

Committee Report

Item No:

Reference: DC/18/02014 & DC/18/02015

Case Officer: Harry Goodrich

Ward: Fressingfield

Ward Member: Lavinia Hadingham

RECOMMENDATION

DC/18/02014 - REFUSE HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION

DC/18/02015 - REFUSE LISTED BUILDING CONSENT

Description of Development

Householder Planning Application – Erection of an extension to lobby.

Application for Listed Building Consent – Erection of an extension to lobby.

Location

Walsham Hall, Metfield Road, Mendham, Harleston, Suffolk, IP20 0NR

Parish: Mendham

Expiry Date: 14/09/2018

Application Type: DC/18/02014 - Householder Planning Application, DC/18/02015 - Listed Building Consent

Development Type: Householder, Listed Building Consent – Alterations

Applicant: Mr S Haddingham

Agent: Peter Codling Architects

PART ONE – REASON FOR REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE

The application is referred to committee for the following reason:

- The Ward Member is a close relation to the applicant

UPDATE

Following the initial committee, members were minded to approve the proposal as they considered the proposal would consider no harm to the designated heritage asset subject to further design considerations being explored. It was proposed that the application should return to Committee B following a meeting to take place between the Planning Officers, the Heritage Officers and the Applicant to design a proposal that all parties consider acceptable.

This meeting has been scheduled for the 8th April 2019, and includes Gemma Walker from the Planning Department, Thomas Pinner from the Heritage Team and the applicants themselves. Due to the limited timescale on ensuring the application can get to the committee before the upcoming elections, an update on the proposal will be issued following the meeting through late papers and verbally. The following report on this basis is the same as previously provided on the basis of the officer considerations remain unchanged.

PART TWO – POLICIES AND CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Summary of Policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2018.

Relevant policies in the Core Strategy Focused Review 2012 and Mid-Suffolk Local Plan 1998:

FC01 - Presumption In Favour Of Sustainable Development
FC01_1 - Mid Suffolk Approach to Delivering Sustainable Development
CS05 - Mid Suffolk's Environment
GP01 - Design and layout of development
H15 - Development to reflect local characteristics
H16 - Protecting existing residential amenity
H18 – Extensions to Existing Dwellings
HB1 - Protection of Historic Buildings
HB3 – Conversion and Alteration to Historic Buildings
HB4 – Extensions to Existing Buildings

Consultations and Representations

During the course of the application Consultations have been sent to relevant parties, with two consultee comments being received.

The Parish Council voted to unanimously support the proposal.

The Heritage Team where consulted on the proposal initially and responded providing comments objecting to the proposal. Amended Documents where received, and following Heritage re-consultation the Heritage Team still objected to the proposal.

PART THREE – ASSESSMENT OF APPLICATION

1. The Site and Surroundings

1.1 - The application site comprises of a detached dwelling located within a cluster of existing buildings located to the East of the main built up area of Mendham, the site is described as being a Manor Farmhouse, with the core of the farmhouse being built in the 16th Century or potentially earlier with 17th Century alterations. A two-span wing was added to the rear at a later date. The site has no immediate neighbouring properties, with the closest neighbouring properties located further down Metfield Road to the East of the site.

1.2 - To the north of the site is a cluster of existing buildings, that are of agricultural nature. These buildings do not have a defined boundary. The application site however has an existing fenced boundary located around the site, this is supported by tree's and hedgerows to form a natural screen for the site from the public highway. A hard-surfaced driveway is in place to provide access and egress from the site, with parking being provided to the rear of the property.

1.3 - The site lies outside of the settlement boundary of the village. The application site is also classified as a Grade II listed building.

2. The Proposal

- 2.1 - The application seeks Planning and Listed Building Consent for the Erection of an Extension to a lobby situated to the rear of the property.
- 2.2 - The proposal involves the construction of an extension to provide additional space for an additional W/C to serve the property as well as providing access to the property that is currently already served through the existing door located on the rear of the property.
- 2.3 - The proposed extension to the lobby is set to extend 3.3m from the rear of the property and having a total width of 3.7m. The proposed extension has been designed to incorporate a W/C as well as a new cloakroom.
- 2.4 - The materials to be used in the proposal are detailed within the elevations plan and are stated to include the walls being constructed in reclaimed facing brick as well as painted render, as well as the roof being constructed using reclaimed clay plain tile.

