

43/17/0144/LB

MR & MRS MUGRIDGE

Erection of single storey side extension with mezzanine and glazed link and internal alterations to main dwelling at Linden Cottage, Linden Hill, Wellington

Location: LINDEN COTTAGE, LINDEN HILL, WELLINGTON, TAUNTON, TA21
ODW

Grid Reference: 312394.120629

Listed Building Consent: Works

Recommendation

Recommended decision: Refusal

- 1 The proposal is contrary to policy D5D of the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan and policy CP8 of the Core Strategy as well as Paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework. It is considered to cause less than substantial harm to the setting of the listed building without any public benefit and there is no evidence to suggest Linden Cottage is not viable as the existing cottage.

Recommended Conditions (if applicable)

Notes to Applicant

1. In accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework the Council has worked in a positive and pro-active way with the applicant and has looked for solutions to enable the grant of planning permission. However in this case the applicant was unable to satisfy the key policy test and as such the application has been refused.

Proposal

Permission is sought for the erection of a 5.7m x 7.7m timber cladding and glazed extension to the east of the existing dwelling. A glazed link is proposed to join the two buildings together. Several internal alterations are proposed these include the reconfiguration of the ground floor to include the enlargement of the bathroom. The removal of the internal wall that currently forms a cupboard, to create a passageway, and creation of a new opening from the new passageway into the snug. The proposal also includes the enlargement of an existing window to create an opening in the eastern elevation to form the glazed link.

Site Description

Linden Cottage is a detached rendered cottage which is grade II Listed. The site is accessed from the north the access runs along the western and southern boundaries to the principal elevation. There is a detached garage to the front of the property and a brick washhouse to the rear. The garden slopes away to the east.

Relevant Planning History

Applications 43/17/0141 and 43/17/0142 for the erection of an extension and conversion of the washhouse to ancillary accommodation have been approved.

Application 43/17/0143 is the householder application running parallel to this application.

Applications 43/09/0037 and 43/09/0038 erection of extension and conversion of wash house to form annexe was refused in 2009 because "the proposed extension, by reason of its scale and location would seriously reduce the historic interest of the host building as a small ancillary building would undermine the subservient relationship of the building with the host dwelling and therefore be detrimental to the setting of the main listed building and cartilage listed building. Reason two was the proposed annexe, by reason of its size, is tantamount to the creation of a new self contained dwelling. It has not been demonstrated that adequate parking, access and amenity space can be provided on the site, without prejudice to the setting of the listed building.

Consultation Responses

WELLINGTON TOWN COUNCIL - no comments received

CONSERVATION OFFICER - My view is that the building is in its optimum viable use as a small cottage. It has value in this form and would easily be sold if marketed.

I don't see that this proposal enhances the asset or makes it easier to understand.

I am not aware of any risks as the building is in good condition and we are not able to take account of any future deterioration that happens if neglected.

National Planning Policy Framework makes the following statement:

34. Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.

My view remains the same. This particular designs causes less than substantial harm at the higher end of the spectrum and will fundamentally change the setting of the building when viewed from the public footpath that runs around the site. I don't consider that the public benefits are sufficient to offset this harm.

I have suggested a set down building that makes use of the land form to conceal a room. This would be less visible but would have an outlook onto the garden. It was made very clear to me that the current design was the only one that the owner wished to consider. If this has now changed i would be happy to meet. Otherwise it would be better for us to determine the application and if refused it could be tested at appeal.

I formally recommend Refusal of this application.

Representations Received

four letters of support making the following comments (Summarised):

- Well designed proposals
- Good for the building

Planning Policy Context

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that applications are determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The development plan for Taunton Deane comprises the Taunton Deane Core Strategy (2012), the Taunton Site Allocations and Development Management Plan (2016), the Taunton Town Centre Area Action Plan (2008), Somerset Minerals Local Plan (2015), and Somerset Waste Core Strategy (2013).

Relevant policies of the development plan are listed below.

ROW - Rights of Way,
DM1 - General requirements,
D5 - Extensions to dwellings,

This takes into account the recent adoption of the SADMP.

Determining issues and considerations

The main consideration in determining this application is the impact upon the setting of the listed building.

Section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act requires that special regard is paid to the desirability of preserving the listed building, its setting and any feature of historic or architectural interest when deciding whether to grant planning permission.

It is noted that the views of the proposed extension would be minimal from the dwellings to the south west and will only be partially visible from the footpath that

runs south of the property it is therefore considered that the proposal will not have a detrimental impact upon the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties.

Paragraph 134 of the NPPF states that "where a development proposal will lead to less substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use". Comments from the heritage officer state that the current design causes less than substantial harm at the higher end of the spectrum and will fundamentally change the setting of the building when viewed from the public footpath where the public benefits are not sufficient enough to offset this harm. It is considered that the building is in its optimum viable use as a small cottage, it has value in this form. The current proposal is not considered to enhance the property or make it easier to understand.

It is considered that the proposal does not comply with policy D5, as it is not considered to preserve or enhance the character or the setting of the listed building.

The proposal includes internal alterations such as the removal of an existing partition in the hall and the insertion of two new doors one leading into the snug and one into the proposed utility/laundry. These changes are not considered to have a significant impact on the historic fabric of the building and are considered acceptable. The applicants submitted statement of significance states that the window to be removed is set in modern brick work indicating that it was inserted into the south east elevation in the late 20th Century, and that the enlargement of this opening would require the loss of some of the original historic fabric. (rubble stone). This opening is not considered to negatively impact upon the listed building. Notwithstanding the above the side extension is considered harmful and there is insufficient benefit and justification to offset the harm.

It is therefore recommend that planning permission be refused.

In preparing this report the planning officer has considered fully the implications and requirements of the Human Rights Act 1998.

Contact Officer: Briony Waterman