
APPLICATION NO.	P09/W0409 and P09/W0410/LB
APPLICATION TYPE	OTHER
REGISTERED	05 May 2009
PARISH	Wallingford
WARD MEMBER(S)	Mr Marcus Harris Mr. Imran Lokhon
APPLICANT	Mr. Darren Pavitt
SITE	4 Beansheaf Terrace, Wallingford
PROPOSAL	Rear Extension to provide kitchen and w.c.
AMENDMENTS	None
GRID REFERENCE	460594/189140
OFFICER	Mr. P. Bowers

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The applications are before the Planning Committee at the request of the Local Member Councillor Imran Lokhan.
- 1.2 The property is a two storey mid terrace dwelling. There are six dwellings altogether of which four Grade II Listed Buildings and are located within the Wallingford Conservation Area. The properties have a long front garden facing on to the lane forming Ayrton Place. To the rear the terrace have courtyards with a 2 metre high brick wall forming the boundary with St Rualds Close.
- 1.3 The application property one of the four listed buildings. Numbers 1 - 4 are listed and Numbers 5 – 6 are later additions to the terrace and are not listed. The listed part of the terrace dates from mid 18th century. Numbers 1-3 have all had single storey rear extensions; Numbers 2 to 3 were extended before the properties were listed and Number 1 extended a couple of months after it was listed. No 4 is the only listed property which has not been extended and retains its original footprint and appearance.
- The rear elevations of the dwellings vary in terms of rendered finish and brick work. The application property was previously rendered however this has recently been removed.
- 1.4 A site location plan can be found attached at **Appendix A** and the plans accompanying the planning and listed building applications can be found at **Appendix B.**

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The application seeks planning permission and listed building consent to erect a single storey flat roof extension to provide a kitchen and w/c. It extends the full length of the court yard up to the boundary wall and covers its width. A circular area is created in the footprint allowing for a small patio with a glazed elevation and patio doors. The roof of the extension, which seeks to provide for an enlarged kitchen, is to be sedum planted.
- 2.2 A near identical scheme was refused planning permission and listed building consent on the 07 April 2009. An appeal was lodged with the Planning Inspectorate a month prior to submitting the current applications and has subsequently been withdrawn prior to the Inspector reaching a decision. The Councils formal decision notices in respect of these refusals can be found at **Appendix C.**

3.0 **CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**

3.1 Wallingford Town Council - Recommend Approval.

Neighbours - No responses received.

Conservation - Objection on the grounds of harm to the character and appearance of the listed building and its setting and conservation area.

4.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 **P09/W0078** - Rear extension to provide kitchen and wc (as amended by drawings 207/P/01, 02, 03 & 04 accompanying photographs and letter from agent dated 19 March 2009). - **Refusal of Planning Permission on 07 April 2009. - Appeal lodged on 27 May 2009. - Appeal Withdrawn**

4.2 **P09/W0079/LB** - Rear extension to provide Kitchen and wc (as amended by drawing nos.207/P/01, 02, 03 & 04 accompanying photographs and letter from agent dated 19 March 2009). - **Refusal of Listed Building Consent on 07 April 2009 - Appeal lodged on 27 May 2009. – Appeal Withdrawn**

5.0 **POLICY & GUIDANCE**

5.1 **South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 -**

G2 – Protection and enhancement of the environment.

G6 – Promoting good design.

CON2 – Alterations and extensions to listed buildings.

CON5 – The setting of listed buildings.

CON7- Proposals affecting a conservation area.

H13 – Extensions to dwellings.

South Oxfordshire Design Guide 2008

PPG: 15 Planning and the Historic Environment

6.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

6.1 The main considerations in this case are;

- i) **The differences between the current and refused scheme.**
- ii) **Impact on the character and appearance of the Grade II Listed Building.**
- iii) **Impact on the setting of the Grade II Listed Building.**
- iv) **Impact on the amenities of the occupants of nearby properties.**
- v) **Impact on the character and appearance of the Wallingford Conservation Area.**

i) The differences between the current proposals and the previously refused scheme.

