

## **Development Control Committee 3 July 2019**

### **Planning Application DC/19/0537/HH & DC/19/0538/LB – Cooks Farmhouse, Lawshall Road, Hawstead**

<b>Date Registered:</b>	25.03.2019	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	20.05.2019
<b>Case Officer:</b>	Adam Yancy	<b>Recommendation:</b>	Refuse Applications
<b>Parish:</b>	Hawstead	<b>Ward:</b>	Horringer
<b>Proposal:</b>	Householder Planning Application and Listed Building Consent - Insertion of two cat slide dormer windows within rear elevation		
<b>Site:</b>	Cooks Farmhouse, Lawshall Road, Hawstead		
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mr & Mrs Baker		

**Synopsis:**

Application under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and Associated matters.

**Recommendation:**

It is recommended that the Committee determine the attached application and associated matters.

CONTACT CASE OFFICER:

Adam Yancy

Email: adam.yancy@westsuffolk.gov.uk

Telephone: 01638 719264

## **Background:**

**The application is referred to Development Control Committee following consideration by the Delegation Panel. The Parish Council support the applications and the recommendation is for REFUSAL.**

**A site visit is scheduled to take place on Monday 1 July 2019.**

## **Proposal:**

1. Planning permission and Listed Building Consent is sought for the insertion of 2no. dormers to the rear elevation of the dwelling.
2. The application was previously submitted in a similar form in 2017, albeit following negotiation with the agent the dormer windows were removed allowing the remainder of that proposal to be approved.
3. An application submitted by the previous owner was also refused in 2014 for the provision of 3 rooflights to the rear roofslope.

## **Application Supporting Material:**

4. - Location and Existing Plans
  - Existing Elevations
  - Proposed Elevations
  - Design and Access Statement

## **Site Details:**

5. The site consists of a two storey semi-detached Grade II listed building located in the Hawstead settlement boundary. The property fronts onto Lawshall Road and is situated amongst dwellings of varying scale and designs.

## **Planning History:**

6.

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Decision Date</b>
DC/14/0304/LB	Listed Building Application - Installation of 3 no. velux windows on rear elevation roof	Application Refused	13.05.2014
DC/17/0185/HH	Householder Planning Application - (i) demolition of garden room, (ii) single storey rear extension, (iii) demolition and reconstruction of garage	Application Granted	24.05.2017
DC/17/0186/LB	Application for Listed Buildings Consent - (i) Removal of late C20th garden room (ii) Construction single storey	Application Granted	24.05.2017

	rear extension oak framed garden room, (iii) Demolition of existing garage (iv) Construction of replacement garage/storage building			
E/99/2071/P	Planning Application - Change of use from agricultural land to paddocks	Application Granted	06.08.1999	
E/86/1463/LB	Listed Building Application - Erection of conservatory	Application Granted	16.04.1986	
E/84/3112/P	Conversion of barn to form two dwellings	Application Granted	12.12.1984	
E/79/2035/P	ALTERATIONS AND EXTENSION AND CONSTRUCTION OF ACCESS	Application Granted	13.08.1979	

### **Consultations:**

7. Conservation Officer – Objects to the application, as explained in more detail below.

### **Representations:**

8. Hawstead Parish Council – The Parish Council support the application on the basis that the application:
  - Is sympathetic to the to the style of the property
  - Would not be visible from the public domain
  - Would allow for more headroom and light into bedroom
9. Ward Member – No comments.
10. Neighbour representations – None received.

