

ENGLISH CHURCHES HOUSING GROUP

RETENTION OF TWO STOREY EXTENSION TO REAR TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL BEDSITS AND OFFICE AT LINDLEY HOUSE, EAST REACH, TAUNTON AS AMENDED BY PLANS NOS. BS251-08C RECEIVED 18TH OCTOBER, 2002

23609/24710

FULL PERMISSION

PROPOSAL

It has been brought to the Local Planning Authority's attention that the extension permitted by the planning committee in September 2001 (38/2001/290 & 291LB) has not been built in accordance with the approved plans. Planning permission and listed building consent is therefore required for the alterations and the retention of the works which have been completed. The two alterations from the original plans are that the roof ridge on the extension to the rear is 0.4 m higher than the approved plans, and there is a parapet introduced to the porch to the front of the extension.

CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS

COUNTY HIGHWAYS AUTHORITY no observations.

CONSERVATION OFFICER no observations to make on this planning application. HOUSING OFFICER fully support the scheme to provide much needed additional bedsits and office facilities. ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH (HOUSING STANDARDS) all works must comply with the current Building Regulations; considerations should be given to the existing fire precautions already installed within the main building.

AVON & SOMERSET CONSTABULARY (COMMUNITY SAFETY) no adverse comments to make. SOMERSET FIRE BRIGADE detailed recommendations concerning fire safety matters will be made at the Building Regulations stage. WESSEX WATER previous comments still applicable, no further comments to make.

4 LETTERS OF OBJECTION received raising issues of: roof is obviously higher than on the plans, double doors have appeared opening onto the car park; if a mere normal citizen was having building work this would surely not have been overlooked; Alfred Street Residents Association contacted TDBC building services expressing concern over the height of the building and apparently nothing was done; if this is an error then it betokens inefficiency and incompetence, if it is not then such a practice exhibits a disregard and contempt for the authority of the planning committee and TDBC and surely cannot be tolerated; it is considered that the size and design of the modern extension does not satisfactorily respect the character and appearance of Lindley House which is a listed building; application is contrary to the policies within the development plan framework regarding the preservation of such important buildings; accepted that an appropriate use of this building needs to be ensured to secure its future survival, but such users should take care to maintain the property so as to retain

its original character and appearance as much as is feasibly possible. It does not seem that TAH are exercising such due care and attention.

ALFRED STREET RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION building roof line is over 3 feet higher than the plans that had been approved, access gates have been added, the porch erected bears no resemblance to the one on the approved plans, and the contractors have painted some of the window reveals (although none had been painted originally); some of the re-pointing that has been done is completely out of character and sympathy with a listed building; can only be supposed that the only reason for this 'mistake' is to create a roof void space that with the installation of suitable roof lights and doors could be used as additional bedrooms/ offices, something that the ASRA would be vehemently opposed to; all work not done according with the original plans should be removed.

POLICY CONTEXT

Policies that were taken into consideration when determining this application were: Somerset & Exmoor National Park Joint Structure Plan Policy 9 (The Built Environment), Taunton Deane Local Plan Revised Deposit Policies EN17 & EN18 (Listed Buildings), S1 (General Requirements), and S2 (Design).

ASSESSMENT

The alterations to the originally approved plans that this application tries to rectify are the minor changes in the roof height of the extension to the rear of the property and the changes in design to the porch to the front of the extension. The issues that needs to be considered are whether these changes to the approved plans are so detrimental to the character of the listed building, or impact on the neighbouring properties to such an extent, as to warrant their refusal. The raising of the roof by 0.4 m is not considered to have a detrimental impact on the neighbouring properties in terms of loss of light or overbearing nature of the extension. Although any raising of the roof creates more bulk to the extension to the rear, it is not considered to significantly impact on the character or appearance of the Grade II listed building. The porch to the front of the extension which can be viewed from the East Reach elevation is not built to the approved plans. A parapet has been added to the front of part of the porch that is visible from the street. This addition is considered to improve the appearance of the extension from this elevation as it simplifies the appearance of the extension when viewed in relation to the main building, in line with the simple, appearance of the listed building. The proposals are considered to be in line with the policies of the Structure and Local Plan as detailed above, and the recommendation is therefore one of approval. With regards to the other issues raised by the representations received the addition of the double doors in the wall on the Alfred Street boundary does not require listed building consent or planning permission. The re-pointing of the brickwork on the original listed building and the re-roofing is a repair and does not require listed building consent. This re-pointing has been carried out with the full consultation with the Conservation Officer, with the original mortar examined, and the new mortar mixed to match the existing. Once weathered down the mortars should be an exact match. With regards to the painting of the window reveals, this does require listed building consent, and a note be attached to any permission requesting an application be submitted in order that these works may be

assessed, and no further painting be carried out without the permission of the Local Planning Authority.

RECOMMENDATION

Permission be APPROVED.

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

CONTACT OFFICER: 356465 MR C D WHITE

NOTES:

