

TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL – DEVELOPMENT CONTROL

Committee:	Planning
Date:	20 October 2020
Site Location:	Tump Court Barrow Boddington Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL51 0TL
Application No:	20/00657/FUL
Ward:	Severn Vale South
Parish:	Boddington
Proposal:	Erection of double and single storey rear extension (retrospective) (Re-submission of application 20/00316/FUL).
Report by:	Mrs Sarah Barnes
Appendices:	Site location plan Block plan Elevations Floor plans
Recommendation:	Refuse

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION AND PROPOSAL

- 1.1. Tump Court is a detached traditional timber framed cottage located in Barrow. It appears to date from 17th or 18th Century (site location plan attached).
- 1.2. The cottage is not listed, nor is it within a conservation area, however, it is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset.
- 1.3. The site falls within the Green Belt, Landscape Protection Zone and Flood Zone 3.
- 1.4. The proposal is for the retention of a double and single storey rear extension (plans attached).
- 1.5. Councillor Williams has requested a committee determination to assess the impact on the Green belt.

2.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

Application Number	Proposal	Decision	Decision Date
20/00316/FUL	Erection of double and single storey rear extension (retrospective).	WDN	10.07.2020

3.0 RELEVANT POLICY

3.1. The following planning guidance and policies are relevant to the consideration of this application:

National guidance

3.2. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy (JCS) - Adopted 11 December 2017

3.3. Policies: SD4, SD5, SD7, SD8

Tewkesbury Borough Local Plan to 2011 - March 2006 (TBLP)

3.4. Policies: HOU8, LND3

Tewkesbury Borough Plan 2011-2031 – Pre-Submission Version (October 2019)

3.5. Policies: RES10, GRB1, LAN2, HER5

3.6. Human Rights Act 1998 - Article 8 (Right to Respect for Private and Family Life)

3.7. The First Protocol, Article 1 (Protection of Property)

4.0 CONSULTATIONS

4.1. Parish Council – no response received.

5.0 PUBLICITY AND REPRESENTATIONS

5.1. The application has been publicised through the posting of a site notice for a period of 21 days.

5.2. Four letters of support have been received from local residents.

6.0 POLICY CONTEXT

6.1. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that proposals be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Section 70 (2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 provides that the Local Planning Authority shall have regard to the provisions of the Development Plan, so far as material to the application, and to any other material considerations.

- 6.2. The Development Plan currently comprises the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) (2017), saved policies of the Tewkesbury Borough Local Plan to 2011 (March 2006) (TBLP), and a number of 'made' Neighbourhood Development Plans.
- 6.3. The Pre-Submission Tewkesbury Borough Plan was submitted to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government on 18 May 2020 for examination. On the basis of the stage of preparation it has reached it is considered that the plan can be afforded at least moderate weight. However, the weight to be attributed to individual policies will be subject to the extent to which there are unresolved objections (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given) and their degree of consistency with the NPPF (the closer the policies to those in the NPPF the greater the weight that may be given).
- 6.4. The relevant policies are set out in the appropriate sections of this report.

7.0 ANALYSIS

Non-designated heritage asset

- 7.1. Tump Court is a traditional timber framed detached cottage which appears to date from 17th or 18th Century.
- 7.2. The cottage is not listed, nor is it within a conservation area, however, it is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset. The NPPF defines a heritage asset as "A building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest".
- 7.3. The National Planning Policy Framework definition states that in the planning context heritage interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. This can be interpreted as follows:
- 7.4. Archaeological Interest: As defined in the Glossary to the National Planning Policy Framework, there will be archaeological interest in a heritage asset if it holds, or potentially holds, evidence of past human activity worthy of expert investigation at some point.
- 7.5. Architectural and Artistic Interest: These are interests in the design and general aesthetics of a place. They can arise from conscious design or fortuitously from the way the heritage asset has evolved. More specifically, architectural interest is an interest in the art or science of the design, construction, craftsmanship and decoration of buildings and structures of all types. Artistic interest is an interest in other human creative skill, like sculpture.
- 7.6. Historic Interest: An interest in past lives and events (including pre-historic). Heritage assets can illustrate or be associated with them. Heritage assets with historic interest not only provide a material record of our nation's history, but can also provide meaning for communities derived from their collective experience of a place and can symbolise wider values such as faith and cultural identity.
- 7.7. In this case it is considered the significance of Tump Court as a heritage asset includes its age, form, context and materials. It is a vernacular composition constructed of a timber frame with brick infill with a steep thatched roof and it appears clearly on the 1884 Ordnance Survey.
- 7.8. In regard to the constraints identified above Section 16 of the NPPF and JCS Policy SD8 are relevant.

- 7.9. Paragraph 197 of the NPPF states that: “The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.”
- 7.10. Policy SD8 states that: “Development should make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness, having regard to valued and distinctive elements of the historic environment. The policy also states that: Designated and undesignated heritage assets and their settings will be conserved and enhanced as appropriate to their significance, and for their important contribution to local character, distinctiveness and sense of place.”

