Planning Committee: 03 March 2020 **Item Number: 10**

Application No: W 19 / 1988 LB

Registration Date: 09/12/19
Town/Parish Council: Stoneleigh **Expiry Date:** 03/02/20
Case Officer: Jonathan Gentry
01926 456541 jonathan.gentry@warwickdc.gov.uk

The Pheasantry, Grovehurst Park, Stoneleigh, Kenilworth, CV8 2XR
Erection of single storey courtyard extension to kitchen & enlarged dormer to bedroom. FOR Mrs Penelope Besson

---

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

RECOMMENDATION

Planning Committee is recommended to refuse Listed Building Consent.

DETAILS OF THE DEVELOPMENT

Listed Building Consent is sought for the proposed erection of a single storey courtyard extension to kitchen and an enlarged dormer to bedroom.

THE SITE AND ITS LOCATION

The Pheasantry is a Grade II listed two-storey red brick house (listed as Kennel Keeper's House) built circa 18th century. The building forms part of a former kennels complex within the historic Stoneleigh Abbey estate and is located within the Grade II* listed Stoneleigh Abbey Park and Garden. The rectangular-plan house has a rear wing projecting from the east elevation, and whilst this was reportedly constructed in the 1990s map regression shows that formerly there was a historic wing in the same location and to a similar footprint as the existing wing. Neighbouring Keepers Lodge is the only immediately adjacent property, sited to the east of the Pheasantry. Broadford House lies some distance to the south. The site is washed over by the Green Belt.

PLANNING HISTORY

W/94/0319 - Erection of six dwellings with garages; refurbishment of Keepers Lodge, Mary Lodge and The Pheasantry including partial demolition, internal and external alterations and extensions, together with provision of garaging; construction of a new access road, Kennels Cottages and Kennels building to be retained and repaired. - Granted

W/12/0723/LB – Installation of new ventilation grille, rainwater goods and replacement skirting board to garden room - Granted

W/19/1988/LB - Erection of single storey courtyard extension to kitchen & enlarged dormer to bedroom.

RELEVANT POLICIES

- National Planning Policy Framework

The Current Local Plan

- HE1 - Protection of Statutory Heritage Assets

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

Stoneleigh and Ashow Parish Council - Members support the application.

Natural England - No comment.

The Gardens Trust - No comment.

WCC Ecological Services - Recommend advisory notes relating to bats and nesting birds attached to any grant of consent.

ASSESSMENT

Design and impact on the Listed building

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.

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 provided detailed feedback on the proposed additions, raising objection to the scale and design of the proposals, which was

shared by officers. The proposed addition of a flat roofed box dormer to the wing extension is considered an inappropriate addition to the Listed Building, noting that the existing dormer to be replaced has been designed sensitively to accord with design characteristics of the original property. The significantly increased size of the proposed feature, alongside the detailed facing materials are viewed to exacerbate this issue. Overall this is viewed a proposal that fails to accord with Residential Design Guidance on dormers or the historical architectural context of the application site.

The primary element of the application comprises a single storey extension. This element would extend to the north from the existing wing into a modest courtyard space, enclosed the property to the south and west, and by tall boundary walls to the north and east. The existing modern wing is of a scale and design that is subservient and sympathetic to the historic character and appearance of the listed building. Its construction maintained the small enclosed courtyard space formed by the building and the historic boundary walls that separated the Keeper's House from the kennels and exercise areas to the north and east. The existing courtyard contributes to the setting and the significance of the listed building and to that of the existing group of historic kennels buildings and associated structures.

The proposed extension would significantly reduce remaining outdoor courtyard area, effectively filling this space with a contemporary addition to the property. It is viewed that an addition of this nature is inappropriate in principle, owing to its harmful impact on the immediate setting of the listed building, notably compromising the historic courtyard area. While the addition would not be visible from a public viewpoint, the identified harm to the setting of the listed building remains a material issue. In addition, the submitted scheme proposes a fibreglass/rubber roof covering and red facing brick. While contemporary style additions can in some cases preserve the architectural significance of a historic structure through harmonious contrast, the materials proposed are in this case viewed to result in a structure of significant bulk and mass, that does not preserve the positive architectural characteristics of the main building.

Overall, it is considered that the proposals are incongruous with the design and setting of the listed building, detracting from its character and appearance. There is a statutory requirement through Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 that authorities should have special regard to the desirability of preserving any listed building, its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.

Resultantly it is viewed that the both elements of the scheme would result in less than significant harm to the designated heritage asset of the listed building. No wider public benefits that outweigh this identified harm have been presented. In summary of the noted matters it is concluded that the proposal fails to accord with the aforementioned policy.

CONCLUSION

The proposed development by virtue of its scale, massing, and design would result in less than substantial harm to the character and architectural significance of the

Grade II Listed Pheasantry, and there are no public benefits identified that outweigh the harm.

On the basis of the above, the proposal is recommended for refusal.

REFUSAL REASONS

1 Policy HE1 of the Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029 states that consent will not be granted to alter or extend a listed building where those works will adversely affect its special character or historic interest, integrity or setting.

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority it is viewed that the proposed extensions and alterations to the Pheasantry would result in material harm to the setting and form of the heritage asset, failing to preserve its historic integrity and character. This is a result of the proposed works compromising the existing courtyard space of the site that contributes to the setting and significance of the building. Is is also considered an inappropriate design and facing materials have been proposed.

The proposal is thereby considered to be contrary to the aforementioned policy.
