

Planning Committee: 23 May 2017

Item Number: 12

Application No: W 17 / 0741 LB

Town/Parish Council: Warwick
Case Officer: Emma Spandley

Registration Date: 19/04/17
Expiry Date: 14/06/17

01926 456539 emma.spandley@warwickdc.gov.uk

33 Bridge End, Warwick, CV34 6PB

Erection of a two storey rear extension FOR Mr & Mrs Colin Rowe

This application is being presented to Committee as more than 5 letters of support have been received and the application is recommended for refusal.

RECOMMENDATION

Planning Committee is recommended to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out at the end of this report.

DETAILS OF THE DEVELOPMENT

The application proposes to erect a two storey rear extension. The ground floor element will project 4.7 metres from the rear wall with a first floor element above, accessed via a partially glazed link walkway.

THE SITE AND ITS LOCATION

The application relates to a Grade II Listed building located on the south side of Bridge End. The two properties were once one house, originally said to be of 14th Century origin. The present structure is 16th Century 2 storey plus attic building. The property is situated in the Warwick Conservation Area.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

W/79/1268 - Erection of a single storey rear extension to form shower room, granted 8th November 1979.

W/82/0110 - Alterations to front porch, granted 15th March 1982

W/83/0120 - Demolition of conservatory at rear and erection of single storey kitchen extension, granted 17th June 1983.

W/12/0829 - Erection of new partition walls and en suite after removal of existing shower/wash area and wardrobes, granted 24th September 2012.

W/16/0618/LB & 0617 - Erection of a two storey rear extension, withdrawn, due to the unacceptability of the scheme.

RELEVANT POLICIES

- National Planning Policy Framework
- The Current Local Plan
- DAP4 - Protection of Listed Buildings (Warwick District Local Plan 1996 - 2011)
- The Emerging Local Plan
- HE1 - Protection of Statutory Heritage Assets (Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029 - Publication Draft April 2014)

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

Cllr Ashford: Supports the proposal; the proposals tick the boxes for a property of this age and the distance separation to the properties either side compliment.

Public Response: The application was submitted with 6 letters of support.

No.27 Bridge End - No objections to the extension as it would be partly obscured from view by the intervening distance, trees and other vegetation.

No.31 Bridge End - No objections.

No.35 Bridge End - No objections.

No.37 Bridge End - No objections, it will have little if no impact visually on their property due to the pre-existing extension at No.3 Bridge End.

No.69 Bridge End - No objections - the extension will not be intrusive or have any effect on their home and garden.

ASSESSMENT

The main issue relevant to the consideration of this application is the impact on the special architectural and historic character and appearance of the listed building.

Sections 16 (2) and 66 (1) of the *Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990* Act require the decision maker to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Section 72 (1) refers to the special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.

Policy DAP4 states that consent will not be granted to alter or extend Listed Buildings where those works will adversely affect its special architectural or historic interest, integrity or setting. Policy DAP8 states that development will be required to preserve or enhance the special architectural and historic interest and appearance of Conservation Areas.

Both Brome Place and Little Brome (listed jointly, and originally one large house) are significant heritage assets both nationally and specifically within the context of the local historic environment. Originally built in the 14th Century with most of the current fabric dating from the 16th Century, the property has architectural merit as a surviving example of both medieval and early modern architectural styles, materials, and techniques. It also has historic merit as illustrative of the medieval origins of the suburb of Bridge End, an integral area in the development of Warwick within the immediate setting of the 11th Century castle.

Whilst the main decorative architecture is to the front of the property, the rear still has evident value. This elevation is relatively architecturally simple (and is quite small) with visual emphasis on key elements such as the attractive dormers, large tiled roof, and timber-frame.

The addition of a two storey extension as proposed is considered to be harmful to the listed building for the following key reasons:

- Whilst the addition of a glazed link is evidently intended to address some of the concerns raised in the 2016 application – namely the physical impact on the valuable timber-frame – it does appear the extension will still be built off from the timber stud work and, therefore reasonably likely to lead to damage.
- The addition of a second floor overbears the structure through the addition of a new element that is both tall and wide, drawing attention away from the key features mentioned above. Furthermore, the extension appears as deep, if not deeper, than the host building, and is thus not subservient.
- The way in which the distinct sections of the extension (one storey protrusion from the kitchen, first floor addition, and glazed link) interact with each other (i.e. with differing rooflines, widths, etc) creates quite complex and incongruous architectural lines in conflict with the simplicity of the host elevation when viewed both from the rear (particularly the tapering effect) and side (particularly the difference in rooflines).

Overall, the proposal will negatively impact the architectural merit of the property through (1) damaging/removing historic fabric and (2) introducing a large, dominating, and architecturally complex structure onto a relatively simple and traditional historic elevation.

The harm to the character and appearance of the listed building and the conservation area would be less than substantial, however, the NPPF sets out that any harm to a designated heritage assets requires clear and convincing justification and where the harm is judged to be less than substantial it should be weighed against any public benefits. In this case the principal public benefit for the domestic extension would be continued investment into a Grade II Listed building, if the scheme was otherwise acceptable. However, the building is not designated 'at risk' and there is no evidence that it is deteriorating, therefore it is considered that the harm to its historical and architectural asset outweighs the potential public benefits of extending the domestic dwelling.

It is therefore concluded that the public benefits would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm the proposed extension would cause to the designated heritage asset.

CONCLUSION

The extension to which this application relates is incongruous in design, bulk and resultant massing which does not harmonise with the Grade II Listed Building. The proposal will negatively impact the architectural merit of the property through (1) damaging/removing historic fabric and (2) introducing a large, dominating, and architecturally complex structure onto a relatively simple and traditional historic elevation.

The public benefits of the proposal are not sufficient to outweigh the harm the proposed extension would cause to the designated heritage asset.

REFUSAL REASONS

- 1 Policy DAP4 of the Warwick District Local Plan 1996 – 2011 & Policy HE1 of the Draft Local Plan 2011 – 2029, both state that consent will not be granted to alter or extend a Listed Building where those works will adversely affect its special architectural or historic interest, integrity or setting. The overall objectives of these policies are broadly consistent with the NPPF, which requires clear and convincing justification for harm to a designated heritage asset and (in the case of less than substantial harm) that the harm be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

The extension to which this application relates is incongruous in design, bulk and resultant massing which does not harmonise with the Grade II Listed Building. The proposal will negatively impact the architectural merit of the property through (1) damaging/removing historic fabric and (2) introducing a large, dominating, and architecturally complex structure onto a relatively simple and traditional historic elevation.

In this case the principal public benefit for the domestic extension would be continued investment into a Grade II Listed building. However, the building is not designated 'at risk' and there is no evidence that it is deteriorating.

It is therefore concluded that the public benefits of the proposal are not sufficient to outweigh the harm the proposed extension would cause to the designated heritage asset.
