

Planning Committee: 19 June 2018

Item Number: 8

Application No: [W 18 / 0480](#)

Town/Parish Council: Stoneleigh
Case Officer: Holika Bungre

Registration Date: 12/03/18

Expiry Date: 07/05/18

01926 456541 Holika.Bungre@warwickdc.gov.uk

10 Vicarage Road, Stoneleigh, Coventry, CV8 3DH

Erection of single storey side extension and demolition and rebuilding of existing rear extension from porch to garden room FOR Mr and Ms Storer and Lowe

This application is being presented to Committee as the Parish Council supports the application and it is recommended for refusal.

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Committee are recommended to refuse the application.

DETAILS OF THE DEVELOPMENT

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a single storey side extension to the north east elevation, with an amended reduced width of 4.3m from 5m as originally proposed, which would also protrude past the rear elevation of the cottage by 2.6m. It is also proposed to rebuild the rear porch and make it into a garden room, to be increased in depth by 1m upon that of the existing structure (also reduced in width and height since the original proposal). Other minor alterations are also proposed.

Both extensions are proposed to be constructed in matching brick, the side extension roof in plain clay tiles and the doors in oak. The rear extension roof is proposed to be a flat roof with a lantern inset.

THE SITE AND ITS LOCATION

The application site relates to a Grade II Listed house, known as The Cottage, dating from around 1600, within the Stoneleigh Conservation Area. The site is also located within the Green Belt, and Part 1 and Part 2 Permitted Development Rights have been removed.

The cottage has a thatched roof and is highly characteristic of Warwickshire's rural environment. It is relatively unspoilt, forming an excellent surviving example of a box timber framed house from the Tudor period. There is an existing lean-to extension built on the western gable, likely dating from the late eighteenth or early nineteenth-century, and a small modern timber flat roof extension to the rear. The width of the main cottage element without the lean to element is 8.8m.

PLANNING HISTORY

W/75/0221 - Granted - Erection of extension and alterations.

RELEVANT POLICIES

- National Planning Policy Framework
- The Current Local Plan
- BE1 - Layout and Design (Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029)
- BE3 - Amenity (Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029)
- HE1 - Protection of Statutory Heritage Assets (Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029)
- HE2 - Protection of Conservation Areas (Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029)
- HE4 - Archaeology (Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029)
- DS18 - Green Belt (Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029)
- H14 - Extensions to Dwellings in the Open Countryside (Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029)
- NE2 - Protecting Designated Biodiversity and Geodiversity Assets (Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029)
- Guidance Documents
- Residential Design Guide (Supplementary Planning Guidance - April 2008)
- The 45 Degree Guideline (Supplementary Planning Guidance)

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

Stoneleigh and Ashow Parish Council: Support.

WCC Archaeology: No objection subject to pre-commencement condition for programme of archaeological works to be secured. The proposals lie within the probable extent of the medieval settlement at Stoneleigh (Warwickshire Historic Environment Record MWA 9531). There is therefore a potential for archaeological deposits associated with the medieval and post medieval occupation of this area to be disturbed by the proposed development.

WCC Ecology: Recommend initial bat survey.

ASSESSMENT

Design and impact on the character of the area and street scene, including the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, impact on the Listed Building and upon the setting of other Heritage Assets

Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 imposes a duty when exercising planning functions to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character of a conservation area. Section 66 imposes a similar duty in relation to Listed Buildings.

Paragraph 132 of the NPPF states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Paragraph 134 of the NPPF states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm

to the significance of a designated heritage assets, the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.

Policy HE1 of the Warwick District Local Plan states that development will not be permitted if it would lead to substantial harm to or total loss of the significance of a designated heritage asset, unless it is demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh the harm or loss, or if criteria listed within the policy have been satisfied. Where development would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm will be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.

The Conservation Officer has no objection to the proposed replacement rear extension, which only appears slightly larger than the existing in terms of floor space and would integrate relatively well with the Listed Building, sitting within the timber frame.

