

Committee Report

Item No: 4

Reference: DC/19/01530

Case Officer: Harry Goodrich

Ward: South East Cosford.

Ward Member/s: Cllr Leigh Jamieson.

RECOMMENDATION – REFUSE HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING PERMISSION

Description of Development

Householder Planning Application - Erection of a single storey & two storey side extension.

Location

The Old Rectory, Rectory Road, Whatfield, Ipswich Suffolk IP7 6QU

Parish: Whatfield

Expiry Date: 21/06/2019

Application Type: HSE - Householder Planning Application

Development Type: Householder

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Mike & Jane Appleby

Agent: Embrace Architecture Ltd

PART ONE – REASON FOR REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE

The application is referred to committee for the following reason/s:

The application has been called to the Planning Committee by the Cllr Leigh Jamieson, who is the ward member for the site of this application. The proposal has been considered by the Delegation Panel to present clear and significant policy and consistency considerations, with a decision on the application being of more than local significance.

Has a Committee Call In request been received from a Council Member?

A Committee Call In request has been received by a member of the Council. The initial committee call in was made by Alan Ferguson, previous Ward Member for the site in question. This Call In was agreed by Cllr Leigh Jamieson, the current ward member for the South Cosford Ward.

Details of Pre-Application Advice

None

PART TWO – POLICIES AND CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Summary of Policies

NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework

CS01 - Applying the presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development in Babergh
CN01 - Design Standards
CN06 - Listed Buildings - Alteration/Ext/COU
HS33 - Extensions to Existing Dwellings

Consultations and Representations

During the course of the application Consultation and Representations from third parties have been received. These are summarised below.

SCC - Archaeological Service

No Objections subject to conditions.

No other consultations or neighbour representations have been received.

PLANNING HISTORY

REF: DC/18/05476	Householder Application - Erection of single and two storey side extension	DECISION: WDN
REF: DC/18/05477	Application for Listed Building Consent - Erection of single and two storey side extension following demolition of part	DECISION: WDN
REF: B/0131/75/FUL	Double garage to house cars, 4 sheds for general storage, as amended by letter received on 4th April 1975	DECISION: GRA

PART THREE – ASSESSMENT OF APPLICATION

1.0 The Site and Surroundings

- 1.1 The application site comprises of a detached dwelling located away from the built-up area of Whatfield. The site is described as being a timber-framed and rendered house, likely originating in the 14th or 15th Century. However, it is considered that the site was rebuilt in the mid-17th century and subsequently extended and altered. The site has no immediate neighbouring properties, with the closest neighbouring properties located further down Rectory Lane to the east of the site.
- 1.2 To the north of the site is an existing stable block and stable yard. This building forms part of the applicant's land. The application site however has an existing moat located around the site, separating the host dwelling and the stable block. The site is well screened from the public highway

due the existing landscaping. A hard-surfaced driveway is in place to provide access and egress from the site, with parking being provided to the front of the property.

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

2.0 The Proposal

- 2.1 The application seeks Planning and Listed Building Consent for the erection of a single storey and two storey extensions on the Western side of the property. This report deals with the Planning application. The Listed Building application (reference DC/19/01531) is also with Members at this meeting.
- 2.2 The proposal involves the construction of extensions to provide additional living space for the property. This follows the demolition of an existing section of the host property.
- 2.3 The extensions consist of two-storey and single storey elements. These would provide space on the ground floor for a kitchen/dining area, a seating area and a laundry room. The first floor of the extension is to provide space for a master bedroom and an en-suite.
- 2.4 The materials to be used in the proposal are detailed within the application form, with walls using materials that are to match the existing and ensure the materials are suitable within the locality.

3.0 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 highway, so it is considered that the proposal is acceptable in this regard.

4.0 Design and Layout

- 4.1 The proposal includes both a single storey and two storey extension to the Western elevation of the dwelling, following the demolition of two existing wings.
- 4.2 The proposed two-storey element would have a ridge height of approximately 7 metres, with an eave height of 4 metres. It would extend 9.6 metres from the host dwelling and has a total width of 5 metres. The ridge height would be lower than that of the host dwelling.
- 4.3 The proposed single storey element would have an overall height of approximately 3m, this is a flat roofed element that sits alongside the two-storey element. The single storey aspect would extend from the host dwelling by 9m and be approximately 4.5m in width.
- 4.4 A new soft red facing brickwork chimney is also to be introduced with this proposal, this would sit at the front elevation of the property and would be approximately 5.1m in height.
- 4.5 The materials have been detailed within the application and are stated to include materials that are to be sympathetic to those that are existing within the property, including roof, walls and fenestration.

