

Item No 06

17/00314/FUL

**The Old Rectory
Ampney Crucis
Cirencester
Gloucestershire
GL7 5RY**

Item No 06

**Glazed link extension at The Old Rectory Ampney Crucis Cirencester
Gloucestershire GL7 5RY**

| Full Application : 17/00314/FUL | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Applicant: | Mr Stuart McIntyre |
| Agent: | M D Architecture Limited |
| Case Officer: | Alison Williams |
| Ward Member(s): | Councillor David Fowles |
| Committee Date: | 12th July 2017 |
| RECOMMENDATION: | REFUSE |

Main Issues:

- (a) Impact on the Listed Building and Conservation Area
- (b) Impact on neighbouring amenity

Reasons for Referral:

The application has been called into Planning and Licensing Committee by Council D Fowles for the following reason:

"I believe that the applicant's proposal to link the two buildings is both innovative and sensitive and, given the fact that Officers hold a contrary view, I request that the application(s) are referred to the committee for determination".

1. Site Description:

The Old Rectory is a Grade II Listed Building situated within the Ampney Crucis Conservation Area. The proposals seek to create a link between the house and an outbuilding to the rear that would also serve as a summer room. The outbuilding has already been converted for ancillary living accommodation.

The proposals have been subject to ongoing consultation with the planning and conservation teams, however it has not been possible to agree a suitable solution.

2. Relevant Planning History:

15/05411/FUL - Internal refurbishment, external alterations - Permitted
15/05223/LBC - Internal refurbishment, external alterations - Permitted

3. Planning Policies:

NPPF National Planning Policy Framework
LPR15 Conservation Areas
LPR42 Cotswold Design Code
LPR46 Privacy & Gardens in Residential Deve

4. Observations of Consultees:

Conservation Officer - Objects to the proposals

5. View of Town/Parish Council:

No comments received.

6. Other Representations:

No comments received.

7. Applicant's Supporting Information:

Heritage statement

8. Officer's Assessment:**(a) Impact on the Listed Building**

The Old Rectory 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 Sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires 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 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 of an asset or development within its setting, that assets are irreplaceable, and that any harm should require clear and convincing justification. Paragraph 134 states that 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 work, including securing its optimum viable use.

Policy 15 of the Cotswold District Local Plan states that development must preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area as a whole, or any part of that area. It states that development will be permitted unless: it involves the demolition of a building, wall or other structure that makes a positive contribution; new or altered buildings are out-of-keeping with the special character or appearance of the area in general or in a particular location (in siting, scale, form, proportions, design or materials); or there would be the loss of open spaces that make a valuable contribution.

Policy 42 of the Local Plan requires that development should be environmentally sustainable and designed in a manner that respects the character, appearance and local distinctiveness of the Cotswold District with regard to style, setting, harmony, street scene, proportion, simplicity, materials and craftsmanship.

Section 7 of the NPPF requires good design. Paragraph 58 states that decisions should ensure that developments: function well in the long term and add to the overall quality of an area; establish a strong sense of place, creating attractive and comfortable places; and respond to local character and history, reflecting the identity of the surroundings and materials, whilst not stifling innovation. Paragraph 60 states that local distinctiveness should be promoted or reinforced and Paragraph 61 that connections between people and places, with the integration of new development into the built and historic environment.

The plans have been amended during the consideration of the application, however Officers do not consider that the proposals overcome the concerns raised in relation to the harmful impact on the character, fabric and setting of the Listed Building.

The proposed link between the two buildings would also create the main hall and point of access, as well as a garden room. It would relocate the existing stone wall that connects the two buildings 3.5m further to the east. This wall would then be increased in height from 2.1m to 2.7m with a timber panelled door inserted, which would then allow entrance into the proposed link/summer room and would also serve as the main entrance to the property.

The extension would be formed from frameless fine line aluminium double glazed screens and sliding doors and glazed roof on the eastern elevation. The extension would extend 3.6m in width to the east.

The earliest part of the Old Rectory dates from the C17th, with C19th additions, and then the taller gabled rear wing added in the 1900s by architects Pilkington and Hall, and at this time the interior was also re-ordered. The north side of the house is the service end of the Old Rectory and the north elevation faces onto its historic service yard, enclosed and formed by the parallel outbuilding. This outbuilding has been converted into ancillary accommodation to the dwelling house in more recent years, but retains its fundamental character as a physically and visually separate ancillary building of historic utilitarian function. The separate functional and physical relationship of the house and outbuilding are essential to their historic character and integrity as well as their contextual setting. The distinct yard area created between them for functional and architectural reasons historically continues to provide evidence of the relationship as to how the buildings were designed and operated in regard to each other and the yard in between them in terms of functional need and social expectations.

