

Item No	Application No. and Parish	8/13 Week Date	Proposal, Location and Applicant
(5)	18/03398/HOUSE Hungerford & Kintbury	6th March 2019	Two storey and single storey extensions Winterley House, Kintbury Mr and Mrs McNally

To view the plans and drawings relating to this application click the following link:
<http://planning.westberks.gov.uk/rpp/index.asp?caseref=18/03398/HOUSE>

Recommendation Summary: **The Head of Development and Planning be authorised to REFUSE planning permission.**

Ward Member(s): Councillor Claire Rowles
Councillor James Cole
Councillor Dennis Benneyworth

Reason for Committee determination: Requested by Cllr Stansfeld

Committee Site Visit: 6th June 2019

Contact Officer Details	
Name:	Isabel Oettinger
Job Title:	Planning Officer
Tel No:	(01635) 519111
E-mail Address:	isabel.oettinger@westberks.gov.uk

1. Site History

86/2783/ADD conversion of grooms cottage and stables into private dwelling and new garage. Approved 05.01.1987

10/00852/FUL Change of Use of land to form new entrance, construct new sections of brick boundary wall to Back Lane and Kintbury Road and new entrance gates to the drive. Approved 20.07.10

10/01186/HOUSE Extension to south west corner and 1st floor bedroom, reconstruct west elevation brick work facing garden and realign fenestration to suit wider elevation. Approved 15.07.10

18/01506/HOUSE Demolition of existing ancillary outbuilding and erection of two storey and single storey extensions. Refused 17.10.18 (

Dismissed at appeal 08/05/19 Inspectors report attached

2. Publicity of Application

Site Notice Expired: 21.02.19

3. Consultations and Representations

Parish Council: No objections.

Highways: No objections.

Conservation Officer: Refusal of application 18/01506/HOUSE and notification of valid appeal against refusal noted.

Whilst arguments have been made by the applicants about the age of the property, there does not appear to be a denial of its heritage value, and the main issue in terms of extending the property has as much to do with the scale of the extensions proposed in house extension as well as heritage impact terms.

The house as it currently exists clearly possesses a symmetry its main (south) elevation, which should be respected in devising any extensions to it. Such "respect" would be best achieved in subservient extensions, with a set back and set down from the existing house. Although an attempt has been made to reduce the impact of the extensions by setting down the ridge heights of the two storey elements (which goes a little way to preserving the symmetry of the main building), no set back is proposed, nor is the footprint of the extensions reduced. Accordingly, the previously made comments are still considered to apply. NB. On a small point of detail, there appears to be a discrepancy between the submitted proposed elevation and floor plan drawings in respect of the window layout for the curved rear two-storey element.

Natural England: No comments.

Public: No representations received.

The following consultation responses from 18/01506/HOUSE are also relevant to the consideration of this application:

Conservation: Original: The two storey part of the extension arguably upsets the basic symmetry of the main building, and the further single storey extension exacerbates this, which is arguably contrary to SPG advice on house extensions, particularly in terms of subservience.

Whilst the building is not a designated heritage asset, nor do the works affect the setting of any designated heritage assets, the host property could be described as a non-designated heritage asset, where paragraph 197 of the NPPF 2018 applies. A Heritage Impact Assessment might therefore be appropriate in this case to justify (the impact of) the proposed works. It might also be appropriate at this stage for the Council's Archaeologist to be consulted on the application for an opinion and whether there is any information in the Historic Environment Record.

Follow-up: I am happy to stand by my original comments of 24th August 2018, that notwithstanding any heritage issues, the proposals, particularly the two storey element, upset the basic symmetry of this albeit historically much altered building, and are not subservient to the main building, arguably contrary to SPG advice on House Extensions and part i of DPD C6 referred to in the Agents e-mail dated 7th September 2018.

Further, there can be little doubt, on the basis of evidence provided by the Councils Archaeologist, that Winterley House should be considered as a non-designated heritage asset, on which basis paragraph 197 of the NPPF 2018 applies.

Archaeology: Original: Winterley House I am fairly certain that it was a listed building from c1950 up until the 1980s review, though the old description only said C.18. Altered which makes it hard to be certain which element of Mount Pleasant was referred to. This was the previous name until the late 1980s, and it was listed at Grade III, a level which was then phased out (being replaced by Grade II). I do not know why it was de-listed - perhaps due to the alterations. The HER entry for the house is provided. Mapping evidence supports an 18th century (or older) date for the building, as a small country house with subservient outbuildings / staff accommodation.

The house appears to have had roughly the same footprint for c 125 years, i.e. nearly square, though from aerial photographs the roof structures are of more than one period. I see a previous application for a small extension was approved in 10/01186/HOUSE. The D & A statement with this app says the house dates back to c 1780, but there were alterations and extension in 1987. There are other planning references in Uniform under the old name, i.e. 80/12600/ADD and 81/15938/ADD which also mention alterations and extensions.