5.0 Listed Buildings

- 5.1 The application site is classed as a Grade II Listed Building and is, therefore, a designated Heritage Asset.
- 5.2 The way in which proposals are dealt with involving listed buildings, where extensions are proposed, requires two separate types of application (Planning and Listed Building) and draws on two different pieces of legislation (Town and Country Planning Act 1990 [as amended] and the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
- 5.3 The latter deals with heritage matters only (i.e. not residential amenity, highway safety, ecology and so on), the former deals with non-heritage matters, but does also overlap into heritage considerations such as the proposed built form in the same way it would with a non-heritage application.
- 5.4 There is, therefore, some overlap here with matters dealt with in the Listed Building report. .
- 5.5 Paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) 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”.
- 5.6 Whilst this is a Planning, as opposed to Listed Building, application, Members are reminded of Paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), which 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”.
- 5.7 Also of relevance, Section 16 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas Act) (1990) states that;

“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.”

- 5.8 Local Plan Policy CN06 repeats these aims and objectives, stating: “ proposals for the alteration (including part demolition), extension or change of use of buildings of Special Architectural or Historic Interest (including curtilage structures), or for the sub-division of, or new work within the curtilage or setting of a listed building should in this case (amongst other things):
- preserve the historic fabric of the building, and ensure that all proposals to remove by demolition, or alter any part of the building are justified in terms of preserving the special character of the building and will cause the minimum possible impact;
 - retain all elements, components, and features which form part of the building’s special interest and respect the original scale, form, design and purpose of the architectural unit;

- 5.9 The Councils Heritage Team has previously commented on a similar scheme at this site under reference DC/18/05477. It considered that the previous scheme would cause a high level of less than substantial harm to the significance of the listed building. The re-submission of this scheme includes a Heritage Impact Assessment and a few minor changes to the proposed extension.
- 5.10 Heritage Officers have assessed the application proposal and consider that it would result in a high level of less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset because the proposal would include the demolition of two historic wings.
- 5.11 Officers consider that the potential for The Old Rectory to contribute to the understanding of the past is significant, partly because evidential value derives from the remains inherited from the past. Note should be made that 'the ability to interpret the evidence tends to be diminished in proportion to the extent of its removal or replacement'.
- 5.12 Paragraph 194 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) 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. Substantial harm to or loss of:
- a) Grade II listed buildings, or Grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;
 - b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, Grade I and II* listed buildings, Grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional"
- 5.13 The Councils Heritage Team consider that the structural movement which is visible may be decades old and is not considered to be 'clear and convincing justification' (NPPF Para 194) for the demolition.
- 5.14 Furthermore, given that the proposal would result in a high level of less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset because the proposal would include the demolition of two historic wings there should be public benefit to outweigh the harm. Given that the proposal would result in a high level of harm but proposes an extension to a residential dwelling which would not offer public benefits it is considered that the proposal would not include public benefits to outweigh the harm as required by paragraph 196.
- 5.15 In conclusion, the application does not meet the requirements of Section 16 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas Act) (1990), nor the policies set out within the NPPF or the Local Plan.

6.0 Impact on Residential Amenity

- 6.1 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.

7.0 Other Matters

7.1 There are no other identifiable matters of concern from a Planning perspective.

PART FOUR – CONCLUSION

8.0 Planning Balance and Conclusion

- 8.1 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 to outweigh the harm, contrary to paragraph 196 of the NPPF.
- 8.2 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, and without clear and convincing justification, contrary to Section 16 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas Act) (1990) and the policies set out within the NPPF or the Local Plan.
- 8.3 Whilst the building in question is a listed building, this is a Planning application for extensions to a dwelling. Although no matters outside of heritage considerations are cited for refusal, this Planning application is recommended for refusal by dint of the proposal being unacceptable in heritage terms..

RECOMMENDATION

That authority be delegated to the Acting Chief Planning Officer to refuse householder planning permission for the following reasons:

The proposed two- storey and single- storey extensions on the western elevation of The Old Rectory, following the demolition of the two-storey and a single-storey wings, are considered to be detrimental to the character, appearance and setting of the Grade II designated Heritage Asset. The proposed demolition of the two historic wings which contribute notably to the understanding of the evolution of the building, would not preserve the designated heritage asset. The harm which would result to the listed building significantly outweighs any public benefits that may be afforded to the proposal and there is not clear or convincing justification for this harm, which should only be allowed in exceptional circumstances. The application, therefore, does not meet the requirements of paragraphs 194 and 196 of the NPPF and Policy CN06 of the Babergh Local Plan (2006).