THE IMPACT OF THE PROPOSAL:

- 7.11. The application is retrospective and includes a substantial two storey rear wing extension (pitched roof and painted rendered walls) linked back to the house via a two storey structural glazed link. There are flat roofed extensions either side of the wing (of glass and render) with a balcony above one enclosed by a glass parapet.
- 7.12. No permissions were sought for the work carried out. Some of the extensions are said to fall under permitted development however the application is to include all developments shown. It is also understood that a historic brick two storey rear extension was present and was demolished in order to facilitate the current extension. Despite being considered a non-designated heritage asset this authority has limited powers to influence demolitions, alterations or extensions affecting the property if they do not require planning permission.
- 7.13. The house itself is charming in its historic form and appearance and sits in a generous plot. There are some quirky later alterations within the original house such as the insertion of cart wheels for windows. However, it generally appears as the archetypal English thatched cottage albeit with a cottage orne veranda. The applicants have restored the oldest part of the cottage to good order and have demolished the rest in order to add the extensions.
- 7.14. The form of the extensions in question are uncompromisingly contemporary in style and also partly in form. The old and the new are clearly separated by the glazed link. Unfortunately, in this case the juxtaposition of the old and new is unsubtle and dramatic, appearing discordant and overwhelmingly unsympathetic to the historic character of this dwelling.
- 7.15. The painted render creates a stark visual contrast to the host building. It is accepted that some infill panels on the cottage have recently been changed from exposed brick to painted render, however this could not be considered similar when used as flat mass coverage. In relation to an alternative finish, horizontal weatherboard of unstained oak or dark stained softwood would have been more suitable. A brick finish may also have been more sympathetic in some places, especially on the North East elevation of the single storey side extension.
- 7.16. The off-set window locations on the rear appear distracting. This clearly works in some contexts but in a historic context such as this it appears unsympathetic. Similarly, in terms of the impact of the glazed balcony upon the heritage asset, it is considered that in this case the high level and prominent glazed balustrade appears alien to the nature and character of the thatched cottage.

- 7.17. With regards to the scale, mass and height of the two storey extension, the ridge and eaves level appears to be the same height if not slightly higher than the main dwelling so it does not read as subservient and competes with the existing dwelling. The extensions are clearly unsympathetic, over-dominant and harmful to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling.
- 7.18. Overall, it is considered that the general visual impact of the new extensions is unsympathetic to the character and appearance of this dwelling as a non-designated heritage asset. The issues identified above are the main contributors to this impact. As such the proposal in its current form is considered to be harmful to the significance of the heritage asset and would be contrary to Section 16 of the NPPF, JCS Policies SD4, SD8 and Policy HOU8 of the Local Plan.

Residential amenity

- 7.19. Policy SD14 of the JCS requires that new development must cause no harm to local amenity including the amenity of neighbouring occupants. Local Plan Policy HOU8 provides that extensions to existing dwellings should not have an unacceptable impact on adjacent property and residential amenity.
- 7.20. The impact of the proposal upon neighbouring properties has carefully been assessed and it is considered that there is not an undue impact upon their amenity in accordance with Policy HOU8 of the Local Plan and Policy SD14 of the JCS.

Green belt

- 7.21. Section 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out that the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in Green Belt. However, there are exceptions including: the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;
- 7.22. Policy SD5 of the JCS similarly advises that within the Green Belt, “development will be restricted to those limited types of development which are deemed appropriate by the NPPF, unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated”.
- 7.23. Consequently, as the site is within the Green Belt, only limited extensions and additions are permitted.
- 7.24. The applicant’s supporting statement states that the original dwelling comprised a total floor area of about 297m². This included an historic extension and also a large thatched barnlike structure that burned down in 1970’s. Whilst an historic photograph has been provided which shows the presence of a derelict barn attached to the dwelling with a footprint of approximately 85m², it is unclear whether this building formed part of the dwelling and was used for residential purposes. However, the Council does not have any evidence of its own to contradict this assertion and therefore Officers accept the now demolished building can be included as part of the ‘original dwelling’.
- 7.25. Officers consider the floorspace of the ‘original dwelling’ to have been approximately 260m² therefore. The floorspace of the dwelling as now built is approximately 272m². The current additions are not therefore considered to comprise a disproportionate addition to the original dwelling therefore.

8.0 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

8.1. Overall, it is considered that the extensions are unsympathetic, over-dominant and harmful to the character and appearance of the existing attractive dwelling which is a non-designated heritage asset. Therefore, the proposed extension, by virtue of its overall size, bulk, design and materials, fails to respect the character, scale and design of the existing dwelling. The proposed development is consequently harmful to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling which is a non-designated heritage asset contrary to Policy HOU8 of the Tewkesbury Borough Local Plan to 2011 - March 2006, Policies RES10 and HER5 of the emerging Pre-Submission Tewkesbury Borough Plan 2011-2031 (2019), Policies SD4 and SD8 of the Joint Core Strategy and the NPPF 2019.

8.2. It is therefore recommended that permission be **refused**.

Refusal reason:

1. The proposed extension, by virtue of its overall size, bulk, design and materials, fails to respect the character, scale and design of the existing dwelling. The proposed development is consequently harmful to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling which is a non-designated heritage asset contrary to Policy HOU8 of the Tewkesbury Borough Local Plan to 2011 - March 2006, Policies RES10 and HER5 of the emerging Pre-Submission Tewkesbury Borough Plan 2011-2031 (2019), Policies SD4 and SD8 of the Joint Core Strategy and the NPPF 2019.

INFORMATIVES:

1. In accordance with the requirements of the NPPF the Local Planning Authority has sought to determine the application in a positive and proactive manner by offering pre-application advice, publishing guidance to assist the applicant, and publishing to the council's website relevant information received during the consideration of the application thus enabling the applicant to be kept informed as to how the case was proceeding.