

Item No 08:-

18/00425/LBC

**3 Dunfield Cottages
Dunfield
Kempsford
Fairford
Gloucestershire
GL7 4HE**

Item No 08:-

Erection of two storey extension to rear, single storey extension to rear and side. Internal and external alterations at 3 Dunfield Cottages Dunfield Kempsford Gloucestershire GL7 4HE

Listed Building Consent 18/00425/LBC	
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs A Ballard
Agent:	Corinium Architectural Services
Case Officer:	Helen Donnelly
Ward Member(s):	Councillor Sue Coakley Councillor Stephen Andrews
Committee Date:	10th October 2018
RECOMMENDATION:	REFUSE

Main Issues:

(a) Impact upon Designated Heritage Assets

Reasons for Referral:

The application has been referred to the Planning Committee for determination at the request of one of the Ward Members, Councillor Stephen Andrews, for the following reasons:

"The revised scheme is in my opinion an improvement on that previously submitted. In particular, the mass of the "wrap round" to the side of the building has been significantly reduced so that it no longer interferes with the historic portion of the building. This now means that, when viewed from the road, the dominant feature remains the historic building with its "common" frontage across the three cottages. Clearly the harm caused to the historic building by the previous proposal has been reduced, and I note that in your most recent report this is described as "less than substantial". In reviewing the plans of the existing layout I would judge that its layout is at least "inconvenient" for a family dwelling by modern standards. I also note the reference made to the need to undertake significant works on the fabric of the historic building and more recent extensions. Taken together, I do not consider it unreasonable for an application to be made that ensures the continued use of this historic building as a modest family home, its traditional use, into the 21st century....Given all of the above, I would ask that this application be referred to the Planning Committee who should be invited to consider whether the application is consistent with the continued use of this historic building as a modest family home into the 21st Century sufficiently respects the historic building and its setting".

1. Site Description:

The application site is located within the small settlement of Dunfield. The application site comprises an end of terrace dwelling, known as No.3 Dunfield Cottages, which is set back from the main road through the settlement.

The terrace (numbers 3, 4 and 5) are Grade II Listed Buildings dating from the late 18th century and are listed together.

The application site does not lie within a designated landscape.

2. Relevant Planning History:

07/02045/FUL. Erection of two storey extension to rear, single storey extension to rear and side. Permitted 19.12.2007.

07/02044/LBC. Demolition of rear felt flat roof single storey extension, erection of a replacement single storey extension, new porch canopy, alterations to fenestration and internal alterations. Permitted 19.12.2007.

CT6077. Erection of Garage, and extension to provide 2 bedrooms. Permitted 20.10.1983.

3. Planning Policies:

NPPF National Planning Policy Framework

4. Observations of Consultees:

The views of the Conservation and Design Officer are incorporated with the Officers Assessment

5. View of Town/Parish Council:

Comments not received.

6. Other Representations:

One letter of support has been received: iii) The proposed plans would not compromise the historic value or aesthetic appearance of the dwellings;

i) As the original building has already been significantly extended to the rear in the 20th C, I see no reason why this cannot be modified in the 21st C to make it more suitable for a young family;

ii) It is a home, not a museum;

iii) The plans do not alter the street view of the main building and the wrap around extension at the rear providing main access to the cottage is discretely set back;

iv) No issues affecting neighbouring properties in terms of access, light or claustrophobic proximity;

v) Reduction in drive area aids symmetry with the building at the other end of the terrace;

vi) Any further work done will only make the property look more aesthetically pleasing.

7. Applicant's Supporting Information:

Design and Access Statement

8. Officer's Assessment:*Introduction*

The application is for the erection of two storey rear extension and a single storey side and rear extension along with new window openings within the existing buildings.

The plans were amended during the course of the application to reduce the projection of the single storey extension along the side elevation of the dwelling.

Legislation

Number 3 Dunfield 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.

It also adjoins, and falls within the setting of numbers 4 and 5 Dunfield. In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority shall 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, in accordance with Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act, 1990.

Policy Considerations

The National Planning Policy Framework

The NPPF has, at its core, a presumption in favour of sustainable development (paragraph 10) There are three overarching objectives to sustainable development, set out within paragraph 8: economic, social and environmental. The NPPF states that these objectives are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways.

Chapter 16- 'Conserving and enhancing the historic environment': The NPPF advises that when, making decisions on planning applications, Local Planning Authorities (LPA) should take into account the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and the positive contribution that they can make to sustainable communities. In addition, new development should make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. Paragraph 193 states 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 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". Paragraph 196 states that where a development proposal will cause harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset that is less than substantial harm, any such harm is to be weighed against the public benefits of those works.

Other

Although not a planning policy, Historic England's advice note 2 "Making Changes to Heritage Assets" (paragraph 41) advises that the main issues to consider in proposals for additions to heritage assets includes: "proportion, height, massing, bulk [and] use of materials". It also advises that: "It would not normally be good practice for new work to dominate the original asset or its setting in either scale, material or as a result of its siting."

