

Application Number: 19/10340 Listed Building Alteration

Site: PARSONAGE HOUSE, GREEN LANE, FORDINGBRIDGE
SP6 1JT

Development: First-floor rear extension; create opening through first floor gable wall (Application for Listed Building Consent)

Applicant:

Target Date: 09/05/2019

Extension Date: 14/02/2020

SUMMARY OF THE MAIN ISSUES

1

The following matters are considered to be the main issues to be taken into account when determining this application. These, and all other relevant considerations, are set out and considered in Section 11, of this report after which a conclusion on the planning balance is reached.

1) Impact on the Listed Building.

This matter is being considered by Committee as a contrary view has been expressed by the Town Council

2 THE SITE

Parsonage House is a Grade II Listed Building set within the Fordingbridge Conservation Area. It is set within a large isolated site, which is well treed. It is located in an important site being associated with a moat, noted in the Historic England Register as being built within 1066-1539 and is on the site of Manor of Woodfidley; this is also an area of Archaeological Importance. The original part of the house dates from approximately 1665. There have been additions to the dwelling over the centuries, including the single storey structure on the rear elevation. This single storey structure, referred to as the boot room in the accompanying Heritage Statement, is likely to date from 1872 and originally formed part of a wraparound extension to the dwelling. There have also been recent additions to the dwelling, in the form of a single storey rear conservatory and attached garage with room over.

3 THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The proposal is for a first floor extension, that would continue the line of the existing rear gable with a glazed end elevation. The extension would be over an existing single storey structure possibly dating from 1875. An opening would be created through the existing gable end wall to form an access into the extension.

4 PLANNING HISTORY

Proposal	Decision Date	Decision Description	Status
19/11304 Single storey extension	17/12/2019	Granted subject to conditions	

19/11306 Demolish existing rear utility and construct new utility room (Application for Listed Building Consent)	17/12/2019	Granted subject to conditions
19/10339 First-floor rear extension		Item 3i :
19/10300 Single-storey extension; roof light	15/08/2019	Refused
19/10301 Single-storey extension; roof light (Application for Listed Building Consent)	15/08/2019	Refused
14/10895 Detached garage/store	13/08/2014	Granted Subject to Decided Conditions
12/99362 Retention of tree house and decking; rope bridge; zip wire	08/01/2013	Granted Decided
12/98999 Replacement garage with room over (Application for Listed Building Consent)	07/09/2012	Granted Subject to Decided Conditions
12/98990 Replacement garage with room over	07/09/2012	Granted Subject to Decided Conditions
12/98996 Single-storey rear extension (Application for Listed Building Consent)	14/09/2012	Granted Subject to Decided Conditions
12/98983 Single-storey rear extension	14/09/2012	Granted Subject to Decided Conditions
XX/RFR/01441 Erection of a double garage.	06/03/1952	Granted Decided

5 THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND OTHER NFDC GUIDANCE

The Core Strategy

CS2: Design quality

CS3: Protecting and enhancing our special environment (Heritage and Nature Conservation)

Local Plan Part 2 Sites and Development Management Development Plan Document

DM1: Heritage and Conservation

The Emerging Local Plan

SO3: Built environment and heritage

Policy 1 Achieving sustainable development

Policy 11(saved policy DM1): Heritage and Conservation

Policy 13: Design quality and local distinctiveness

Supplementary Planning Guidance and other Documents

SPG - Fordingbridge - A Conservation Area Appraisal

SPD - Fordingbridge Town Design Statement

6 RELEVANT LEGISLATION AND GOVERNMENT ADVICE

Relevant Legislation

Section 66 General duty as respects listed buildings in exercise of planning functions.

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

National Planning Policy Framework:

NPPF Ch.12 - Achieving well-designed places

Paras 124 and 127

NPPF Ch.16 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

paras 189,193 and 196

7 PARISH / TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS

Fordingbridge Town Council: Recommend (PAR 3) permission as it makes the property more uniform and it won't affect anyone else

8 COUNCILLOR COMMENTS

No comments received

9 CONSULTEE COMMENTS

The following is a summary of the representations received:

Conservation Officer: objection as the proposed extension would be harmful to the historic integrity of the Listed Building.

10 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

None received

11 OFFICER COMMENTS

Introduction

11.1 This application was deferred from the August 2019 committee to allow the applicants the opportunity to commission and submit an ecology report. This has now been received to support the submission of the associated planning application (19/10339). Furthermore, a section has been submitted to show the position of the existing end window in relation to the first floor extension, which would serve the first floor and be positioned at floor level. This section clearly shows that the existing window in the Victorian extension would not be cut across by the new first floor. Also it shows that the brickwork removed in the making of the doorway will be reused in the new gable wall and the bond will be English Bond. This additional information was received on the 20 December 2019.

11.2 Notwithstanding the submission of the Ecology report, the only issue when determining this Listed Building application is the impact of the proposed development on the Listed Building. Previously this application was recommended for refusal, as it was identified that the proposed extension would be harmful to the character and appearance of the Listed Building, and loss of historic fabric was not justified. This is in line

with **Section 16 (2) and 66 (1)** of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, which requires LPAs to have regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

- 11.3 There have been no amendments to the proposed extension nor has justification been provided for the proposed works, and as such the officer concerns relating to the harm have not been addressed.