### **Policy:**

11. On 1 April 2019 Forest Heath District Council merged with St Edmundsbury Borough Council to become a single Authority, West Suffolk Council. The development plans for the merged local planning authorities were carried forward to the new Council by Regulation. The Development Plans remain in place for the new West Suffolk Council and, with the exception of the Joint Development Management Policies document (which had been adopted by both Councils), set out policies for defined geographical areas within the new authority. It is therefore necessary to determine this application with reference to policies set out in the plans produced by the now dissolved St Edmundsbury Borough Council.
12. The following policies of the Joint Development Management Policies Document and the St Edmundsbury Core Strategy 2010 & Vision 2031 have been taken into account in the consideration of this application:

## **Other Planning Policy:**

13. National Planning Policy Framework (2019) (NPPF)

14. The NPPF was revised in February 2019 and is a material consideration in decision making from the day of its publication. Paragraph 213 is clear however, that existing policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted or made prior to the publication of the revised NPPF. Due weight should be given to them according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF; the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the NPPF; the greater weight that may be given. The policies set out within the Joint Development Management Policies have been assessed in detail and are considered sufficiently aligned with the provision of the NPPF that full weight can be attached to them in the decision making process.

## **Officer Comment:**

15. The issues to be considered in the determination of this application are:

- Principle of Development
- Impact on Listed building
- Design and Form

### Principle of Development

16. Policy DM24 states that planning permission for alterations or extensions to existing dwellings, self-contained annexes and ancillary development within the curtilage of dwellings will be acceptable provided that the proposal respects the character, scale and design of existing dwellings and the character and appearance of the immediate and surrounding area, will not result in over-development of the dwelling and curtilage and shall not adversely affect the residential amenity of occupants of nearby properties. In this instance, the principle of adding dormers to the dwelling is acceptable under Policy DM24 subject to consideration of the detail below, including the effect upon the listed building.

### Impact on Listed Building

17. Section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires the decision maker to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

18. Policy DM15 states that proposals to alter, extend or change the use of a listed building or development affecting its setting will be permitted where they are of an appropriate scale, form, height, massing and design which respects the existing building and its setting and the setting of the listed building.

19. The proposed dormers are to serve the former attic space now used as a fourth bedroom and to light and provide additional head height over the staircase. Whilst the desire to introduce natural light to the attic space and improve head height over the staircase is understood, according to the list description this space was created in the 18th century for further attic space. Therefore, it is unlikely that this space was ever intended to provide the

comforts typically enjoyed by the primary rooms found at lower levels; indeed such limitations are not uncommon for attic accommodation. Whilst some opening up work has been undertaken no assessment of the roof's significance has been provided. The purpose of the opening up works is to determine the significance of the roof carpentry, which should then be used to inform the acceptability of loss of fabric. Officers are advised the areas exposed are modern plaster and insulation from the late 20th century with boarded plyboard ceilings and that the insertion of the dormers will not involve the loss of historic fabric, however no evidence to substantiate this claim has been provided. The list description advises the building is of 16th century origin with 17<sup>th</sup> and 18th century alterations with a wind braced purlin roof. It is highly likely therefore (assuming the list description is accurate and in the absence of any evidence to demonstrate to the contrary) given the position of the proposed dormers, that their insertion will involve cutting the purlin and possibly historic rafters. This would be likely to result in the loss of historic fabric causing physical harm to the building. In the absence of sufficient assessment and based on the list description it is appropriate that a precautionary approach should be taken.

20. The second issue relates to the visual impact of the proposal on the external appearance of the building. Currently the external appearance of the roof slope is uninterrupted by any physical features with the exception of an impressive off centre axial chimney with four attached hexagonal flues on a square base. This chimney contributes greatly to the significance of the building, inserted in the 17th century and is emphasised due to the absence of any other distractions within the roof. The provision of the proposed dormers will appear as a visual intrusion particularly due to the awkward relationship of the staircase dormer with the off centre axial chimney. In addition, the size and scale of the proposed dormers are notably larger than windows serving the first floor rear elevation. As a result undue attention is drawn to their existence appearing at odds with key characteristics which contribute towards the building's significance. Consequently the impact of the proposed dormers on the significance of the roof and chimney will prove detrimental irrespective of whether or not the work will involve loss of historic fabric, particularly given the awkward relationship of the proposed dormer serving the staircase with the chimney stack due to the positioning and size.
21. A similar proposal submitted by a former owner for the insertion of rooflights was previously refused on similar grounds and a more recent application for dormer windows and other works (as set out at paragraph 6) was negotiated to secure the removal of the dormer windows from the proposal. In the absence of any additional information to address the continuing concerns it would be appropriate to be consistent in the determination of the application.
22. The potential loss of historic fabric together with the visual impact on the external appearance of the roof will inevitably cause harm to the building's significance. That harm is likely to be 'less than substantial' harm subject to the loss of historic fabric. The proposed development will therefore fail to

contribute towards the preservation of the building proving detrimental to its special architectural and historic interest, proving contrary to policy DM15, and causing 'less than substantial' harm.

