site Description:

Dower House is a Grade II Listed large detached house set in extensive grounds, the building is a former farmhouse and then dower house, dating to the C17, C19 and C20. Constructed in coursed squared and dressed limestone, with a stone slate roof, and ashlar stacks. Its two storey main range has a simple rectangular form, with a C19 extension running back to the rear left, and further C20 extensions. Windows are set in stone mullioned surrounds. The site is located within the Mangersbury Conservation Area and Cotswold AONB.

2. Relevant Planning History:

CD.2483/E Construction of greenhouse, demolition of conservatory and construction of new - Approved
 14/04291/FUL - Alterations to dwelling - Approved
 14/04292/LBC - Alterations to dwelling - Approved

3. Planning Policies:

NPPF National Planning Policy Framework

4. Observations of Consultees:

Conservation Officer: Objects to the proposal as set out within the officer's report

5. View of Town/Parish Council:

Mangersbury Parish Council - No objections

6. Other Representations:

No letters of representation received.

7. Applicant's Supporting Information:

Design and Access Statement

8. Officer's Assessment:

Background and Proposed Development

This application seeks to remove the existing garden room and replace with a family room extension. The existing garden room was constructed in the late 1990's and is modest in scale and design (2.5m from the rear and 7.7m in width, 2.5 to the eaves and 3.6m to the ridge). The proposed family room extension would extend 5m from the rear elevation and 7.8m in width and measure 2.6m to the eaves and 3.9m to the top of the roof lantern. The extension would be constructed in untreated oak pillars with full height glazing between and a Cotswold Stone tiled roof with central glazed roof lantern.

(a) Design and impact on the Listed Building and Conservation Area

The Dower House is a Grade II Listed Building. The Local Planning Authority is therefore statutorily required to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building, its setting, and any features of special architectural or historic interest it may possess, in accordance with Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. The site is also within a conservation area and Section 72 of the Act requires that the LPA should pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing its character and appearance.

Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework asks that Local Planning Authorities should take account of the desirability of sustaining or enhancing the significance of heritage assets. Paragraph 132 states that when considering the impact of the proposed works on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. It also states that significance can be harmed through alteration or development within the setting. Paragraph 134 states that where proposals will cause harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset that is less than substantial harm, that harm is weighed against the public benefits of those works.

The proposals would require the removal of stone mullions, sill and masonry below the right hand (probably late C19) window. The left hand (late C19) window is also proposed to have its remaining mullion, sill and masonry below removed. This window has been altered through the insertion of a doorway but it is still a feature of interest. It is also proposed to remove the central (slightly later, C20) window as well as the masonry between this and the left-hand window, forming a larger single opening. This work will result in the loss of historic fabric and features that form part of the evolution of the building. This would also result in harm to the integrity and character of this part of the building. The larger openings result in erosion of the typically more cellular layout of the interior. It may be that spaces have been altered but there would become a blurring between the historic building and the space within the proposed new addition.

Since original submission, the proposed replacement garden room has been amended slightly in design. It has been reduced in depth to a degree, which is positive. However, it is still deeper than the existing conservatory and would therefore appear more intrusive as seen against this garden elevation. The roof takes the form of slack roof pitches surrounding a central raised box lantern feature. This lantern is intended to be frameless glass but this represents an uncharacteristic and intrusive roof profile. The slopes around it are now shown covered in natural stone tile, which at least matches the material to the main house roof slopes above. But this material is applied to an uncharacteristically slack pitch, which visually is not so successful and is also not reflective of the local architectural traditions. The corner piers would be in untreated oak with sliding folding aluminium, framed glazed doors. The width of these openings, both below the large span of the more solid roof above and between the insubstantial oak piers, would appear uncomfortable and incongruous with the architecture of the existing building. These glazed screens, especially when open, and in conjunction with the creation of larger openings in the historic wall behind, would result in intrusive apertures that would detract from the visual integrity of the building.

For the above reasons, the proposed works are deemed to be harmful and to fail to preserve the building and its features. There would therefore be a conflict with our statutory duty as set out in


Sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (LBCA) Act 1990. The works would diminish the significance of the building as a designated heritage asset. There are no public benefits in this case that would outweigh that harm. The proposals are therefore also considered to fail to meet the tests within Section 12 of the NPPF.

9. Conclusion:

It is therefore recommended that the application is refused as the works would fail to preserve the listed building and its features. Its significance as a designated heritage asset would be diminished, and without public benefit to outweigh that harm. It is therefore judged that there would be a failure to meet the requirements of Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.


10. Reason for Refusal:

The Dower House is a Grade II Listed Building. The Local Planning Authority is therefore statutorily required to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building, its setting, and any features of special architectural or historic interest it may possess. The proposals include the removal of stone window surrounds and masonry, and the creation of larger openings. This would result in loss of historic fabric and features, and harm to the integrity and character of the building. The proposals also include a new garden room extension, which by virtue of elements of its design, including its proportions and large scale glazed openings, slack roof pitches and box lantern feature, would appear intrusive and incongruous. The works would therefore fail to preserve the listed building and its features. Its significance as a designated heritage asset would be diminished, and without public benefit to outweigh that harm. It is therefore judged that there would be a failure to meet the requirements of Section 16(2) [66(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.




EAST ELEVATION
as existing and as approved but only partly built


SOUTH ELEVATION
as existing




WEST ELEVATION in courtyard
as existing and as approved but only partly built




NORTH ELEVATION
as existing and as approved but only partly built




THE FLAT
GROUND FLOOR PLAN.



MAIN HOUSE
GROUND FLOOR PLAN.
as existing, included alterations already approved



WEST ELEVATION
as existing and as approved but only partly built



EAST COURTYARD ELEVATION
as existing and as approved but only partly built

| | |
|--|------------|
| | |
| The Phoenix House, Monksborough, GL54 1HR | |
| Tel: 01451 820041 Fax: 01451 820000 www.eastbrookarchitects.co.uk | |
| EASTBROOK ARCHITECTS 27-29, High Street, Stroud, Gloucestershire GL54 1HQ Phone: 01451 820041 Fax: 01451 820000 www.eastbrookarchitects.co.uk | |
| AG Belling House Section and Elevation | |
| Scale: 1/100 @ A1 Date: 04/13 | 11/87/1310 |