The boundary wall that currently divides the yard is a relatively modern addition and is positioned $\frac{3}{4}$ of the way along the outbuilding at a relatively low height, therefore although the yard size has diminished to some extent, this is relatively marginal and the low height of the wall, along with its simplicity of form, maintains a clear sense of the separate historic and architectural character of the two buildings and the contribution the yard provides in this relationship.

The proposal, through the relocation of the existing wall by 3.5m further to the west, aims to increase the size of the resultant yard, but would at the same time increase the height of the wall, rendering it more prominent in its uncharacteristic division of the yard space. Indeed the boundary wall would no longer be a simple boundary wall but the wall of a garden room, located within the service yard and physically linking the principal dwelling-house to its ancillary outbuilding, which historically was characteristically separate both physically and functionally.

The proposed centralisation of the entrance door from the yard into the proposed stone wall of the link extension would, through its location and use of a solid planked door, give added prominence to the link as an entrance feature, rather than a boundary wall with an incidental gate access within it.

The provision of a linking garden room as proposed, although increasing the yard space slightly, would result in harm being caused to the individual legibility of the separate buildings, the architectural and operational relationship between the buildings historically and their associated functional spaces, thereby harming the character, significance and setting of the principal and curtilage listed buildings.

In addition, the relocation of the wall to form the elevation of the garden room/link extension results in the physical alteration of historic fabric and features to the elevations of both the main house and the outbuilding. The Heritage Significance Addendum report submitted with the application provides no clear or convincing evidence that the openings proposed for alteration hold no significance and would not be harmed by the proposals. The current proposals would result in the loss of the door jamb, which appears to be original. In relation to the window and door arrangement to the main house, the existing door appears to be an alteration from a window, but the existing window appears from the photograph to be a historic and architectural part of this elevation. As such, it is considered that there is insufficient justification for the loss of historic fabric to outweigh the harm.

It is acknowledged that houses of this type and date often had conservatories attached to the main house historically, however this is not the case here and this may also be to do with the constraints and historic function of the buildings and yard behind. Any conservatory historically would not have been within the yard space and would have related in location, form and architecturally to the house and garden, with any physical attachment to an outbuilding being minimal and incidental. Indeed a garden room would have related to the garden and turn its back on the service and yard space. Positioning a garden room within the rear service yard and linking it to two buildings of deliberately designed differing functional and physical character is considered to be incongruous harming the setting and significance of the listed buildings.

As such, the proposals would result in less than substantial harm to the special character and significance of the Listed Buildings in relation to the loss of historic fabric, the negative impact of the historic legibility of the buildings, the relationship of the buildings and their historically functional spaces. The extension would also fail to preserve the character or appearance of the Ampney Crucis Conservation Area. The significance of the designated heritage assets would be diminished, and without public benefits in this case, to outweigh that harm. The proposals are therefore contrary to Section 16(2) and 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Section 12 of the NPPF, and Policies 15 & 42 of the Cotswold District Local Plan 2006. As such the application is recommended for refusal.

(b) Impact on neighbouring amenity

Due to the enclosed nature of the site the proposals would not impact on neighbouring amenity in accordance with Policy 46 of the Cotswold District Local Plan.

9. Conclusion:

The proposals would result in less than substantial harm to the special character and significance of the listed buildings in relation to the loss of historic fabric, the historic legibility of the buildings, the relationship of the buildings and their historically functional spaces. However, there are no public benefits to outweigh the harm. As such, the proposals are contrary to Section 12 of the NPPF and Sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. As such, the application is recommended for refusal.

10. Reason for Refusal:

The proposals would result in less than substantial harm to the special character and significance of the listed buildings in relation to the loss of historic fabric, the negative impact of the historic legibility of the buildings, the relationship of the buildings and their historically functional spaces. The extension would also fail to preserve the character or appearance of the Ampney Crucis Conservation Area. The significance of the designated heritage assets would be diminished, and without public benefits in this case to outweigh that harm. The proposals are therefore contrary to Section 16(2) and 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Section 12 of the NPPF, and Policies 15 & 42 of the Cotswold District Local Plan 2006. As such, the application is recommended for refusal.