

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No. and Parish</b>	<b>Statutory Target Date</b>	<b>Proposal, Location, Applicant</b>
(5)	19/02150/HOUSE Speen	29 October 2019 <sup>1</sup>	Annexe to the Old Coach House  The Old Coach House, Bath Road, Speen  Ms L Purton

<sup>1</sup> Extension of time agreed with applicant until 6 November 2019

To view the plans and drawings relating to this application click the following link:  
<http://planning.westberks.gov.uk/rpp/index.asp?caseref=19/02150/HOUSE>

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

**Ward Member(s):** Councillor Lynne Doherty  
Councillor Steve Masters

**Reason for Committee Determination:** Called in by Councillor Masters due to difference of opinion between officers and the applicant on the impact of the proposal

**Committee Site Visit:** 31 October 2019

#### **Contact Officer Details**

**Name:** Liz Moffat  
**Job Title:** Assistant Planning Officer  
**Tel No:** 01635 519111  
**Email:** elizabeth.moffat@westberks.gov.uk

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1 This application seeks planning permission for a single storey extension linking the existing 5 bedroom dwelling to an existing one bed flat / annexe (approved in 2010), thereby creating a three bedroom annexe.
- 1.2 The Old Coach House was de-listed in 2016 following its conversion to a house in the 1980s and subsequent extensions. It previously formed part of the garaging and / or stables to Speen House which is a Grade II listed property to the east side of the application site, and they continue to share the same vehicular entrance from the A4 to the north. The site lies outside the Speen Conservation Area and outside the defined settlement boundary.
- 1.3 The application site lies in a fairly isolated location with Speen House being the sole neighbour. It is well set back from the A4 and is fairly linear in form with a large private garden to the south side of the dwelling which is largely enclosed by high attractive walls. There are additional outbuildings further west within the residential curtilage. The proposed extension will extend from the western end of the dwelling, joining onto the existing annexe so that the built form would be L-shaped.

## 2. Planning History

- 2.1 The table below outlines the relevant planning history of the application site.

Application	Proposal	Decision / Date
17/03275/HOUSE	Single storey rear extension for swimming pool	APPROVED 12.01.18
16/00182/HOUSE & 183/LBC	First floor extension over ground floor area	APPROVED 16.03.16
10/00514/FULMAJ	Conversion of existing lean-to garage to habitable ground floor flat and new replacement garage	APPROVED 24.06.10
128785 and 86/LBC	Conversion of coach house into house	APPROVED 28.05.87
117091 and 92	Conversion of the coach house to a dwelling	APPROVED 26.05.82

## 3. Procedural Matters

- 3.1 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA): The development falls within the description of development in column 1 of Schedule 2 (10a) of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, however the development is not located within an environmentally sensitive area, and is below the given thresholds as defined by the regulations. As such, EIA screening is not required.
- 3.2 Publicity: Site notice displayed on 5<sup>th</sup> September 2019 on a fence post at the main entrance to Speen House and The Old Coach House expired on 26 September 2019

- 3.3 CIL: Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is a levy charged on most new development to pay for new infrastructure required as a result of the new development. CIL will be charged on residential (C3 and C4) and retail (A1-A5) development of more than 100 square metres of net floorspace (including extensions) or when a new dwelling is created (even if it less than 100 square metres). Based on the CIL PAIR form, it appears that the CIL liability for this development will be nil.

## 4. Consultation

### *Statutory and non-statutory consultation*

- 4.1 The table below summarises the consultation responses received during the consideration of the application. The full responses may be viewed with the application documents on the Council's website, using the link at the start of this report.

