

19/09/0007/LB

D& A BEST & MATTHEWS

ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO WEST ELEVATION AT BUTTLES LODGE, VILLAGE ROAD, HATCH BEAUCHAMP

329986.120038

Listed Building Consent: Works

PROPOSAL

The proposal comprises the erection of a single storey extension to the rear (west) of the lodge on the site of an existing loggia (portico). The proposal includes taking down the existing dressed stone columns and pilasters and relocating them within the proposed extension.

Materials will match the existing dwelling and a glass screen is proposed behind the stone columns.

SITE DESCRIPTION AND HISTORY

Buttles Lodge is a Grade II listed building that lies within the village settlement of Hatch Beauchamp. The lodge fronts onto Village Road, which runs into the centre of the village. There are two separate access points off Village Road, which merge into a single driveway to the rear of the lodge. Some hedgerow planting can be found to the front of the site.

Planning History

19/2002/0028LB & 0027 - Erection of single storey extension towards the road. Applications were refused on 3rd February 2003 for the following reason:

‘The proposed single storey extension would introduce an alien feature at variance with the classical, two storey, near symmetrical facades of this Grade II listed building and as such would have a serious detrimental effect on its character and Hatch Beauchamp....’

The application was later dismissed at appeal on 25th November 2003.

19/09/0003LB – Erection of single storey extension to east elevation. The proposed extension was proposed to be sited in a similar location to the previous application and was refused on 7th May 2009 for the following reason:

‘The proposal, by reason of its design, juxtaposition, materials and visual impact on the host building, would have a serious, detrimental, unjustified effect’.

CONSULTATION AND REPRESENTATION RESPONSES

Consultees

SSC - *TRANSPORT DEVELOPMENT GROUP* - No observations.

HATCH BEAUCHAMP PARISH COUNCIL - Support application. Improvement on two previous unsuccessful applications made for extensions on east elevation, which Parish Council objected. New plan appears in harmony with original building in terms of design (preserves loggia columns and pilasters) and materials (dressed ashlar stone), does not obscure or interfere with balustrade frieze, barely visible from public frontage of Village Road.

*CONSERVATION OFFICERS -
GENERAL*

It would complete the picture, if full rather than part, proposed elevations were provided, as I suspect such would confirm my opinion that, the proposed extension will unbalance the near symmetry of the extant building and compromise its existing compact composition.

The proposed extension, is clearly a very different approach to those previously advocated and refused. I understand and to a degree empathise with the promoted design philosophy but cannot support the scheme, for reasons detailed later.

DESIGN STATEMENT

Submission at 2.3 – whilst the proposed extension would not be generally visible from the public realm, Listed Building status does not diminish the requirement to assess the impact of proposals on the character of the building ie internal alterations are subject to scrutiny and these are clearly only visible by owners and guests. Whilst this submission addresses one of the concerns noted by the Inspector to the previous Appeal, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, it should not be given the “weight” suggested.

Submission at 4.1 – here; it is advocated that the proposed extension, is on the rear elevation. This conflicts with the accurate statement at 1.4 in that, this elevation, is indeed the principal elevation of the building.

Submissions at 3.2 and 3.3 – Policies EN16 and EN17 are cited however these were not saved by Direction under Part 1(3) of Schedule 8 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. As such, these policies are irrelevant to the determination of the application and the reason why they were not cited in the reason for refusal for 19/09/0003LB.

SPECIFIC OBSERVATIONS ON PROPOSALS

Having studied the proposals in detail and mindful of my comments at 1 above, I offer the following reasons why I object:

The pseudo portico, would have a fundamental and irretrievable effect on historic fabric and the intact original façade.

Whilst anything is possible, no justification has been put forward to warrant the dismantling and relocation of the existing columns.

Whilst not an issue for the Local Planning Authority, the cost of relocation of the stone columns (by an approved contractor), would appear to be unviable, given the resultant space secured. This is therefore considered an element worthy of note, as part of the decision-making process.

As noted at 1.1, the portico/extension, would unbalance the (very near) symmetry of the building and compromise its existing compact composition.

In essence, the proposed extension is designed as a classical portico, which historically would be open. Here however it is proposed to be infilled with contemporary glazing to the front and ashlar stone to the sides. Glazing details are lacking hence I have reservations as to how this could successfully be achieved.

