

**ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION (SCHEME A) TO EAST ELEVATION AT BUTTLES LODGE, VILLAGE ROAD, HATCH BEAUCHAMP, (AS AMENDED) AND AS CLARIFIED BY E-MAIL RECEIVED 2 SEPTEMBER 2011.**

Grid Reference: 329997.120039

Listed Building Consent: Works

---

**RECOMMENDATION AND REASON(S)**

Recommended Decision: Refusal

- 1 The extension, by reason of its size, location, design and form, would detract from the modest, compact scale, elegant simple form, harmonious, balanced composition, self contained appearance and distinctiveness of the host building. and result in an incoherent addition. As such, the proposal is deemed not to preserve the character of the Listed Building and hence is contrary to Section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Planning Policy Statement 5 and Policy 9 of the Somerset and Exmoor National Park Joint Structure Plan Review.
- 2 Buttles Lodge is a largely unaltered example of a former lodge/estate workers dwelling. The extension, by reason of its size, form and location, would detract from the essential qualities of the host building's existing balanced composition, debase the ready perception of its former use and existing spacious setting. In addition, it is considered that no evidence has been submitted to suggest that, if an extension was not allowed, the building would fall into disrepair or become unused. As such, the proposal is not considered to preserve the character of the Listed Building or its setting and hence contrary to Section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Planning Policy Statement 5 and Policy 9 of the Somerset and Exmoor National Park Joint Structure Plan Review.

**RECOMMENDED CONDITION(S) (if applicable)**

Notes for compliance

- . You are advised that a separate application for planning permission is required.

**PROPOSAL**

Erection of a single storey, fully attached, lead flat roofed, extension. Paired casements to reflect the host building are proposed, as is Bath stone cladding.

This is one of two applications, for a single storey extension in the same location, which were submitted at the same time. The other application (19/11/0002/LB), was refused under delegated powers on 30 August 2011.

## **SITE DESCRIPTION AND HISTORY**

Grade 2 Listed, Mid C19 detached lodge/ estate workers dwelling, located to the south of the parkland which formerly served Hatch Park. (The latter was destroyed by fire in 1940). Palladian style, slate roof, Bath stone ashlar facing, loggia to principal facade on west, facing up the drive.

### **Planning History:**

Applications 19/02/0027 and 0028/LB. "Erection of single storey extension towards the road, at Buttles Lodge, Hatch Beauchamp". REFUSED under delegated powers, 3/2/2003. Appeals dismissed 25/11/2003.

Application 19/09/0003/LB. "Erection of single storey extension to the east elevation" (as now proposed and towards the road, as per the appealed applications above) "at Buttles Lodge, Village Road, Hatch Beauchamp". REFUSED under delegated powers 7/5/2009.

Application 19/09/0007/LB. "Erection of single storey extension to west elevation, at Buttles Lodge, Village Road, Hatch Beauchamp". REFUSED by the Planning Committee. Certificate dated 19/11/2009.

Application 19/11/0002/LB. "Erection of single storey extension (scheme B), to east elevation of Buttles lodge, Village Road, Hatch Beauchamp, (as amended). REFUSED under delegated powers 30/8/2011.

## **CONSULTATION AND REPRESENTATION RESPONSES**

### **Consultees**

*HATCH BEAUCHAMP PARISH COUNCIL* - supports - "prefers the traditional approach".

*GEORGIAN GROUP* - Thank you for consulting the Georgian Group on the application to add an extension to the above building. This is the sixth time in eight years, and the second time in four weeks, that the Group has commented on an application to extend this building.

Buttles Lodge dates from c1835 and was built as a lodge to Hatch Park. It is listed Grade II. The building is built on a T-plan, the main elevation facing west up the drive towards Hatch Park, with a small rear wing to the rear. All the elevations are pedimented, and the cornice and stringcourse are continued around the whole building. The overall impression is one of formal symmetry, although this is not exact to the north and south. The classical design and the high quality materials and detailing all reflect the status of the former landowner. The Lodge appears to have survived in its original form without any significant alteration.

While the Group notes that an alternative design has been submitted, together with a

slightly revised statement of significance, we must still object to this application.

The chief part of the historical character and significance of Buttles Lodge lies in the formal treatment of all of its facades, a common feature of lodge buildings, which were often treated as architectural 'specimens'. The proposed extension would damage this aspect of the building's character by undermining the coherence of the historical facades. It would also involve altering the historical fenestration to the East elevation, including the removal of original masonry. There will always be some historical buildings to which any extension would be damaging and the Group advises that this is such a building.

