

38/14/0246

MR R MCDONALD

**ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY REPLACEMENT GARDEN ROOM TO THE FRONT OF MOUNTSWOOD HOUSE, HAINES HILL, TAUNTON**

Location: MOUNTSWOOD HOUSE, HAINES HILL, TAUNTON, TA1 4HN

Grid Reference: 322070.123636

Full Planning Permission

---

**RECOMMENDATION AND REASON(S)**

Recommended Decision: Refusal

The proposed extension, by reason of its design and location, would disrupt the appearance and harm the significance of the listed dwelling and is contrary to Policies DM1d and CP8 of the Taunton Deane Core Strategy, policy H17(C) of the retained Local Plan and guidance in Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework in respect of proposals relating to listed buildings. It therefore fails to preserve the listed building and conflicts with the duty outlined at Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

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 entered into pre-application discussions 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**

Erection of a single storey garden room to the front elevation of Mountswood House.

**SITE DESCRIPTION AND HISTORY**

Mountswood House is the front (west) half of a mid 19th century gothic-style brick villa with a slate roof dating to the 1860s. The house was split into two in the 1940s, with Oakwood House (1a Haines Hill) occupying the rear half and the coach house to the north converted to separate domestic accommodation. Mountswood House forms part of the Haines Hill development built by the architect Richard Carver and is located at the corner of Haines Hill and Trull Road with gardens to the south and west containing trees and shrubs and bordered by hedging with close boarded

fencing to Haines Hill.

The house was listed at Grade II on 4 July 1975 and is within Haines Hill Conservation Area. Previous applications (38/07/0532/LB and 38/07/0535) were made in 2007 for a single-storey extension in a similar position to that currently proposed and subsequently withdrawn. Recent applications given approval were for the erection of a fence and demolition of shed (38/06/0212) and installation of a rooflight (38/03/0423/LB).

## **CONSULTATION AND REPRESENTATION RESPONSES**

### **Consultees**

*LANDSCAPE* - The proposed garden room is of better design than the existing. However is it appropriate to add a garden room to this listed building at all? In addition the footings of the new extension are likely to impact on the roots of a nearby Atlantic cedar tree.

*CLLR MR T J HALL - MANOR AND WILTON* - I know this site quite well. The existing structure of the conservatory is in poor condition and time expired. I support the application to construct a garden room to replace it. The materials to be used are in keeping with the main house. It will not be visible from Trull Road or Haines Hill.

### **Representations**

Six letters of SUPPORT raising the following comments:

- This would appear to be a great improvement on the frankly ugly existing conservatory attached to the building. Other additions to properties in the road have enhanced them and I believe this would do the same. Visually there would be minimal effect as it would not be seen from the road. I am in favour of this application.
- I have reviewed the planning proposal and I fully support the application. The plans are sympathetic with the period property and in keeping with the house appearance.
- I have no objections to this planning proposal. Several other properties in the area have similar improvements in order to make the houses more suitable for family living - the proposal looks architecturally sensitive and will not detract from the overall pleasing appearance of the property.
- I have studied the plans in detail. I fully support the application. Not only does it enhance the living space, and increase the size of the kitchen, but the improvement is sympathetic to the existing property. The slight increase in the footprint occupied by the property will be a positive advantage to the quality of living space, without impairment to the overall property. Many properties on Haines Hill have undergone modernisation over the last 10 years, and these

plans are entirely consistent with the modifications that have been made to other similar properties in the same residential area.

- I fully support Mr McDonald's planning application. The improvements to his house are necessary to give him amenities expected for everyday modern living and will greatly benefit him and his wife raising their young children.
- We have checked the plans on your website and the proposals appear to us to be a sensitive improvement to this neighbouring property. We give it our full support and approval.

## **PLANNING POLICIES**

NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework,  
CP8 - CP 8 ENVIRONMENT,  
DM1 - TD CORE STRATEGY - GENERAL REQUIREMENTS,  
H17 - TDBCLP - Extensions to Dwellings,

## **DETERMINING ISSUES AND CONSIDERATIONS**

Mountswood House comprises the front, and most architecturally sensitive, half of a large Victorian gothic-style villa designed by the renowned local architect Richard Carver. The existing extension, which comes forward of the former verandah, is of undetermined date but it looks to have been built in the 1980s, although it could conceivably have been erected before the building was listed in 1975. I have absolutely no doubt that it would not have received the necessary listed building consent had this been required/applied for at the time of its construction as it detracts from the front of the building.

On first consideration the proposed extension appears to be an improvement over the existing. It is, however, even less sensitive to this listed building and would have a much greater impact on its character and appearance. Specifically, the proposed extension would occupy over one third of the length of this front elevation and project very slightly further into the garden. More damaging is that it would also obscure the original verandah, the line of which can be still be traced in the roof of the current extension, and wrap around the gabled projection of the original building that contains the dining room. In addition, as the proposed extension, would be taller than the existing, it would cut through the decorative string course between the ground and first floor and so visually intrude into the first floor area. This would adversely affect the character and appearance of the dwelling contrary to retained Local Plan policy H17(C), policy DM1d of the Taunton Deane Core Strategy and would not conserve or enhance the existing listed dwelling contrary to policy CP8 of the Core Strategy.

The proposed extension would not be readily seen from public vantage points but this is not a consideration that is taken into account when assessing the impact on the character and appearance of the dwelling. The screening of the property does, however, mean that it would have no identifiable effect on the amenity of neighbouring properties and it is noted that the consultation responses from local

residents are all supportive. The Landscape Officer has highlighted some potential issues with tree roots close-by.

The application proposes to replace a poor quality extension to the front of a listed building with a larger and architecturally insensitive extension which would detract from the historic and architectural character and appearance of this dwelling. As such, the proposal conflicts with DM1d and CP8 of Taunton Deane Core Strategy and established national policy and guidance relating to historic buildings. In terms of Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, the extension would harm the designated asset's significance and, as set out in Paragraph 134, this harm is not outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal. The proposed extension fails to preserve the character and appearance of this listed building and, in accordance with Section 66(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, it is advised that planning permission should not be granted.

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

**CONTACT OFFICER: Mr N Pratt Tel: 01823 356492**