

APPLICATION: MA/10/0791 Date: 6 May 2010 Received: 16 August 2010

APPLICANT: Mr P Bradley

LOCATION: 3, RANDALLS ROW, HIGH BANKS, LOOSE, MAIDSTONE, KENT,
ME15 0EG

PARISH: Loose

PROPOSAL: An application for listed building consent for erection of single storey rear extension (re-submission of MA/09/0726) as shown on drawing number(s) 05 rev A, 07 Rev A, 10 and 08 Rev A and a site location plan upon drawing no. 01 Rev A received on 10/05/10, drawing no. 09 Rev B received on 16/08/10, drawing no. 01 Rev B received on 23/07/10 and a Heritage Statement received on 21/07/10.

AGENDA DATE: 14th October 2010

CASE OFFICER: Louise Welsford

The recommendation for this application is being reported to Committee for decision because:

- it is contrary to views expressed by the Parish Council
- Councillor Sherreard has requested it be reported for the reason set out in the previous Committee report

POLICIES

Government Policy: PPS5.

1. HISTORY

- 1.1 See previous Committee report. Planning application MA/10/0790 for a single storey rear extension was approved by Members at Planning Committee on 23rd September 2010.

2 CONSULTATIONS

- 2.1 Please see the previous Committee report and Urgent Update for details of the original comments received. At the previous Planning Committee meeting, Members sought a detailed analysis of the proposal by the Conservation Officer. The following comments have therefore been received since the previous Committee meeting:

2.2 **Maidstone Borough Council Conservation Officer:**

“3 Randall’s Row is part of a Grade II listed terrace of 5 cottages dating from the late 18th century. It lies within Loose Valley Conservation Area with a number of other listed buildings located nearby.

The extension is proposed to the rear of the property. A number of the dwellings in this terrace have had rear extensions approved in the past, most notably numbers 1 & 5 Randall’s Row, both in 1994. The current extension to 3 Randall’s Row was found to be lawful in 1981 under a Section 53 Determination (MA/81/0871). On conservation grounds, we do not object to the principle of extensions to listed buildings.

The applicants submitted plans for approval of a glazed extension of modern design in 2009 (MA/09/0727 & MA/09/0726), which we recommended for refusal on conservation grounds because we considered the design and form to be out of keeping with the character of the house. We then were involved in on-site pre-application discussions along with a planning officer. This application responds directly to the recommendations we made during those discussions by bringing down the height and depth of the extension while simplifying the details.

There is a great deal of precedent for allowing an extension of modern appearance to a listed building, provided its installation does not negatively affect the special interest of the building, such as involving the unacceptable removal of historic fabric or being of a scale which dominates the listed building. Indeed a suitable modern approach can be viewed as the more “honest” intervention in that it does not present a pastiche of the original. We have recommended approval of extensions with a modern approach even to listed buildings of a higher grade, such as at Grade II* Blue House in East Sutton (MA/07/1944).

Paragraph 178 of the PPS5 Practice Guide states as follows:

The main issues to consider in proposals for additions to heritage assets, including new development in conservation areas, are proportion, height, massing, bulk, use of materials, use, relationship with adjacent assets, alignment and treatment of setting. Replicating a particular style may be less important, though there are circumstances when it may be appropriate. It would not normally be acceptable for new work to dominate the original asset or its setting in either scale, material or as a result of its siting.

We considered this guidance carefully when we determined to raise no objection to the current proposal subject to conditions.

We felt that the limitations of the site would make a more traditional approach difficult, as an increase in height would be required to accommodate a traditional pitched roof, thus increasing bulk and further impacting the neighbours. Crucially in this case, the proposed glazed extension would be attached to an existing extension which is not considered to be of historic significance due to its age and character; it

therefore does not require the removal of any historic fabric of 3 Randall's Row. The historic appearance of the ground floor of the building has been entirely lost already by virtue of the existing extension. The modestly-proportioned extension proposed is of a simple, modern design which, in our view, does not compete with the existing Grade II listed building and can be easily read as a modern element. In our view, it is in line with the recommendations of PPS5.

The issue of double glazing in listed buildings is an important consideration. As described in the PPS5 Practice Guide (paragraph 152), "*Doors and windows are frequently key to the significance of a building...Secondary glazing is usually more appropriate than double-glazing where the window itself is of significance.*" As the proposed new windows to the rear of 3 Randall's Row are in a sense replacing the existing modern windows of no great significance, we do not view secondary glazing as the only suitable approach in this case.

Furthermore, the very first policy in PPS5 (HE1.1) addresses concerns over climate change, stating:

Local planning authorities should identify opportunities to mitigate, and adapt to, the effects of climate change when devising policies and making decisions relating to heritage assets by seeking the reuse and, where appropriate, the modification of heritage assets so as to reduce carbon emissions and secure sustainable development. Opportunities to adapt heritage assets include enhancing energy efficiency, improving resilience to the effects of a changing climate, allowing greater use of renewable energy and allowing for the sustainable use of water.

While it continues to be our practice to resist the installation of double glazing in existing parts of a listed building, suitably-designed double glazed units have been permitted in some historic buildings, most often in new extensions or conservatories with large amounts of glazing. This approach is, to some extent, an attempt to help satisfy Building Regulations on thermal performance. It is also in line with recommendations in PPS5 policy HE1.1 on improving the efficiency of historic buildings without damaging the character of the older parts.

In recent cases, we have approved the use of a modern type of double glazing often referred to by the company name "Slimlite". The thin gap (6 mm) of these units improves thermal efficiency and reduces carbon output while minimising the impact of the double reflection often considered out of keeping with the character of many heritage structures. Their reduced size also avoids the heavy timber sections usually required by more conventional double glazing.

For example, at Grade II listed East Farleigh House, such double glazing was permitted to the orangerie approved in MA/08/0725 (conditions MA/09/2105). A similar approach was taken at Pollehill Farmhouse in Detling, also Grade II listed, where an orangerie and another extension replaced modern extensions which were

not considered in keeping with the character of the building (MA/08/2194, conditions MA/09/1805).

In the current application, we view the approval of "Slimlite" double glazing – for this extension only – as being an acceptable compromise between the need to protect the special character of the building and the need respond to sustainability concerns. We have recommended a joinery condition so that we can further review the details of the windows with reference to their character and design quality.

As a result of the above, on balance we do not object on heritage grounds to the current applications for the proposed glazed extension at 3 Randall's Row".

3. REPRESENTATIONS

3.1 See previous Committee report and Urgent Update.

4. BACKGROUND

4.1 This application was considered by Members at the Planning Committee on 23rd September 2010. Members resolved to defer the application and sought detailed comments from the Conservation Officer and the Conservation Officer's attendance at the Planning Committee meeting.

4.2 This application also follows the refusal of application MA/09/0726, which was refused on the following grounds:

"The proposed conservatory by virtue of its design, in particular, the pitched roof and double glazing would cause significant harm to the character, appearance and form of the listed building and would detract from the traditional and historic appearance of a terrace of listed buildings, contrary to policy BE6 of the South East Plan 2009 and advice contained within PPG15: Planning and the Historic Environment".

4.3 Subsequent to the previous refusal, the applicant sought pre-application advice upon the acceptability of a revised scheme. An informal meeting was held on site on 7th December 2009, with a Planning Officer and a Conservation Officer and a detailed letter providing informal advice was written to the applicant upon 9th December 2009. This proposal is in line with the Listed Building advice contained within the said letter. A copy of the pre-application advice is attached as an Appendix. (This was submitted with the application).

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

5. SITE AND SITUATION

5.1 The application site contains an eighteenth century, Grade II Listed, mid-terraced cottage. The front elevation is constructed of red brick in Flemish Bond to the ground floor and white weatherboarding to the first floor, under a plain tiled roof. A rendered rear extension was added prior to 1981, having accommodation upon two floors. Nos. 1-5 within the row are all Grade II Listed, although the end cottage, to the north, known as Forge Cottage, is not listed. The site is located within Loose Conservation Area and the village envelope of Loose. It also falls within an Area of Local Landscape Importance.

6. PROPOSAL

6.1 Listed Building Consent is sought for the erection of a single storey rear extension. The extension would have a footprint of approximately 4m x 2.5m. Its walls would be rendered and it would have a flat, felt roof with a raised rooflight.

6.2 This application follows the refusal of application MA/09/0726, which was refused upon the grounds of the impact upon the Listed Building and Listed terrace. The full reason for refusal is given above.

6.3 The main differences between the previous scheme and this scheme are that the proposal has been reduced in scale, from a maximum height of approximately 3.5m to 3m and from a maximum depth of approximately 3.8m to 2.5m. Also, the pitched roof has been replaced by a flat roof.

7. HISTORICAL IMPACT

7.1 Further comments have been received from the Conservation Officer, which are included in full above. These comments clearly set out why the Conservation Officer considers that the development would not cause significant harm to the Grade II Listed Building.

7.2 As previously stated, this development would be of a small scale and would be attached to a modern extension. It would not destroy the form of the original historic building, because it would not be attached to it. It would not dominate the existing building in either scale or position and it would not result in the loss of historic fabric. PPS5 does not resist the principle of modern extensions to Listed Buildings, and, as stated by the Conservation Officer, in this case a traditional extension (with a steeply pitched roof) would not be appropriate, as this would be of a greater scale, mass and impact upon both the Grade II Listed Building and adjoining properties. The modern design is simple and due to its low height and

limited depth, the extension would not compete with the existing building, but could be read separately.

- 7.3 The height, massing and bulk of the proposal would be relatively low and, on balance, it is considered that it would not cause significant harm to the Grade II Listed Building, or the listed terrace, in these regards.
- 7.4 Conditions regarding joinery and materials (including the use of lead for the roof) would ensure a good quality of development and appropriate finish. This would ensure that the quality and appearance of the building and the terrace are preserved.
- 7.5 The design, including the flat roof, use of render and use of double glazing is all in accordance with pre-application advice, which was sought by the applicant after the previous refusal.

8. CONCLUSION

- 8.1 Taking all of the above into account, and also the comments within the previous Committee report and Urgent Update, it is concluded, on balance, that the previous reason for refusal has been addressed and that the proposal would not result in significant harm to the character, appearance or setting of the Grade II Listed Building or to the historic environment and Conservation Area.
- 8.2 Approval is therefore recommended.

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT LISTED BUILDING CONSENT subject to the following conditions:

1. The works to which this consent relates must be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this consent;

Reason: In accordance with the provisions of Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development shall not commence until full details of new external and internal joinery, in the form of large scale drawings, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To preserve the setting, character and appearance of the Grade II Listed building and the Conservation Area, in accordance with PPS5.

3. The development shall not commence until full details of the render mix and colour of the finish of the extension have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To preserve the setting, character and appearance of the Grade II Listed building and the Conservation Area, in accordance with PPS5.

4. Notwithstanding the details submitted in section 14 of the application form received on 10th May 2010, the roof of the extension hereby permitted shall be constructed of lead and shall be maintained thereafter to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To preserve the setting, character and appearance of the Grade II Listed building and the Conservation Area, in accordance with PPS5.

Informatives set out below

Joinery details should show flush casements, with no more than 6mm double glazing.

The proposed development, subject to the conditions stated, is considered to comply with the policies of the Development Plan (Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000) and there are no overriding material considerations to indicate a refusal of planning consent.