3. Site Access, Parking and Highway Safety Considerations

3.1 - The existing site access and parking arrangements will not be changed by this proposal. There are no works planned to take place within the highways, so it is considered that the proposal is acceptable in this regard.

4. Listed Buildings

4.1 - The application site is classed as a Grade II designated Heritage Asset.

4.2 Paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2018) 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".

4.3 Section 16 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas Act) (1990) states that;

- (1) Subject to the previous provisions of this Part, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State may grant or refuse an application for listed building consent and, if they grant consent, may grant it subject to conditions.
- (2) In considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works the local planning authority or the Secretary of State 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.
- (3) Any listed building consent shall (except in so far as it otherwise provides) enure for the benefit of the building and of all persons for the time being interested in it.

4.4 Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas Act) (1990) states that;

- (1) In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State 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.

- (2) Without prejudice to section 72, in the exercise of the powers of appropriation, disposal and development (including redevelopment) conferred by the provisions of sections 232, 233 and 235(1) of the principal Act, a local authority shall have regard to the desirability of preserving features of special architectural or historic interest, and in particular, listed buildings.

4.5 - The Council's Heritage officers have assessed the application proposal and consider the proposal would result in a low to moderate level of less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset because the proposed porch would negatively impact the significance of the listed building by upsetting the hierarchy of the asset.

4.6 - The Heritage Team considers that the scale of the proposed rear porch is inappropriate. The proposed porch would be dominant due to its size and would thus cause the rear elevation of the building to visually compete with the front elevation.

4.7 - The Heritage Team considers that any rear porch to Walsham Hall should be reduced substantially in scale before it may be considered acceptable. It is also recommended that an alternative roof form is considered, to further reduce the dominance of any extension on this elevation.

4.8 - As required by the NPPF, great weight should be given to an asset's conservation. As further set out at paragraph 196 where a development will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset any harm must be weighed against the public benefits of a proposed development. The development proposes an extension to an existing porch on a private residence, it is considered that the harm to a designated Heritage Asset would not be outweighed by public benefits, or by way of securing the optimum viable use.

4.9 - In conclusion, the application does not meet the requirements of Section 16 and Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas Act) (1990), nor the policies set out within the NPPF or the Local Plan. It is this reason therefore that the proposal has been recommended for refusal.

5. Impact on Residential Amenity

5.1 - The site has no immediate neighbouring properties, with the closest property being located a significant distance to the East of the application site, due to this it is considered that the proposal will not detrimentally affect any neighbouring amenity.

PART FOUR – CONCLUSION

6. Planning Balance and Conclusion

6.1 - The National Planning Policy Framework details that any works to listed building that present a level of harm to a designated heritage asset, must provide public benefits that outweigh the harm caused by the proposal. It is considered that there are no public benefits from this proposal, so as to outweigh the harm.

6.2 - The application proposal is, therefore, considered to cause a level of harm to a designated heritage asset that cannot be justified through its public benefits, contrary to Section 16 and Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas Act) (1990), nor the policies set out within the NPPF or the Local Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

DC/18/02014 – That the Householder Planning Application is REFUSED for the below reasons;

The proposed extension to the lobby is detrimental to the character, appearance and setting of Walsham Hall, a Grade II listed and designated Heritage Asset as well as the Curtilage Listed Outbuilding to the East of the site. The proposed porch would dominate the rear elevation of the listed farmhouse, thus competing with the principle front elevation and altering their hierarchy. This ultimately detracts from the character and form of the historic building, eroding the special interest of the building. Due to this it is considered that the harm to the listed building significantly outweighs any public benefits that may be afforded to the proposal. The application, therefore, does not meet the requirements of Section 16 and Section 66 of the P(LBCA)A 1990, nor the policies within the NPPF or the Local Plan.

DC/18/02015 – That the Listed Building Consent is REFUSED for the below reasons;

The proposed extension to the lobby is detrimental to the character, appearance and setting of Walsham Hall, a Grade II listed and designated Heritage Asset as well as the Curtilage Listed Outbuilding to the East of the site. The proposed porch would dominate the rear elevation of the listed farmhouse, thus competing with the principle front elevation and altering their hierarchy. This ultimately detracts from the character and form of the historic building, eroding the special interest of the building. Due to this it is considered that the harm to the listed building significantly outweighs any public benefits that may be afforded to the proposal. The application, therefore, does not meet the requirements of Section 16 and Section 66 of the P(LBCA)A 1990, nor the policies within the NPPF or the Local Plan.