

**WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE  
ON 31 AUGUST 2016  
UPDATE REPORT**

**Item No:** (2)                      **Application No:** 16/01675/HOUSE & 16/01676/LBC2                      **Page No.** 39 - 47  
**Site:** Long Acre Farm Seven Barrows

---

**Planning Officer Presenting:** Derek Carnegie

**Member Presenting:**

---

**Parish Representative speaking:** Councillor Riggall

**Objector(s) speaking:** N/A

**Supporter(s) speaking:** N/A

**Applicant/Agent speaking:** Mr Mark Preston  
Mr Mike Fowler

**Ward Member(s):** Councillor Graham Jones  
Councillor Gordon Lundie

**Update Information:** Further Representations:-

Historic England – OBJECTION – high degree of harm from overdevelopment

Comments:

- Overdevelopment.
- This is a cottage orné, a relatively modest farmhouse with a very playful frontage.
- I imagine that it's the work of a large landowner who likes the idea of his tenants living in picturesque rustic buildings. Therefore while a lot of thought has been put into the façade it was conceived as quite a small building.
- The proposed extension is very large, nearly as big as the original house. I think that this is fundamentally at odds with the architectural character of the building, its making a modest house into a mansion, and thus there is a high degree of harm to the significance of the listed building.

- The heritage statement is highly uninformative and completely misses the historical interest as an estate cottage. The fact that it looks fancier than it needs to is part of its interest.
- It tells a story about an owner beatifying his estate and it forms part of the wider story of improving landlords in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century building model villages and ideal cottages that provide better conditions for tenants, but are also nice for the gentry to look at.
- The Heritage statement does not ask the obvious question of was it part of a group of similar buildings built by the same landowner?
- The building is worthy of further research on its origins.

### **Impact on the Listed Building**

Heritage England have objected to the proposed extension on the ground of overdevelopment which would lead to a high degree of harm to the significance of the listed building.

The impact on the listed building was previously considered on page 45, paragraph 6.17 onwards of the main Committee Agenda report. It was concluded that the proposal would lead to 'less than substantial harm' to the significance of the listed building. Following the response from Historic England however, it is now considered that the proposal would lead to 'substantial harm' to the significance of the listed building.

Paragraph 132 of the NPPF states that:

*“Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building, park or garden should be exceptional.”*

In then goes on to state in paragraph 133 that in these instances *“local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss.”*

Therefore given the above advice, it is considered that the proposal would lead to substantial harm to the original and relatively rare Cottage Orn  through overdevelopment. 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.

In these circumstances, the guidance is clear that such applications should be refused unless there is substantial public benefit outweighing the harm. 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 no public benefit contrary to advice.

### **Recommendation**

The recommendation remains that of REFUSAL with the reasons for refusal as set out in the Committee agenda report.

DC