My advice for 18/01506/HOUSE would therefore be the same as [Conservation], i.e. that Winterley House aka Mount Pleasant should be considered as a non-designated heritage asset, and a bit more information about its origins, development and existing fabric should be provided to justify this larger extension. Symmetry is a key feature of most Georgian buildings but I leave the comments about design to the Conservation Officers. I do not believe I would request any below ground archaeological investigations should this extension be approved, as any possible post-medieval features (e.g. rubbish dumps) are unlikely to be very significant. The garage doesn't appear to be an old building.

Follow-up: Thank you for forwarding on the Design, Access and Heritage Statement on Winterley House. I do not have any further comments to make as regards the planning proposals and would not be requesting an archaeological condition.

4. Planning Policy

- 4.1 Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The statutory development plan includes the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026 (WBCS) and the Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document 2006-2026 (HSA DPD).
- 4.2 The following policies from the WBCS are relevant to this application:
- ADPP1: Spatial Strategy
 - ADPP5: North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)
 - CS13: Transport
 - CS14: Design Principles
 - CS19: Historic Environment and Landscape Character
- 4.3 The following policies from the HSA DPD are relevant to this application:
- C1: Location of New Housing in the Countryside
 - C3: Design of Housing in the Countryside
 - C6: Extension of Existing Dwellings within the Countryside
 - P1: Residential Parking for New Development
- 4.4 The following are relevant material considerations:
- The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
 - Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)
 - Quality Design SPD (2006)
 - House Extensions SPG (2004)

5. Description of Development

- 5.1. The application site is located outside of any defined settlement boundary. There is a single dwelling to the south east (Mount Pleasant Cottage) and the converted stables dwelling to the north east. The site lies in the North Wessex Downs AONB. The existing property is a large, detached dwelling set within established gardens with a single pitched roof garage/outbuilding on the east side.

- 5.2 The existing dwelling has had several historical additions over time, detailed in the Design, Access and Heritage Statement. The most recent of which was a two storey extension in 2010 which effectively squared-off the south-west corner of the dwelling.
- 5.3 Amended proposed floorplans and elevations have been provided in response to the consultation received from the conservation officer which have set the two-storey elements of the extension in by approximately 100mm and adjusted the window proposed on the curved element.
- 5.4 The current scheme is a re-submission of the previously refused application (18/01506/HOUSE) with the amendment of a set-down in the ridge line of the second storey extensions and additional information submitted as part of a heritage statement.
- 5.5 The two storey element would add an additional hall, 4 metres wide, and add on to the existing kitchen at ground floor level. It would also provide an additional bedroom and bathroom at first floor level. There are now set down ridge lines and eaves line at approximately 6.5 metres in height. The single storey of the orangery and office would extend to a ridge height of 5 metres with a new chimney reaching 6.5 metres high.

6. Consideration of the Proposal

The main issues raised by this development are:

- 6.1. The principle of development;
- 6.2. The impact on the character and appearance of the building and area;
- 6.3. The impact on the living conditions of the neighbouring properties.

6.1. The principle of development

- 6.1.1 Core Strategy Policy ADPP1 provides a hierarchy of settlements within the district to ensure development follows the existing settlement pattern and delivers the spatial vision and objectives for West Berkshire. The hierarchy comprises defined urban areas, rural service centres, and service villages. New development will be considered commensurate to its position within the hierarchy. Below the settlement hierarchy, smaller villages with settlement boundaries are suitable only for limited infill development subject to the character and form of the settlement. Beyond defined settlement boundaries, only appropriate limited development in the countryside will be allowed, focused on addressing identified needs and maintaining a strong rural economy.
- 6.1.2 The application site is located outside of any defined settlement boundary and is therefore regarded as “open countryside” under Core Strategy Policy ADPP1. The site is also located within the AONB where great weight must be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty. Policy ADPP5 states that, recognising the area as a national landscape designation, development will conserve and enhance local distinctiveness.
- 6.1.3 In the context of this general policy of restraint in the countryside, Policy C6 of the HSA DPD gives a presumption in favour of proposals for the extension of existing permanent dwellings. An extension or alteration will be permitted providing that:
 - i. the scale of the enlargement is subservient to the original dwelling and is designed to be in character with the existing dwelling; and
 - ii. it has 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; and
 - iii. the use of materials is appropriate within the local architectural context; and

- iv. There is no significant harm on the living conditions currently enjoyed by residents of neighbouring properties.

6.1.4 As detailed below it is considered that, despite the set down of the ridge and eaves, the proposal fails to comply with points i and ii. Overall, therefore, the proposal fails to comply with the aforementioned policies, and is not appropriate limited development in the AONB countryside.

6.2. The design and impact on the character of the area

6.2.1 Through the provisions of the NPPF the government outlines the importance of the design of the built environment and proposals affecting heritage assets. Paragraph 197 states that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

6.2.2 Policy CS14 of the Core Strategy states that new development must demonstrate high quality and sustainable design that respects and enhances the character and appearance of the area. According to Policy CS19, particular regard will be given to: (a) the sensitivity of the area to change, (b) ensuring that new development is appropriate in terms of location, scale and design in the context of the existing settlement form, pattern and character, and (c) the conservation and, where appropriate, enhancement of heritage assets and their settings.