(a) Impact upon the Heritage Asset

The terrace that comprises 3, 4 and 5 Dunfield Cottages historically formed a linear, two-storey range that was only a single room deep. All of the houses have been extended subsequently. Planning application CT.6077, permitted in 1983, was for the erection of a two storey extension and a half-width, single-storey offshoot to the rear of number 3. The extensions were erected and although the footprint of the dwelling was almost doubled at the ground floor, the rear projection of the two-storey extension was slightly less than the depth of the existing building, rendering it slightly subordinate. The two storey extension was also the same depth as the two-storey extensions on the other two houses, creating a consistent and generally flat rear elevation (with the exception of fenestration and roof treatments). There are a variety of further, single-storey projections, but these, due to their limited height, have had a fairly limited impact upon overall form of the group. Consequently, as all three houses have rear extensions to the same depth at first floor level, Officers consider that a certain degree of simplicity of form and linearity remains legible.

Planning permission 07/02045/FUL was for the extension of the single-storey offshoot to make it full width with a very slight increase in length. It also included the construction of a detached garage. The permission was not implemented but had it been, the terrace would still, from the front, retain its simple, uncluttered form. From the rear, whilst altered, a degree of linearity and consistency would remain.

The current application proposes a rendered two storey gable extension, which would project beyond the existing rear wall by 2 metres. The roofslopes would be covered in natural Cotswold slates. At the ground floor there would be a single storey lean to extension that would project an additional 3.3m and would wrap around the building by approximately 1.8m, projecting beyond the existing and historic side building line. This part of the extension would be approximately 2 metres in width. The single storey extension would be erected of natural stone with and the roof would be covered in raised seam metal sheeting.

The proposed extension of the gable would be visible obliquely from the road in conjunction with the historic part of the building. From this angle Officers consider that the existing extension already appears large and visually quite dominant and the proposed extension would exacerbate this considerably, creating a very long rear wing that would cumulatively be out of proportion with the historic parent building. It would also break the established rear building line above ground floor, eroding the only aspect of the rear elevations that is sympathetic to the historic terrace, which is its linearity and simplicity of form. This would also erode an aspect of the setting of numbers 4 and 5 that contributes positively to their significance.

The proposed single storey extension, by wrapping around the side elevation of the building, would erode the simplicity of form that is characteristic of such cottages, and would make the extension far more visually obvious than a rear extension. Consequently the current proposal would fail to preserve the special interest of this listed building and the two adjacent listed buildings, thereby failing to sustain their significance as designated heritage assets.

The proposed development would result in "less than substantial harm". The NPPF defines harm to heritage assets as either "less than substantial" or "substantial". As established in case law (*Barnwell Manor Wind Energy Ltd v E.Northants DC*, English Heritage, National Trust [2014]) less than substantial harm does not equate to a less-than-substantial objection.

In accordance with paragraph 196 of the NPPF, the less than substantial harm that would arise from the development has to be weighed against the public benefits that would arise from the development. The applicant has stated that the proposed development would provide overall enhancements to the building as follows:

"The removal of the majority of the poorly constructed rear wall;

Removal of existing render (of poor quality and finish) and replace with new render to better show distinction between old and new and 'tell the story' of the building as a whole.

Removal of externally cited oil fired boiler that sits on the side of the property, spoiling the significant front vista;

Addition of a (currently missing) front entrance to the property - restoring an element of symmetry to the building and also enhancing the safety of the property (that houses two children under 6) by adding an additional escape point".

Officers consider that the above improvements do not provide public benefits that would outweigh the harm identified. The erection of an extension is not necessary to enable maintenance of the listed building nor is it necessary to relocate an existing oil fired boiler. Officers have sought advice from the Council's Building Control team regarding the issue of the escape point. It is accepted that the current situation is not ideal as there is only one door at the ground floor which is accessed through the kitchen. The proposed extension does propose a second means of escape, again through the kitchen; this is still not ideal but the increase in size of the proposed extension would provide additional volume for smoke to disperse. However, it is not necessary to erect the proposed extension to provide an escape access and an additional escape access could be more sympathetically created through an escape window at the ground floor level or potentially by reinstating the original access within the front elevation.

9. Conclusion:

Officers and the applicant have been in discussions to find a suitable compromise but unfortunately one could not be found. Therefore Officers are recommending refusal of the application due to the harm that would arise without sufficient public benefits that would outweigh that harm.

10. Reason for Refusal:

Number 3 Dunfield Cottages is a Grade II listed building and forms the end of a linear two storey range of cottages that were originally only a single room deep. Under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990, the Local Planning Authority is statutorily required 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. by virtue of its scale, form and massing, would fail to preserve the special interest of this listed building and the two adjacent listed buildings, thereby failing to sustain their significance as designated heritage assets. The harm would be less-than-substantial but not be outweighed by any resultant public benefits. As such the proposal conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular chapter 16, and to grant consent would be contrary to the requirements of Section 16 of the Framework, and the statutory requirements of Section 16(2) of the 1990 Act.

Informatives:

This decision relates to the plans numbered 1743/2 Rev F and 1743/2 Rev K.