6.2 Planning permission and listed building consent were refused by the Council on the 19 March 2009. Consents were refused for three reasons relating to the impact the proposed extension would have on the special architectural and historic character of the listed building and its setting and with regard to a lack of information as to how the extension would affect the wall which forms the rear boundary.

6.3 The current applications include details of how the extension would relate to the wall in terms of works, proximity and foundations. These details are considered acceptable

and demonstrate that the wall would not be materially affected as a result of the works for the extension. These details can be found in **Appendix B**. This overcomes one of the three previous reasons for refusal. However in all other respects the applications remain the same. The remaining two reasons for refusal of the previous applications are still applicable and relate to this current proposal. For the reasons set out in considerations ii) to v) the extension is still considered unacceptable.

ii) Impact on the special architectural and historic character and appearance of the Grade II Listed Building.

- 6.4 In line with advice set out in PPG: 15 Planning and the Historic Environment the Council has set out its policy for considering applications that affect listed buildings. Policy CON2 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 deals with extensions to listed buildings and states;

‘an extension to a listed building must be appropriate to its character, must be sympathetic to the original structure in design, scale and must not dominate or overwhelm it.’

- 6.5 The dwellings in the terrace are modest dwellings. Their character comes from the small cellular rooms and small windows. The modest sized rear courtyard is also characteristic of this terrace. The rear permitted extensions to the other listed properties are small lean-to single storey extensions that are 3.4m in depth. These leave a courtyard that is 4m in depth and still able to be a usable space. The extensions are clearly subservient in scale and reflect the proportion and cellular character of the dwellings.
- 6.6 The extension proposed as part of the applications would cover the entire rear courtyard save for the semi circular cut out along the eastern boundary, which would be glazed with floor to ceiling windows. A flat ‘green roof’ with a rooflight would be set slightly lower than the rear boundary wall.
- 6.7 The proportions and design of the extension in this instance is inappropriate. The property is a traditional modest mid terrace house, where the scale, size and form of its built form is an important characteristic and quality. The small regular cellular rooms of the property are an important feature of the properties historic character. The extension would create a large open room at the rear which would be larger in depth than the depth of the existing house. It would completely distort and be incongruous with the traditional internal form of the property. Paragraph 3.12 of PPG15 clearly states that the elements that make up the special interest of a listed building also include the spaces and layout of the building. In this instance the layout and scale of the proposed extension is at odds with the special character of the building. It would be considerably harmful to the special architectural and historic character and appearance of the Grade II Listed Building and contrary to Policy CON2 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan and advice in PPG15.
- 6.8 The supporting information in the application contends that the extension has been designed to be distinct and contrasting in design to the listed building. Such approaches can be acceptable in some circumstances however the scale and size of any extension should respect that of the original building. A much smaller extension, comparable to those permitted to No 1-3) possibly contemporary designed, would likely be a more acceptable solution in this case. Approximations of the existing extensions in the terrace in comparison to the proposed extension can be seen at **Appendix D**.

iii) Impact on the setting of the Grade II Listed Building.

- 6.9 Policy CON5 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 states that proposals for development which would adversely affect the setting of a listed building will be refused.
- 6.10 The setting of a listed building is often as essential part of its character as the building itself. The setting of this property and of the terrace is its distinctively long public front gardens and small private courtyards to the rear. The courtyards to the rear of the properties form an important part of the listed buildings character.
- 6.11 The extension in this case is excessive in its depth and coverage of the courtyard. The extension would cover two-thirds of the rear elevation and fill virtually the whole of the courtyard area. The extension would have an area of 21sqm compared to the other extensions in the terrace of a modest 14sqm. For comparison the footprint of the property is only 26sqm, measured externally. The size of courtyard left would only be 8sqm compared to other courtyards of 16sqm. It would result in the loss of most of the courtyard space, which would be at odds with the setting of the rest of the terrace, which is characterised by its smaller single storey lean-to extensions within small courtyards along the rear. The loss of this open space significantly harms the setting of the listed building and adversely affects the terrace as a whole.
- 6.12 The supporting information in the application contends that the extension will not be viewable from any vantage point. The fact that a development cannot be readily seen from public vantage points does not mean it is an acceptable form of development. In terms of a listed building, its character comes from not just its external appearance but also its internal form of rooms and spaces.
- 6.13 The proposal would detract from the setting of the listed buildings and therefore is contrary to policy CON5 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan.

iv) Impact on the amenities of the occupants of nearby properties.