Relevant Considerations

Impact on the Listed Building

- 11.4 The National Planning Policy Framework 2019 Chapter 12 "Achieving well designed places" acknowledges (in Para 124) that the creation of a high quality built environment is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development in creating better places to live and work. Being clear about design expectations is essential to achieving this goal.
- 11.5 Para 127 of the NPPF requires development to be sympathetic to local character, respect surrounding built environment and maintain a strong sense of place in terms of building gaps, spaces and materials.
- 11.6 Para 189 provides guidance on the requirement of information describing the significance of any heritage assessment, including any contribution made by their setting. In areas described as having archaeological importance at a minimum a desk based study would be required.
- 11.7 Para 193 stresses that great weight should be given to the assets conservation.
- 11.8 Para 196 of the NPPF states that when the proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
- 11.9 When considering a scheme for this Grade II Listed Building, it is important that it pays due regard to the existing historic fabric as well as the form, scale and mass of the existing building. It is also important that any changes do not result in a loss of significance to the heritage asset, regardless of whether or not this alteration will be visible from a public vantage point.
- 11.10 Most of the additions to the building are historic, and this adds to the character and significance of the building. The single storey element, which is proposed to be built over, is likely to be historic and the Conservation Officer is confident that parts of this structure pre date 1872. The presence of foundations is unknown, and this leads to the possibility that structural interventions could be required, though this has not been addressed in the application.
- 11.11 The existing single storey extension is of historic construction, and its asymmetric roofline is part of the character and significance of the building relating to a former wraparound extension present on the historic maps. The building retains an original roof purlin which would be lost in the raising of the roof.

- 11.12 The new roof of the proposed first floor extension would link to the old roof, altering the overall appearance of the building, and adding to the bulk and mass of the building. Whereas currently the chimney stack is sited on the end of the gable, the addition would result in this chimney being isolated and incongruous within the extended roof.
- 11.13 The opening in the original rear wall to create a doorway to the new bedroom space, would result in an unacceptable loss of historic fabric and also an unacceptable alteration to the original plan form of the building. Although there have been alterations to the brickwork in this elevation resulting in a straight joint in part of the wall, the brickwork proposed to be removed to make way for the new doorway is of older handmade bricks of historic date. Albeit that the removed bricks would be reused to make up the gable wall, the loss of this brickwork from this existing location has not been justified and would result in a loss of significance. The alteration to the plan form would result in a detrimental effect on the character and significance of the building.
- 11.14 There have been modern additions to the dwelling, in the form of a rear conservatory and larger pitched roof garage. The proposed first floor extension has been designed to be an obvious modern addition to the property, and would mimic the same architectural style of the conservatory. However this would result in a more suburban style of architecture which would not reflect the traditional, rural appearance of the building. The addition of a further extension would increase the scale and mass of the building which would have a cumulative effect, resulting in an unacceptable impact upon the historic scale and form of the building and erode its architectural integrity. Furthermore, the existing conservatory reads as an entirely new addition. Although the gable of the proposed extension would match the conservatory in style, the lack of subservience and the elongation of the historic form of the building would result in an unacceptable alteration to the building which cannot be read as an alteration distinct from the building form of the existing property.
- 11.15 The proposed development would result in less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the Listed Building. The building is currently used as a six bedroom residential dwelling, and the proposal would enlarge an existing small bedroom. Even though this would be of benefit to the applicants, it would not outweigh the harm caused to the Listed Building, set out in the provisions of the NPPF para 196.

12 CONCLUSION ON THE PLANNING BALANCE

- 12.1 The proposals have been considered within the relevant local and national policy context. The proposed development would result in harmful additions to the Listed Building, and the loss of historic fabric which cannot be justified and are not outweighed by other benefits. As such, Listed Building Consent is recommended for refusal.

13 OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Crime and Disorder

None relevant

Local Finance

Not applicable

Human Rights

In coming to this recommendation, consideration has been given to the rights set out in Article 8 (Right to respect for private and family life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (Right to peaceful enjoyment of possessions) of the European Convention on Human Rights. Whilst it is recognised that this recommendation, if agreed, may interfere with the rights and freedoms of the applicant to develop the land in the way proposed, the objections to the planning application are serious ones and cannot be overcome by the imposition of conditions. The public interest and the rights and freedoms of neighbouring property owners can only be safeguarded by the refusal of permission.

Equality

The Equality Act 2010 provides protection from discrimination in respect of certain protected characteristics, namely: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or beliefs and sex and sexual orientation. It places the Council under a legal duty to have due regard to the advancement of equality in the exercise of its powers including planning powers. The Committee must be mindful of this duty *inter alia* when determining all planning applications. In particular the Committee must pay due regard to the need to:

- (1) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act;
- (2) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and
- (3) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

14. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE LISTED BUILDING CONSENT

Reason(s) for Refusal:

1. The proposed first floor extension would increase the scale and mass of the building, and taking into account previous extensions would detract from the architectural integrity of this building by making a further cumulative change to the original form of the Listed Building. Furthermore, the extension would be suburban in style, detracting from the traditional rural appearance of the building. This inappropriate addition would be harmful to the character and appearance of the Listed Building. This would be contrary to Policies CS2 and CS3 of the Core Strategy for the New Forest District outside the National Park, DM1 of the Local Plan Part 2: sites and Development Management Plan, Policies 11 and 13 of the Emerging Local Plan and Chaps 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The proposed development would result in the loss of part of the historic first floor gable wall, and an original roof purlin in the single storey element. There is no justification for the loss of this historic fabric, particularly as part of the gable wall forms part of the older part of the house. Furthermore, the resulting change to the historic plan form would result in less than substantial harm to the character and significance of the building. This development would be contrary to Policies CS2 and CS3 of the Core Strategy for the New Forest District outside the National Park, DM1 of the Local Plan Part 2: sites and Development Management Plan, Policies 11 and 13 of the Emerging Local Plan, and Chaps 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Further Information:

Kate Cattermole

Telephone: 023 8028 5588