

**Item No 10:-**

**18/04738/LBC**

**8 Wraggs Row  
Stow-On-The-Wold  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL54 1JT**

**Item No 10:-**

**Demolition of the existing single storey extension, and replacement with a 1.5 storey mono pitch and 2 storey gable extension with a glazed area infill, insertion of dormer windows to rear, and internal alterations. Alterations to boundary walls. at 8 Wraggs Row Stow-On-The-Wold Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL54 1JT**

<b>Listed Building Consent 18/04738/LBC</b>	
Applicant:	Mr Carl Barnard
Agent:	Mr Marcus Howe
Case Officer:	Sophie Browne
Ward Member(s):	Councillor Dilys Neill
Committee Date:	10th April 2019
<b>RECOMMENDATION:</b>	<b>REFUSE</b>

**Main Issues:**

(a) Design and Impact on Heritage Assets

**Reasons for Referral:**

Cllr Neill has called this application to Committee for the following reason: "I think that the current application is more suitable for modern living than the previous plan. I would like to bring the application to the planning committee for their opinion."

**1. Site Description:**

The application site comprises a Grade II listed building located in Stow-on-the-Wold. The property is mid-terraced in a row of terraces called Wraggs Row, all of which are Grade II listed. The property is a small, early-19th century terraced house. Its significance rests in its being a characteristic example of vernacular architecture, and as an example of a very modest artisan's or agricultural worker's cottage. Integral to this are its modest scale, its simple plan-form, and its linear character.

The site is located in the Stow-on-the-Wold Conservation Area and within the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

**2. Relevant Planning History:**

17/03299/LBC - Demolition of a mono pitch single storey extension, being replaced by a mono pitch and half storey extension with a stone gable at one end and works to the boundary dry stone walls. Withdrawn 23.04.2018

18/02177/LBC - Demolition and replacement of rear extension, dormer windows to rear, re-roofing and roof alterations to existing rear extensions, replacement doors and windows and internal alterations. Permitted 25.10.2018

**3. Planning Policies:**

NPPF National Planning Policy Framework

**4. Observations of Consultees:**

Conservation Officer: comments incorporated into the Officer's Assessment.

**5. View of Town/Parish Council:**

No objection.

**6. Other Representations:**

One comment received in support of the application, on the grounds that the cottage is in need of renovation.

**7. Applicant's Supporting Information:**

Proposed plans and Heritage Report (revised).

**8. Officer's Assessment:**

8 Wraggs Row is a Grade II listed building: as such, the Local Planning Authority is 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.

As the property is located within Stow-on-the-Wold Conservation Area, the Local Planning Authority is statutorily obliged to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area, in accordance with Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

**(a) Design and Impact on Heritage Assets**

NPPF Section 12 requires good design, providing sustainable development and creating better place to live and work in. Paragraph 127 states that decisions should ensure that development will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development. Development should be visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping, which are sympathetic to local character and history maintaining a strong sense of place.

NPPF Section 16 states that historical 'assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations'. Specifically Paragraph 192 states that local planning authorities should take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation. 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. Paragraph 194 states that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Paragraph 196 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 proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

This submission is a revision of two previous schemes: the first was withdrawn following substantial negotiation, with a subsequent, much-evolved scheme, later being approved. The current proposals are similar to the withdrawn scheme in that they include the dismantling of the historic lean-to along the rear of the building, an increased footprint and roof pitch to the extension off the sitting room, and the erection of a two-storey gabled wing at right-angles to the

building. The current proposals also include increasing the size of the approved dormer in the in the main rear roof slope. These departures from the approved scheme, which allowed for a more modest extension across the rear of the building with the partial-retention of the historic lean-to, combine to create a greater mass across the rear of the property. Some elements of the approved scheme have been retained within the current proposal: these are largely uncontentious and include works to the front of the building and the dry stone walls to the rear of the site.

It should be noted that some aspects of the submitted plans are unclear, there is a lack of detail in relation to the proposed internal works, and that the Heritage Report submitted initially did not relate to the current scheme. A revised Heritage Report was requested and subsequently received: whilst the proposals outlined therein now correspond with the submitted drawings, discrepancies remain in the 'Assessment of Impact' section. Were the proposals supported in principle, further clarification would have been sought - however, this was considered unwarranted given the concerns with the proposed scheme.

The building was originally a linear structure, only a single range deep, the evidence for which is the pointing on the now covered rear wall, and the blocked rear window at first floor. The existing lean-to, whilst a subsequent addition, is nonetheless historic, as evidenced by both the stonework and its depiction on the 1902, 1:2,500 O.S. map. Such lean-tos were characteristic additions to such cottages: they were simple, functional additions that were visually subordinate and preserved the characteristic linear form of the buildings.