- 6.14 Policy H13 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 indicates that extensions to dwellings will be permitted subject to a number of criteria. One of these is that the amenity of the occupants of nearby properties is not materially harmed.
- 6.15 Criterion ii) states that the scale and design of the proposal should be in keeping with the character of the dwelling, site and with the appearance of the surrounding area.
- 6.16 The South Oxfordshire Design Guide 2008 advises that a single storey extension should not extend more than 3 metres out from the original building where it adjoins or is closely positioned to neighbouring buildings.
- 6.17 The extension projects along the boundary with the adjoining 5 Beansheaf Terrace for its total length and along the boundary with number 3 with the exception of the circular 'cut out'. Given that these are terraced properties they have a very close relationship to each other due to the width of the sites. In terms of the impact to number 5 the existing built form along the boundary in conjunction with the limited height of the extension assists in mitigating the impact to that property such that it is not materially harmful. The extension at number 3 however extends along the boundary by 3.3 metres. Beyond the end of that extension the proposed extension at number 4 extends a further 3.5 metres. Some of that length however forms part of the 'cut out' in the footprint such that it extends away from the boundary. Whilst there will be an

impact to number 3, the height and amount of actual built form abutting the boundary means that it does not result in a significantly harmful impact to the amenities of the occupants.

- 6.18 The proposal is contrary to the advised three metres however there are mitigating circumstances in this particular instance to set aside this guidance.
- 6.19 The area to the front of the dwelling provides the larger space that serves the property. This however is not private in that it is entirely open to public views. The only private amenity space available to the property is located in the rear courtyard. The extension consumes nearly the entire rear court yard such that there is little external private amenity area available to the occupants of the dwelling.

v) Impact on the character and appearance of the Wallingford Conservation Area.

- 6.20 Policy CON7 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan states that planning permission will not be granted for development which would harm the character or appearance of the conservation area. Development within the conservation area is required to be of a design and scale that is in sympathy with the established character of the area and that traditional materials should be used whenever it is appropriate to the character of the area.
- 6.21 Views of the rear of the site are extremely prominent from St. Rualds Close to the north. The boundary wall and rear elevations of these listed properties contribute significantly to the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- 6.22 The harm to the listed building results in harm to the intrinsic value of the overall character and appearance of the conservation area contrary to Policy CON7.

7.0 CONCLUSION

- 7.1 The applications include sufficient information to address the concerns of one of the three reasons for the refusal of planning permission and listed building consents issued earlier in the year. However they do not overcome the previous overriding reasons for refusal relating to the harm to the special architectural and historic character of the listed building and its setting.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 8.1 **That planning permission is refused for the following reasons;**

- 1. That, having regard to the design, scale and proportions of the extension it does not relate to the modest scale and form of the Grade II Listed Building significantly harming its special architectural and historic character contrary to Policy CON2 and H13 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011.**
- 2. That, having regard to the depth of the extension and the area the extension covers in terms of the size of the modest courtyard the proposed development significantly detracts from the setting of the Grade II Listed Building contrary to Policy CON5 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011.**

8.2 That listed building consent is refused for the following reasons;

- 1. That, having regard to the design, scale and proportions of the extension it does not relate to the modest scale and form of the Grade II Listed Building significantly harming its special architectural and historic character contrary to Policy CON2 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011.**
- 2. That, having regard to the depth of the extension and the area the extension covers in terms of the size of the modest courtyard the proposed development significantly detracts from the setting of the Grade II Listed Building contrary to Policy CON5 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011.**

Author Mr. P. Bowers
Contact No. 01491 823278
Email Add. planning.west@southoxon.gov.uk