6.2.3 The site is located within the AONB. The NPPF provides AONBs the highest level of protection in terms of landscape and scenic beauty. Policy ADPP5 of the core strategy states that 'development will conserve and enhance the local distinctiveness, sense of place and setting of the AONB'. Moreover, development will respect and respond to the historic environment of the AONB.

6.2.4 Policy C6 of the HSADPD seeks to ensure any enlargement remains subservient to the original dwelling and in character with the existing dwelling. This reflects design guidance in the Council's Quality Design SPD and House Extensions SPG, as well as the site-specific advice from the conservation officer in terms of conserving the significance of this non-designated heritage asset.

6.2.5 For this application the two storey extensions have had the ridgeline dropped by approximately 0.5 metre. However, the bulk, depth, and scale of the extensions at two storey and single storey remain as previously. Therefore the previous assessment remains that overall, the scheme is not subservient to the main dwelling. Furthermore, it is still considered that the resultant dwelling would appear unbalanced and lose its current architectural identity. The single storey elements represent a poorly related add-on to the existing well defined dwelling character, to the detriment to the visual quality and character of this sensitive building in a sensitive location.

6.2.6 The proposed extensions would appear intrusive within the streetscene when viewed from Back Lane, and cumulative would provide substantially greater bulk and roofscape of the orangery and office. This would be incongruous to the character of the immediate area and would impact on its setting in the wider landscape. The two neighbouring dwellings on the east side would also have clear views of the new extensions.

6.2.7 Overall, it is considered that the new extensions would fail to achieve a high standard of design that respects the character and appearance of the area, and is appropriate in scale and design. Moreover, the extensions would harm the significance of the building as a

non-designated heritage asset. The harm would be exacerbated by the impact on the street scene. The proposal would fail to comply with the aforementioned policies.

6.3 The impact on the amenities of the neighbouring properties

6.3.1 Core Strategy Policy CS14 requires new development to make a positive contribution to the quality of life in West Berkshire. The Quality Design SPD and House Extensions SPG outline the factors to consider with regard to impact on neighbouring properties.

6.3.2 The two neighbouring dwellings on the east side would have clear views of the new extensions. The existing pitched roof garage is a slightly incongruous feature within the existing garden area. This would be considerably exacerbated by the addition of a linear, linked extension. This concern is raised above in relation to the impact on the character and appearance of the area, but given the separation distance to neighbouring properties the proposed extension is not considered to result in material harm to the living conditions of the neighbouring properties.

6.4 The impact on highways and parking

6.4.1 The proposed application does not impact on available parking within the site as the garage/outbuilding is not accessible for parking.

6.5 Other matters

6.5.1 The previous application received a consultation response from the Council's Archaeological Officer providing historical background context for the dwelling and detailing its previous listed status. The current application is very similar to the previous scheme, a further consultation response has been sought but not received at this stage.

6.5.2 The current application is accompanied by further information in the Design, Access and Heritage Statement. This has been assessed afresh for the current application, together with the external alterations to the scheme, namely the reduction of the ridge height by approximately 0.5 metre and the setting in of the two storey elevations from the existing building by approximately 0.1 metre.

7. **Conclusion**

7.1 The dwelling is located in open countryside within the North Wessex Downs AONB, a statutory designation which is afforded the highest level of protection for landscape and scenic beauty. The existing building was also previously a listed building, and is therefore regarded as a non-designated heritage asset. The proposal would add dominant and incongruous extensions to the detriment of the existing character of the dwelling and the local area. They would harm the significance of this non-designated heritage asset.

7.2 The proposed extensions are not considered an acceptable design, bulk or scale for the reasons given above. Having taken account all of the relevant policies and the other material considerations referred to above, it is considered that there are clear reasons to refuse the proposal.

8. Full Recommendation

- 8.1 The committee resolution for the application on 13th March was for the deferment of the application pending the appeal decision. The appeal was dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate on 08.05.19. The recommendation of the application remains for Refusal.
- 8.2 It is recommended that the Head of Development and Planning be authorised to REFUSE permission for the following reason:

Winterley House is a former Grade III listed building until being delisted in the 1980s review. Whilst the building is no longer a designated heritage asset, nor do the works affect the setting of any designated heritage asset, the host property is regarded as a non-designated heritage asset to which paragraph 197 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) applies. The site is located within the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). This status of the building and area increases the sensitivity of the building to inappropriate extensions.

Notwithstanding the changes from the refused proposal (application 18/01506/HOUSE), the proposed two storey extension would upset the basic symmetry of the main building, which is a key feature of most Georgian buildings, and this impact would be exacerbated by the additional single storey extension. Overall, the extensions would result in a dominant and bulky addition to the host building, which fails to be subservient and significantly harms the existing character and appearance of the building. The building is visible from public viewpoints and also from neighbouring dwellings to the east, which further exacerbates these impacts, and also thereby fails to conserve the special qualities of the AONB.

Accordingly, the proposal conflicts with the NPPF, Policies ADPP1, ADPP5, CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026, Policies C3 and C6 of the Housing Site Allocations DPD 2006-2026, the North Wessex Downs AONB Management Plan 2014-19, the Council's House Extensions SPG, and the Council's Quality Design West Berkshire SPD (Part 2).

Appeal decision note: