

22/2006/008

MR & MRS KAVANAGH

EXTENSION OF DWELLING AND WORKS TO EXISTING BOUNDARY BANKS TO PROVIDE NEW RETAINING WALLS AND DRIVE WITH SUBTERRANEAN GARAGE, COURSLEY COTTAGE, LYDEARD ST LAWRENCE AS AMENDED BY AGENTS LETTER DATED 21ST JULY, 2006 AND DRAWING NOS. 1045/26, 1045/27, 1045/28 AND 1045/29.

314144/133099

FULL

PROPOSAL

The proposal relates to the internal refurbishment, a two storey extension to the side and single storey subterranean garage/extension to this Grade II Listed Building. The two storey element of the extension project some 6m to the side of the property and is 8 m in width. The front of the extension is of single storey construction and is stepped back some 3.6 m from the front wall of the existing dwelling. The subterranean element provides three garages with separate oak doors accessed via a new drive entering the garden at its northern most point and following the east boundary of the site.

This application for planning permission is accompanied by listed building consent 22/2006/009LB. Previously applications 22/2005/015 and 22/2005/016LB were withdrawn on 6th January, 2006, following concerns over the size of the extension.

CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS

COUNTY HIGHWAY AUTHORITY no objection subject to conditions. RIGHTS OF WAY the works must not affect the footpath e.g. to the retaining walls. The footpath must be clear at all times.

LANDSCAPE OFFICER no objection subject to the reinstatement of the orchard, re-planting of existing boundary hedges, planting to the east of the parking area it should be possible to integrate the proposals into the local landscape.
CONSERVATION OFFICER As amended I can now support the proposal.

PARISH COUNCIL objected to the original submission on the grounds that despite the reduction of subterranean elements, the extension still appears very large to the original, and inappropriate to its listed status. The planning statement appears to show that the architect and TDBC have reached agreement on obtaining approval, although the extension would still be slate which is considered unsympathetic to the appearance of the listed building. Concerned re safety re the unprotected drop from the garage roof. Is the re-instatement of the orchard part of the application, if so conditions should be applied. Elements of the scheme are commendable such as the reinstatement of thatching and underground garaging. Object to the revised design as the extension is still too large and the mixture of slate and thatch would not be

sympathetic. Although the revised design is now smaller in size, all previous comments made still stand.

ONE LETTER OF REPRESENTATION has been received raising the following issues:- an access to the south of the application site is not owned by the applicants.

POLICY CONTEXT

Taunton Deane Local Plan Policies S1 (general requirements), S2 (design), H17 (extensions to dwellings) and EN16 (Listed Buildings) are relevant to this proposal.

ASSESSMENT

Following the withdrawal of previous applications 22/2005/015 and 22/2005/016LB the subterranean element of the proposal was reduced in size and resubmitted with this application and accompanying application for listed building consent 22/2006/009LB. Upon request of the Conservation Officer the two storey element of this proposal was also reduced by 2.5 m in depth. The Conservation Officer is satisfied that the revised proposal would not detrimentally harm the character of the listed building.

The objections from the Parish Council appear to be mainly concerned with the size of the extension and use of slate instead of the current double roman tiles. The size of the extension has been reduced to a level in proportion and subservient to the existing building. Furthermore the submitted justification statement shows that the only one third of the original dwelling remains today and therefore the proposal is not at odds with its historical context in terms of the additional volume of accommodation proposed. The mixture of slate and thatch is a common approach found on many listed buildings and the double roman tiles currently found on the dwelling form part of a non-original modern roof, the loss of which is not considered to harm the character of the dwelling. In terms of design therefore the proposal satisfactorily reflects the character of the listed building and visual amenity of the area.

The Landscape Officer has requested that the orchard is reinstated, re-planting of existing boundary hedges, planting to the east of the parking area. In this instance it would appear unreasonable to request the latter for what amounts to a two storey extension. The development will be seen within the context of the existing dwelling and does not require screening, however it may be beneficial to increase the east boundary hedges to screen the new track and turning area. The applicants are proposing an extensive amount of tree planting anyway and it is considered reasonable therefore to only impose a standard landscaping condition.

The Highway Authority has raised no objections to the proposal subject to a number of conditions including visibility 30 m in each direction at the new access point. The visibility splay however would result in the loss of a mature hedgerow and trees. Given that the lane is a no through road leading to one other property in an isolated rural location, the visibility splay as recommended by the Highway Authority is not considered necessary. The visibility splay as shown on the submitted plan is therefore considered acceptable in this instance.

There are no neighbouring properties that would be detrimentally affected in terms of residential amenity. The unprotected drop will be railed off as a requirement of the Building Regulations to a minimum of 1100 mm and a condition is imposed requiring details to be submitted. With regard to the representation received the field access to the south of the site would not be interfered with as a result of this proposal. It is understood from the agents that this issue has been resolved with the originator of the representation however as a civil issue it would not form a material consideration anyway.

RECOMMENDATION

Permission be GRANTED subject to conditions of time limit, materials, landscaping, garage – domestic use only, consolidated access, gradient of access, access gates, prevention of surface water to the highway, sample panel of render, wheat reed thatching, sample of slate and details of roof venting, details of rooflights, doors, railings, windows, glazed screens and finished treatment of joinery. Note re footpaths

REASON(S) FOR RECOMMENDATION:- The proposal is considered not to harm visual or residential amenity and does not adversely affect the character of the Listed Building and is therefore considered acceptable and, accordingly, does not conflict with Taunton Deane Local Plan Policies S1, S2, H17 and EN16.

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

CONTACT OFFICER: 356469 MR R UPTON

NOTES: