

Item (3)	16/01675/HOUSE and 16/01676/LBC2
Title of Report:	Long Acre Farm, Seven Barrows, Lambourn Mr and Mrs M Preston Erection of two storey extension and single storey glazed link.
Report to be considered by:	District Planning Committee
Date of Meeting:	28 th September 2016.
Forward Plan Ref:	N/A

To view the plans and drawings relating to this application click the following link:
<http://planning.westberks.gov.uk/rpp/index.asp?caseref=16/01675/HOUSE>

To view the plans and drawings relating to this application click the following link:
<http://planning.westberks.gov.uk/rpp/index.asp?caseref=16/01676/LBC2>

Purpose of Report: **For the District Planning Committee to determine the application in question.**

Recommended Action: **The Western Area Planning Committee, at the meeting on 31st August 2016, RESOLVED** to approve the application, subject to conditions. The application, if approved, would comprise a departure from current Development Plan Policy in the Core Strategy 2006 to 2026, the advice given in the NPPF and the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Reason for decision to be taken: The application, if approved, would comprise a departure from current Development Plan Policy in the Core Strategy 2006 to 2026 - ADPP1, ADPP5 and CS19. Policy ENV24 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan Saved Policies 2007, Policies C3, and C6 of the draft West Berkshire Council Proposed Submission Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document (November 2015).

The proposal therefore conflicts with the statutory requirements of the Planning (Listed Buildings and conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Key background documentation: Western Area Planning Committee on 31st August 2016. Agenda Report and minutes, plus update sheet. Application file 16/01675/HOUSE and 16/01676/LBC2

Key aims.

- Focus development within established settlement boundaries.
- Protection of designated heritage assets
- Protecting the environment and rural areas
- Achieve sustainability in Council planning decisions.

The proposals contained in this report have to be considered in order to help to achieve the above Council Strategy as set out in the 2013 to 2018 document.

Portfolio Member Details	
Name & Telephone No.:	Councillor Hilary Cole
E-mail Address:	Hilary.Cole@westberks.gov.uk
Date Portfolio Member agreed report:	To be advised.

Contact Officer Details	
Name:	Sharon Brentnall
Job Title:	Temporary Planning Officer
Tel. No.:	01635519111
E-mail Address:	Sharon.brentnall@westberks.gov.uk

Implications

Policy:	Core Strategy Policies – ADDP1, ADPP5, CS 13:, CS 14, CS 18, CS 19
Financial:	N/A
Personnel:	N/A
Legal/Procurement:	N/A
Property:	N/A
Risk Management:	N/A
Equalities Impact Assessment:	N/A

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The Western Area Planning Committee on 31st August 2016, considered an agenda report for the erection of a single storey glazed link from the existing dwelling leading to a two storey extension. The site is located to the within Upper Lambourn, outside of any defined settlement boundary and within the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The application site falls within the open countryside as identified within Policy ADPP1 of the Core Strategy where 'only appropriate limited development in the countryside will be allowed, focussed on the addressing identified needs and maintaining a strong rural economy'. Policy ENV.24 of the Local Plan Saved Policies allows for the extension of houses in the countryside in principle subject to a range of criteria, primarily relating to design, harm to the character of the area and whether it would be disproportionate to the original dwelling.:
- 1.2 Policy C6 of the Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document (HSA DPD) is proposed to replace saved policy ENV.24. This policy also allows for the extensions of houses in the countryside. There is a presumption in favour of proposals for the extension of existing permanent dwellings and will be permitted subject to scale in relation to the original dwelling, design and use of materials, harm to the amenity of neighbouring

properties. Of most relevance to this application is that it should have no adverse impact on the setting, the space occupied within the plot boundary, on local rural character, the historic interest of the building and its setting within the wider landscape.