<b>Parish Council:</b>	No comments received
<b>WBC Highways:</b>	No comments
<b>Tree Officer:</b>	The trees at the front of the property are covered by a TPO 201/21/0210 either side of the driveway. There are a number of mature and semi mature trees on the rest of the site. These are unlikely to be impacted as part of this proposal for an annexe on the property. Just in case I would suggest a tree informative. Recommendation: No objections
<b>Archaeology:</b>	The Old Coach House is a 1980s rebuild of an 18th century stables and coach house for the adjacent Speen House, and was noted by Historic England as having group value as part of the development of the house and grounds, even though the Old Coach House itself was removed from the National Heritage List for England in 2016 due to its conversion. This application for an annexe follows several applications for extensions and alterations to the Old Coach House. Although there might be deemed to be some archaeological potential on this site, both from the post-medieval buildings and possible earlier use, on balance I believe there will be no major impact on any features of archaeological significance from this proposal
<b>Conservation Officer:</b>	The Old Coach House was delisted on 18.11.16 because little historic structure remained following its re-building circa 1987 (it was originally listed in 1983). It has been subject of recent approved applications to alter and extend - applications 16/00183/LBC2 (before it was de-listed) and 16/016/00182/HOUSE refer - together with application 17/03275/HOUSE for a swimming pool and enclosure following the de-listing.  Despite its re-building, de-listing, and extensions, the Old Coach House, with its clear echoes of the original, in terms of overall scale and appearance, is still considered to be of heritage value and an important building as part of the group which forms the former curtilage of Speen House. The proposals should therefore, amongst other considerations, still be considered in their wider context in terms of their impact on the setting if not their direct impact on the Grade II listed Speen House and listed

outbuildings to the east of the application site. The now proposed extensions are however situated at the western end of the Old Coach House, away from these listed buildings.

In accordance with the Council's extant Supplementary Planning Guidance on House Extensions, any extension to an existing dwelling is also expected to be sympathetically designed to appear subservient to the main house and not unbalance or "draw the eye", and any architectural detailing should reflect that of the house being extended. This would nominally appear to be the case here.

Some justification for the proposals would therefore be expected to accompany the application in terms of a Design and Access Statement, incorporating an assessment of heritage impact. Indeed the application is somewhat "thin" generally in terms of justification for and details of the "annexe", which potentially amounts to an additional dwelling on the site, which raises other issues.

The proposed extension will be of materials and a design in keeping with the main house and extensions, and is therefore broadly acceptable in building conservation terms, although increasing the length of the existing building frontage. On balance, it is considered subservient to the now de-listed Old Coach House itself, so as to not materially impact on its character and appearance. Further, given the separation distance between the proposed extension and the listed Speen House and outbuildings, which somewhat turn their back on the Old Coach House site, the proposed annexe is not considered to impact on the setting of the aforesaid listed buildings.

Accordingly, whilst a little more explanation and justification for the proposals would be helpful, and notwithstanding any other Development Control Case Officer considerations, on balance, no objections are raised to the proposals from a building conservation point of view

### ***Public representations***

- 4.2 One letter of representation raising concerns of potential for multi-household dwellings and wish for property to remain under one household.

## **5. Planning Policy**

- 5.1 Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The following policies of the statutory development plan are relevant to the consideration of this application.

- Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026 (WBCS).
- Policies C3 and C6 of the Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document 2006-2026 (HSA DPD).

5.2 The following material considerations are relevant to the consideration of this application:

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
- Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)
- WBC House Extensions SPG (2004)
- WBC Quality Design SPD (2006)
- Planning Obligations SPD (2015)

## **6. Appraisal**

6.1 The main issues for consideration in this application are:

- Principle of development
- Design and impact on character and appearance of the surrounding area
- Impact on amenities of neighbours

### ***Principle of development***

6.2 The site is located outside any defined settlement boundary but the principle of development is acceptable provided the proposal complies with the development plan and in this case the policies contained within the NPPF and in particular Core Strategy Policies and HSA DPD Policy C6 - Extension of existing dwellings within the countryside - unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

### ***Design and impact on character and appearance of the surrounding area***

6.3 The Core Principles of the NPPF state that planning should always seek to secure high quality design. Policy CS14 of the WBCS seeks that new development should demonstrate high quality and sustainable design which respects and enhances the character and appearance of the area. Policy CS19 seeks to ensure that new development is appropriate in terms of location, scale and design in the context of the existing settlement form, pattern and character.

6.4 Policy C6 of the HSA DPD seeks to prevent the over development of sites in the countryside and requires certain criteria to be met; these include;

- the scale of the enlargement is subservient to the original dwelling and is designed to be in character with the existing dwelling;
- 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;
- the use of materials is appropriate within the local architectural context;
- there is no significant harm on the living conditions currently enjoyed by residents of neighbouring properties.