Historic England's Making Changes to Heritage Assets identifies the importance both of the massing and bulk of historic buildings (paragraph 41) and of historic fabric (paragraph 42). Historic England's Listing Selection Guide Domestic 1: Vernacular Houses identifies that later phases of a building's evolution, especially those that are characteristic and also vernacular in form, can actually add to the building's significance (pg.11).

Consequently, the complete removal of the historic lean-to along the rear of the building is unwelcome, as it comprises historic fabric and an historic and characteristic phase of the building's evolution.

The existing lean-to extension is roofed with corrugated asbestos cement sheeting, which was previously approved to be replaced with natural blue slate tiles at a higher pitch. The replacement of the roof was not considered contentious: however, the current scheme would result in the lean-to roof joining the main roof slope at the same pitch, thus eroding the clear separation of the original part of the building from the subservient lean-to structures, furthered by the use of stone tiles to match the existing roof. This would result in no clear delineation between the old and new phases of the building, thus harming the significance of the building.

The section of the lean-to that is heavily glazed is considered acceptable as it would be a clear later addition, allowing for a modern living space that relates better to the garden.

A marked characteristic of the property is the contrast between its front and rear elevations. The front elevation, despite its modest size, has a balanced composition, with a central door topped by a stone canopy of brackets, and clearly strives at the appearance of a status that belies the actual size of the cottage. By contrast the rear elevation, being single-storey beneath a long cat-slide roof, is remarkably modest in character. This gives the building a very strong, and almost split, character, with all the emphasis being towards the street frontage.

The creation of a gabled wing at right-angles to the building would fundamentally alter the distinct historic character of the building by compromising its linear form, and by elevating the status of the particularly low, humble character of the rear elevation.

It is acknowledged that 7 Wraggs Row has a two-storey rear extension; however this pre-dates current legislation and guidance, being clearly depicted as 'existing' in planning drawings from 1987. 5 Wraggs Row has a rear extension that is shown as extant in 2000 but has no other planning history; it may be historic in origin. Consequently, these do not form material precedent:

furthermore, every planning application is considered on its own merits in the light of the impact upon the character and significance of that building.

The proposed gabled extension seeks to mirror the extension at No. 7 to create a balanced composition, the effect of which would be to further elevate the status of the rear of the property. The extension would therefore fail to preserve both the very distinct linear form of the building, and the very pronounced hierarchical difference between the two elevations, and as such would fail to preserve special interest or to sustain the significance of the building.

The proposed dormer window on the second storey was previously approved as a smaller window with a greater pitched slope. Whilst this is not the most characteristic form, there are other cat-slide dormers on Wraggs Row and it was therefore considered acceptable. The current scheme enlarges this window and flattens the roof pitch sufficiently that the visual appearance of the dormer would be as a flat roof rather than a cat-slide. 9 Wraggs Row has a small dormer window with a near flat roof: however, this is much smaller than the proposed and is not characteristic of the age or type of house. The proposed dormer is therefore considered harmful, with insufficient justification.

Various internal works are proposed, many replicated from the previous consent: however, insufficient detail of these has been submitted to allow any meaningful assessment.

It is proposed to re-roof the diminishing course natural stone tiled roof with salvaged tiles or reclaimed natural tiles, which is supported.

The scheme also proposes to dismantle the dry stone walls abutting the property and the neighbouring properties and rebuild the boundary walls to the rear of the site. Where the walls would be dismantled would be made good and the stone re-used to rebuild the boundary walls between No. 8 and 7 and 9 Wraggs Row. The proposed works would be in keeping with the character of the property and are therefore considered acceptable.

The demolition of the historic lean-to, replacement extension, erection of a gabled rear extension, and addition of a dormer window would fail to preserve the character or sustain the significance of the heritage asset as a modest, linear cottage, and the proposals are therefore considered to be contrary to Sections 12 and 16 of the NPPF. As such, to permit the application would be contrary to the statutory duty of the LP under Section 16(2) of the 1990 Act.

## **9. Conclusion:**

The demolition of the historic lean-to, replacement extension, erection of a gabled rear extension, and addition of a large dormer window would fail to preserve the character or sustain the significance of the heritage asset as a modest, linear cottage: the proposals are therefore considered to be contrary to Sections 12 and 16 of the NPPF, and to permit the application would therefore be contrary to the statutory duty of the LPA under Section 16(2) of the 1990 Act.

## **10. Reason for Refusal:**

8 Wraggs Row is a grade II listed building; it comprises a modest little cottage whose strongest characteristics are its linear form, and the very different character of its two elevations. 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. The current proposal, by virtue of the rear gabled wing that would erode both the linear form, and the low, humble character of the rear elevation, would neither preserve the special architectural or historic interest of the listed building, nor sustain its significance as a designated heritage asset. The harm would be less-than-substantial, but not be outweighed by any resultant public benefits. As such the proposal conflicts with paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework, 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.