- 1.3 It is considered that the impact of the proposed extension when taken with the existing building would result in a substantial dwelling on this plot, which would be inappropriate in this location. Whilst the plot size is relatively large, the proposed dwelling would dominate the residential curtilage. The original rear garden area would be lost to built development, with the front of the dwelling re-sited to the extension. The original listed farmhouse/ farm yard layout will no longer be visible, which is considered to have an adverse impact on the setting of this Grade II Listed Building.
- 1.4 Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty have a high status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty, as set out in para. 115 of the NPPF. It is considered that the cumulative impact of the proposed extension, in conjunction with the existing dwelling and surrounding buildings on the site would introduce a significant amount of built form into this open, rural landscape which would have a detrimental impact in this location. It is considered that the proposal does not comply with relevant criteria of saved policy ENV24 or emerging policy C6 in this regard.
- 1.5 with regard to proportion and increases in size proposed by extensions in the countryside, the Replacement Dwellings and Extensions to Dwellings in the Countryside SPG outlines the factors to consider (including floor space calculations based on the original dwelling as first constructed or as they existed in 1948 if built before this date). It states that an increase in floor space of less than 50% would likely be acceptable, with anything over 100% normally to be unacceptable. Between 50% and 100% depends on the site characteristics, scale and massing of the proposal. The existing dwelling currently consists of the original farm cottage, which has been significantly extended over time, with a substantial two storey extension, followed by a further significant single storey modern extension. The proposal would add a further two storey extension to replicate the existing two storey dwelling. Due to the amount of changes over time, the actual floorspace of the original dwelling is difficult to calculate. If however the single storey rear extension is removed and the two storey original building and proposed extensions are simply compared, this would represent a 97% increase. Historical maps show that the dwelling would have been significantly smaller and therefore the actual increase in floorspace over the original dwelling would be in excess of 100%.
- 1.6 It is noted that the applicants have questioned the use of the 'disproportionate calculations', which is one of the criteria of Policy ENV24. Emerging policy only requires the proposal to be subservient to the host dwelling. It is clear from the calculations that the proposed would be marginally subservient to the host property in terms of a 97% increase, but visually this would not be apparent, particularly when it is added to the proposed single storey extension and the existing modern elements of the property. These elements combined would result in a form of development which would be three times the depth of the original building and not a form which could be considered to be either proportionate or subservient.
- 1.7 The dwelling is a Grade II Listed building and an application for Listed Building Consent is also being considered. In the consultation response from Historic England, the dwelling is described as a relatively rare Cottage Orn , where the proposed extension on the grounds of overdevelopment, would lead to a high degree of harm to the significance of the listed building. The proposed extension is considered to be fundamentally at odds with the architectural character of the original modest cottage and the significance of the listed building would be lost.

- 1.8 The Conservation Officer echoes these views, also adding that It is the council's duty to preserve buildings and settings of architectural interest. The property's special interest was derived from its modest, but decorated appearance, the building techniques used in its construction and the detailing on the facade. Whilst it had been extended, this had been to the rear of the building and had been subservient and of the same architectural language. The proposed design replicates the existing cottage in a bookend effect, which is clearly not subservient to the main cottage. In 100 years time it would be difficult to determine the original house, which is of key significance. The original dwelling will no longer house the entrance to the dwelling and the original siting and layout will be lost. Whilst it is acknowledged that previous extensions have undermined some of the significance of the heritage asset, this is not sufficient reason to grant consent. The building still remains a valuable heritage asset which in the opinion of Historic England warrants further research.
- 1.9 The proposals are considered to result in significant harm to the heritage asset. In these instances the NPPF (paragraph 132), is clear that "*Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting.*" It goes on to state that "*where there is no public benefit to outweigh the harm, these applications should be refused*". It is considered that the existing dwelling has sufficient floorspace to enable it to operate as a viable dwelling. Therefore the proposed extension of the dwelling would provide only private benefit and no public benefit contrary to advice. Whilst the applicants wish to remodel the space to suit family requirements, this does not represent sufficient justification to outweigh the harm to the valuable heritage asset.
- 1.10 This is further reinforced by the views of the Conservation Officer and that of Historic England, who as specialist heritage professionals, set out that the application should be refused as contrary to policy CS19, the NPPF and the provisions of and the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
- 1.11 Members at the Western Area Planning Committee in the main considered that the proposed extension was of a design which was appropriate and the original modest form of the cottage did not meet modern requirements and therefore the proposed extension, given that the original cottage had already been extended was acceptable. This benefit would outweigh the harm and justify the departure from national and local planning policy. Officers determined that the issues involved should be considered by the District Planning Committee due to the conflict with the provisions of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. In addition to conflict with planning policy that would undermine the development plan and the forthcoming Housing Allocations DPD. The detailed reasons are set out more fully in the report attached at Appendix 1 and update paper at Appendix 2.

2 CONCLUSION

- 2.1 The Western Area Planning Committee evaluated the planning policy advice provided in the Committee Report and concluded that the proposed extension to this Grade II Listed building was acceptable and appropriate to this location. The benefits of the proposal, namely extending the property to provide a dwelling which has sufficient floorspace and a layout to meet modern standards, outweigh the departure from national and local planning policy.

3 RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 That the District Planning Committee **REFUSE** planning permission for the reasons set out in paragraph 8.2 of the report to the Western Area Planning Committee on 31st August 2016.

APPENDICES

- 1 WAP Committee Report of 31st August 2016
- 2 Update paper of 31st August 2016
- 3 Minutes of meeting held on 31st August 2016

DC