Although de-listed, The Old Coach House is of heritage value given its historic association with Speen House. Currently, the existing annexe is read as a stand along outbuilding, albeit linked to the house by an attractive 3.5m high garden wall. Although single storey and in keeping in terms of design, the proposed extension will further elongate an already large, 5 bedroom linear dwelling creating a large annexe which

would be capable of being made into a separate dwelling. Whilst the accommodation is proposed to be occupied by family members, the nature of the accommodation, together with all the facilities for independent living will be occupied to all intents and purposes as a separate dwelling, with two separate households in each building, and as such does not fall into one of the excepted categories of development permitted by Policy C1 (Location of new housing in the countryside) of the HAS DPD. Whilst there may be a legitimate use for the annexe in the short term, it is capable of becoming an independent dwelling for which it would be easy to create a separate curtilage. This is contrary to the NPPF and Policy C6 of the HSA DPD and the guidance within West Berkshire Council's SPG - House Extensions with regard to annexes.

- 6.5 Policy C6 supports the general policy of restraint in the countryside and proposals for extensions may be permitted provided that there is no adverse impact on the rural character of the countryside. Proposed changes should not, either individually or cumulatively over-dominate the existing dwelling. Given the original proportions of the dwelling and subsequent extensions over the last 30 years, consideration must be given to the cumulative effect on the existing dwelling. As such it is considered that the proposal is not subservient, further increasing the built form so as to be disproportionate to the original dwelling.
- 6.6 Furthermore, the proposal will result in the loss of views of the garden wall when looking at the principal elevation as a whole. The wall is considered to be an attractive, historic feature and an important element when considering the character of the property in its rural setting, and its heritage value. The proposed extension would therefore have an adverse impact on the immediate 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 which is contrary to Policy C6. The proposal is also contrary to Policies CS14 and CS19 of the WBCS and the SPG on Extensions to Dwellings in the Countryside which seeks to prevent overdevelopment of a site and a material increase in visual intrusion in the countryside.

### ***Impact on amenities of Neighbours***

- 6.6 With regard to the impact on neighbour amenity, policy CS 14 of the WBCS seeks all development to have a positive impact on quality of life in the district. Conversely, developments that have a negative impact on quality of life would not accord with the policy. In terms of house extensions and their impact on amenity, SPG 04/2: House Extensions, identifies loss of light (natural and direct), overshadowing, overbearing and loss of privacy as the issues of primary concern. Speen House is partially visible from the rear of the Old Coach House, however the proposal is not considered to result in any harm to the private amenity of this property. There are no other neighbouring properties affected by the proposal.

## **7. Planning Balance and Conclusion**

Having taken into account all of the relevant policy considerations and other material considerations referred to above, there are clear reasons that the proposal is unacceptable due to the impact on the character and appearance of The Old Coach House and the potential for it to be capable of becoming an independent dwelling in the future. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies CS14 and CS19 of the WBCS, Policies C3 and C6 of the HSA DPD, the NPPF and the Council's House Extensions SPG.

## 8. Full Recommendation

- 8.1 To delegate to the Head of Development and Planning to REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION for the reasons listed below.

1.	<p>The Old Coach House, although de-listed in 2016 is considered to be of heritage value given its historic association with the adjacent Grade II listed property, Speen House. The Old Coach House has been significantly extended within the last 30 years and there are several outbuildings within the large residential curtilage. The proposed extension which links the host dwelling to an existing outbuilding, which already functions as an annexe, will detract from the character and appearance of the property. The proposal will result in a disproportionate addition to the side of dwelling, subsuming what was the original coach house and will also result in the loss of an attractive, historic wall which forms part of the walled garden. As such the proposal will have an adverse impact on the setting and the historic interest of the building and the rural character of the area. The proposal therefore fails to comply with Policies C3 and C6 of West Berkshire Council's Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document (2006-2026) (HSA DPD).</p> <p>The proposal is consequently contrary to the core planning principles of the NPPF and Policies CS14 and CS19 of The West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026 and the Supplementary Planning Guidance on Extensions to Dwellings in the Countryside which seeks to prevent overdevelopment of a site and a material increase in visual intrusion in the countryside.</p>
2.	<p>The application site consists of a detached dwelling known as The Old Coach House, with detached ancillary outbuildings to the west of the property. The property is located within the open countryside. The application is proposing an extension to link the house to an existing annexe to create an annexe with three bedrooms, 2 bathrooms and living accommodation. By virtue of the size and the design of the annex it will be capable of being occupied in a manner which is tantamount to a separate dwelling and a separate curtilage could easily be created. This is contrary to the NPPF and Policy C6 of the Housing Site Allocations DPD (2006-2026) and the guidance within Supplementary Planning Guidance 2004, House Extensions with regard to annexes.</p>

DC