There have been changes to the design of the side extension, including a reduction in width by 0.7m, a slight set back from the front elevation, a reduction in the amount of glazing has been reduced. Whilst these changes have improved the design to a more rustic appearance, there are still strong concerns and an objection by the Conservation Officer to the proposals. This is due to its potential impact on the Listed Building, the Stoneleigh Conservation Area, the setting of nearby Listed Buildings and potentially views across to the Grade II* Listed Stoneleigh Abbey Park and Garden. There is also the potential to affect views from and to St Mary's Church, which dates from the Norman period.

This proposed extension on the eastern gable would significantly increase the building's floor space (almost doubling the footprint of the original building), and consequently it would not maintain the historic small scale of the cottage. It would also deviate from the primary visual emphasis of the parent building and create an inappropriate focus on the modern addition which, although being lower in height than the cottage, would be almost half the width of the existing building and therefore would distort the building's symmetry. It should be noted that the building's symmetry is not damaged by the historic lean-to, as it sits well with the primary elevation and remains entirely subservient.

It is difficult to envisage any extension in this location, which would undoubtedly remove the visual focus away from the parent cottage and cause material harm to the masonry of the gable end, and potentially to the internal timberwork. Its exposed position would be particularly amplified during the Autumn and Winter months due to the lack of vegetation coverage, as the extension sits adjacent to a large meadow leading to St Mary's and faces to the junction with Walkers Orchard.

Ultimately, the proposed extension on the eastern gable would distort the building's original appearance, character and form, thereby causing harm to the Listed Building's special architectural and historic interest. It would also have a detrimental impact on the Conservation Area and the setting of nearby heritage assets. The harm would be considered to be less than substantial in terms of

Paragraph 134 of the NPPF, yet there are no public benefits that would outweigh this harm.

Whether the proposal is appropriate development in the Green Belt and, if not, whether there are any very special circumstances which outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm identified.

Warwick District Local Plan Policy DS18 states that extensions to dwellings will be permitted unless they result in disproportionate additions to the original dwelling which do not respect the character of the original dwelling; do not retain the openness of the rural area; or substantially alter the scale, design and character of the original dwelling. This reflects the approach to development in the Green Belt in the NPPF.

Policy H14 indicates that an extension of more than 30% of the gross floor space of the original dwelling is likely to be considered disproportionate in the Green Belt.

The total original floor space of the house is calculated to be 105.21 sq m. All existing and proposed extensions have a total floor area of 35.74 sq m which equates to a 33.97% increase in floor space upon the original dwelling. This is considered suitably compliant with the 30% guideline in this case. Therefore this is proportionate and in accordance with Policies H14 and DS18. The proposal is therefore appropriate development in the Green Belt and will not cause harm to openness.

Impact on Neighbour Amenity

There would be no breach of the 45 degree angle to the neighbour and it is not considered that any loss of light, privacy or outlook would occur.

Archaeology

County Ecology had no objection subject to a programme of archaeological works being secured by condition, prior to development.

Ecology

While an initial bat survey was recommended, a bat note would be considered reasonable here.

Summary/Conclusion

While the proposed extensions are considered to be appropriate development within the Green Belt, and will not cause harm to the amenity of neighbours, the side extension would cause harm to the appearance and significance of the Listed Building, the street scene, the Conservation Area and the setting of other nearby Heritage Assets. This harm is not outweighed by any public benefits and therefore the application is recommended for refusal.

REFUSAL REASONS

- 1 The proposal relates to a Listed Building within a Conservation Area and it is considered that the proposed side extension would be seriously detrimental to the character, appearance and significance of both the building itself and the Conservation Area as a whole as well as the setting of other nearby Heritage Assets by reason of its scale, design, width and depth.

The development is thereby considered to be contrary to Policy HE1 of the Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029.