23.Paragraph 196 of the NPPF states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. In this regard, there is no public benefit arising from the proposal, and the building is already in its optimum viable use so there nothing to balance and mitigate against the clear harm identified.

24.To conclude, and in the absence of any further information, it is considered highly likely that the proposed dormers will not only involve the loss of historic fabric but will also materially and adversely affect the building's significance. This is due to the visual impact of providing disproportionately large dormers on this presently uninterrupted roofspace, thereby causing harm to its significance. It is not possible to determine the degree of harm due to insufficient information in relation to the degree of historic fabric to be lost. However, noting the visual harm arising and that there would in any event be no public benefit to outweigh the harm caused, the proposal would be contrary to Policy DM15 as well as to Paragraph 196 of the NPPF.

#### Design and Form

25.The design of the proposed dormers are simple and would not result in any harm to the amenity currently enjoyed by neighbouring property or to the character of the surrounding area. As a result the proposal would otherwise be acceptable when considered against Policy DM24. However, given the listed status and the presently uninterrupted roofscape of the building, the proposed dormers would result in harm to the listed building and therefore would not be compliant with Policy DM15.

#### **Conclusion:**

26.In conclusion, the principle and detail of the development is considered to be unacceptable and fails to comply with relevant development plan policies and the provisions of the NPPF relating to heritage assets.

#### **Recommendation:**

27 It is recommended that planning permission and Listed Building Consent be **REFUSED** for the following reason:

1. The list description advises that the house dates back to the 16th century with 17th and 18th century alterations. The roof is referred to as a wind braced purlin roof. Whilst some opening up works have been undertaken no assessment of the significance of the roof carpentry has been provided. Information provided states that the areas exposed are modern plaster and insulation from the late 20th century with boarded plyboard ceilings. Furthermore, that the works will not involve cutting any historic timbers however, in the absence of a suitable assessment of the significance of the

roof carpentry or evidence to support this statement it is not possible to determine whether or not the works will result in physical harm to the fabric of the building.

Currently the roof is uninterrupted by any physical features with the exception of an impressive off centre axial chimney with four attached hexagonal flues on a square base. This chimney contributes greatly to the significance of the building inserted in the 17th century and is emphasised due to the absence of any other distractions within the roof. Whilst the desire to introduce natural light to the attic space and improve head height over the staircase is understood, according to the list description this space was created in the 18th century for further attic space, and it is considered unlikely therefore that this space was ever intended to provide the comforts of primary rooms found at lower levels. The impact of the proposed dormers on the significance of the roof and chimney will prove detrimental irrespective of whether or not it will involve loss of historic fabric particularly given the awkward relationship of the proposed dormer serving the staircase with the chimney stack. In addition the size and scale of the proposed dormer windows are notably larger than those serving the first floor rooms to the rear elevation, consequently their insertion would detract from the smaller historic openings to this elevation proving an overbearing addition. As a consequence the proposed dormers would result in visual harm to the currently uninterrupted roof slope of the dwelling, resulting in adverse harm to the historic character of the building.

It is not possible to determine the degree of harm potentially caused to the roof timbers due to insufficient information but it is considered highly likely that the proposed dormer windows would involve the loss of significant structural roof timber(s). However, and regardless, the adverse visual impact of the insertion of the oversized dormer windows into the otherwise uninterrupted roof slope is clear, and there would be no public benefit to outweigh the harm caused. Therefore the proposals would be contrary to Policy DM15 of the Joint Development Management Plan and Paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

**Documents:**

All background documents including application forms, drawings and other supporting documentation relating to this application can be viewed online [DC/19/0537/HH](https://www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/DC/19/0537/HH)