The pseudo portico, in my opinion, would give Buttles Lodge a non-deserving hierarchy but perhaps more importantly, its proposed use would belie the design ie table, chairs, blinds/curtains and other domestic paraphernalia would inevitably ensue, which in turn would compound the detrimental effects noted elsewhere, such that the architectural essence and historic purpose of Buttles Lodge, would be severely compromised and devalued.

GEORGIAN GROUP - Group have written to authority twice and Planning Inspectorate regarding extension to this building. Letter from March 2009 advise that: The addition of dining room not essential to continuation as a dwelling and that any extension would be damaging to the character of this building. PPG 15, Para, C.7: There will always be some historic buildings where any extensions would be damaging and should not be permitted. Current application involves relocation of historic fabric, a procedure that is seldom advisable as it disrupts the historic appearance of the building in a misleading manner.

Representations

LETTER OF SUPPORT FROM WARD COUNCILLOR: - Ask that permission be granted; environmentally sustainable to extend property for 21st Century living; third application, overcomes previous issues and design achieves this without interference to street scene; note comments made by conservation officer that visibility of building not important, I feel that it does not have an impact on street scene to be of relevance; fully support Parish Council comments.

EIGHT LETTERS OF SUPPORT: - small extension; will not dominate; sympathetic to age, character and appearance of lodge; materials to match; will not affect integrity of the building; enhance downstairs living space; sited to rear; not visible from road; no detrimental impact.

PLANNING POLICIES

S&ENPP9 - S&ENP - The Built Historic Environment,
PPG15 - Planning and the Historic Environment,

DETERMINING ISSUES AND CONSIDERATIONS

The portico/extension would unbalance the (very near) symmetry of the building and compromise its existing compact composition. The design of the extension, as a classical portico, would historically have been open. Here however it is proposed to be infilled with contemporary glazing with ashlar stone to the side. Glazing details are lacking, hence some reservations as to how this could successfully be achieved. Furthermore, the pseudo portico, would have a fundamental and irretrievable effect on the historic fabric of the building. The scheme being on the principal elevation is

thus more detrimental than the previous refused scheme.

Whilst removing the existing stone columns and pilasters may be possible, no justification has been submitted to warrant the dismantling and relocating.

It is not disputed that the proposed extension would have a limited impact on the street scene. The main concern, as mentioned above, is the impact on the character of the listed building itself, and its principal (west) elevation. The accompanying statement, 1.4, submitted with this application confirms that the elevation is the principal elevation, and Para 8 of the Inspector's Report comments that the east elevation is the less formal side of the building, reiterating the above comments.

The previous appeal decision raises points that are still valid to this application. Para 10 refers to PPG15 and to the 'sensitivity to alteration or extension of humble and once common building types that are relatively unaltered examples of a particular building type'; Buttles Lodge being considered such a building. As such, it is considered that any proposal to extend the lodge would be damaging and should be resisted. The same para 10 refers to viability:..'no detailed evidence has been submitted to indicate if the lodge were not extended it would be at risk of becoming unused or falling into a state of disrepair'. No evidence has been submitted. The submitted statement 5.7, states ..'Separate dining facility is both desirable and reasonably necessary in the context of C21st living'.

Notwithstanding the need for the extension and its resiting, the design, removal of historic fabric and siting on the principal elevation are considered detrimental the listed building and provides a worse scheme than the previous refusal and appeal and the application should be refused.

RECOMMENDATION AND REASON(S)

Recommended Decision: Refusal

- 1 The proposal, by reason of the alterations to the classical, intact, principal facade, would have a significant, irretrievable and seriously detrimental impact on the character of this Grade II Listed Building without adequate justification. In addition, the proposed extension would unbalance the near symmetry of the extant building, hence compromising its compact composition, all of which is contrary to Policy 9 of the Somerset and Exmoor National Park Joint Structure Plan Review and PPG15.

RECOMMENDED CONDITION(S) (if applicable)

Notes for compliance

In preparing this report the Planning Officer has considered fully the implications and requirements of the Human Rights Act 1988.

CONTACT OFFICER: Mr D Addicott Tel: 01823 356463