The creation of a dining room is not essential to the continuation of the listed building as a dwelling, and it is difficult to envisage an extension which would not damage the character and significance of the listed building to at least some degree. While more space may be desired by the present occupants the Group must advise that the comparative intactness of the historical character of the building cannot be damaged for the sake of present wishes. Buttles Lodge is perfectly viable as a residential building as it stands and therefore the harm that the proposed extension would cause to the building's significance is not acceptable.

Therefore the Group advises that this proposal would harm the significance of the listed building to an unacceptable degree and that the application should be refused consent.

## **Representations**

8 letters of support have been received which raise the following issues:

- extension fits very well with the existing gatehouse;
- design in keeping / will not detract from the house's character;
- carefully thought through (design) so as to be sympathetic to the surrounding environment;
- extension will no doubt enhance the property;
- sympathetically designed to blend with original house.

## **PLANNING POLICIES**

S&ENPP9 - S&ENP - The Built Historic Environment,  
PPS 5 - PPS5 Planning for the Historic Environment,

## **DETERMINING ISSUES AND CONSIDERATIONS**

Section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, requires that, when considering applications for Listed Building consent, special regard is paid to the desirability of preserving the building, its setting and any features of architectural or historic interest it possesses.

As the siting of the extension, is the same as that Appealed and Dismissed under applications 19/02/0027 and 0028/LB, the Inspectors reasons for dismissal are clearly of relevance, as are the differences between the proposals.

The Appealed scheme, provided for a single storey extension with a pitched slate

roof, set off from the host building by a flat roofed link and a new flat roofed, essentially glazed entrance lobby. Other than a Bath stone plinth, rendered walls were specified. The overall design can be described as pseudo traditional i.e. reflective of the design of the principal building.

The current proposal provides for a fully attached single storey flat roofed extension, faced with Bath stone. Rolled lead is specified for the roof. Paired casements to reflect those of the host building are proposed.

Relevant extracts from the Inspectors decision letter are as follows:

Para 7 "However the building" (Buttles Lodge) "is carefully detailed on all faces and appears as a harmonious and well balanced composition from all aspects. Its compact form and classical composition, together with its modest scale, gives the building a distinctive and self contained appearance. In my view it is immediately recognisable as a largely unaltered former lodge.

Para 8 Whilst accepting that the single storey extension would be modest and constructed of traditional materials - "In my view it would harm the balanced composition of the listed building and would make it a sprawling, incoherent built form.

Para 9 Acknowledging that the design and detailing of the extension took cues from the listed building - "To my mind the extension would appear as an incongruous addition that would undermine the buildings elegant, simple form and would harm its distinctive compact appearance which is characteristic of its original use as a lodge. In addition I consider that the construction of an extension between the listed and its boundary with the road would create a sense of clutter which would harm the buildings spacious setting".

Para 10 (Note PPG15 has been replaced by PPS5) "PPG15 advises that many listed buildings can sustain some degree of sensitive alteration or extension to accommodate continuing or new uses. However it also draws attention to the sensitivity to alteration or extension of humble and once common building types that are relatively unaltered examples of a particular building type. I consider Buttles Lodge to be such a building and the fact that it has been altered so little over the years has added weight to my conclusions on the main issue. I recognise that the lodge provides only limited accommodation ". "However no detailed evidence has been submitted to indicate that if the lodge were not extended it would be at risk of becoming unused or falling into a state of disrepair. On this basis I am not persuaded that there is such an overriding need for additional accommodation that it outweighs the harmful effect that the proposal would have on the listed building and its setting".

As noted at Para 10 above and in common with the current application, no detailed evidence has been submitted to suggest that the building would become unused or at risk, if an extension was not allowed. Whilst the applicants desire for a separate dining room is noted and the existing accommodation modest, the latter is not considered inadequate as it comprises: two bedrooms and a bathroom at first floor, with a hall, wc, kitchen and lounge on the ground floor. As the kitchen is small, dining takes place in the living room. This said, such is not an uncommon arrangement.

The proposed extension, is in the same position as the Appealed and Dismissed

scheme. Apart from a flat, rather than a pitched roof, deletion of the glazed lobby and different fenestration, both schemes are in essence, very similar.

Whilst the applicants are clearly devoted to managing the associated woodland and have maintained the building in an appropriate manner, in the absence of evidence to suggest there has been a significant change in circumstances, the desire for a dining room, is not considered to outweigh the detrimental impact on the host building or to warrant a different view from the Appeal Inspector.

Therefore the application is recommended for refusal

**In preparing this report the Planning Officer has considered fully the implications and requirements of the Human Rights Act 1998.**

**CONTACT OFFICER: Ms D Hartnell Tel: 01823 356492**