

APPLICATION: MA/13/0930 Date: 23 May 2013 Received: 23 May 2013

APPLICANT: Mr Gordon Harrold, Retigraph Ltd

LOCATION: FAIRBOURNE MANOR, FAIRBOURNE LANE, HARRIETSHAM,
MAIDSTONE, KENT, ME17 1LN

PARISH: Harrietsham

PROPOSAL: Retrospective application for listed building consent for the erection of new porches and an infill extension as shown on Drawings H-1024 100, H-1024 101a, H-1024 111a, H-1024 112a, H-1024 113a, H-1024 114a, H-1024 114a, H-1024 115a, H-1024 116a, H-1024 117a, Design and Access Statement, Statement of Significance and Photographs 1-39 on H-1024 doc 12 received 23 May 2013.

AGENDA DATE: 18th July 2013

CASE OFFICER: Joanne Alexander

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

- it is contrary to views expressed by Harrietsham Parish Council and they wish the application to be reported to Planning Committee

1. POLICIES

- Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000: N/A
- Village Design Statement: N/A
- Government Policy: National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

2. HISTORY

MA/84/1166 – change of use of barn to gallery and outbuilding to fine art screen painting workshop and studios - AC

3. CONSULTATIONS

3.1 Harrietsham Parish Council – wish to see the application approved

3.2 Conservation Officer – objects to the application on heritage grounds as the alterations do not fit in well with the building; the porch to the east elevation is of unfortunate proportions and features an inappropriate false-pitch roof with flat

top; the porch to the north elevation has an inappropriately pitched roof, being of a markedly shallower angle than the other gables and sits uncomfortably with this elevation of the house; and the loss of openness of the loggia is unacceptable in principle with its infilling with crude plate glass windows significantly altering the character and detracting from the qualities of the 1910 addition.

4. REPRESENTATIONS

4.1 Neighbours – no responses have been received.

5. CONSIDERATIONS

5.1 Site Description

5.1.1 Fairbourne Manor is a large 17th Century, grade II listed building having extensions circa 1910 and circa 1945. It is set on the eastern side Fairbourne Lane being one of a number of detached properties served by the same vehicular access.

5.1.2 For the purposes of planning, the site lies in the open countryside, being to the south of the village of Harrietsham. Footpath KH285 runs on the line of one of the vehicular access tracks which serves the properties, being to the north of the entrance to the subject site.

5.2 Proposal

5.2.1 This is a retrospective application seeking listed building consent seeking regularisation for various works prior to the sale of the property.

5.2.2 The details accompanying the application confirm that the works to which the application relate were carried out some 35 years ago without the necessary consent being sought at that time. The development consists of:

- a new porch to east elevation
- a new porch to north elevation
- the infilling/enclosing of the existing loggia with two windows and one door.

5.2.3 The porch to the east elevation is attached to the extension from circa 1910 and serves the kitchen area. It measures some 1.6 metres in depth, by 5.2 metres in length and provides a secure store area with door to the southern side, and entrance porch with door and two windows to the eastern elevation, and one window to the northern elevation. It has a false pitched roof which has a flat top to a height of some 3.5 metres.

5.2.4 The porch to the north elevation measures some 3.4 metres in width, by 3.75 metres in depth having a pitched roof to a height of some 4.1 metres. The entrance door is to the eastern elevation, together with one windows. A further window is inserted to the remaining two elevation of the porch.

5.3 Principle of Development

5.3.1 There are no saved policies within the Maidstone Borough Local Plan 2000 which directly relate to listed buildings, however the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) addresses 'Conserving and enhancing the historic environment' at Section 12.

5.3.2 Paragraph 126 of the NPPF states that it should be recognised that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resources and they should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance; with paragraph 132 stating that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, with the guidance recognising that significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. Paragraph 133 states that permission should be refused where a proposed development leads to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss; and 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 benefit of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.

5.3.3 The application confirms that the subject works were undertaken by the owners around 35 years ago, and feel that they were undertaken in a sympathetic way; that they are subservient; do not impinge on the historic fabric; with the porches and the infilling of the loggia protecting the historic fabric of the building from weather; and that the works are reversible and the historic building can be returned to its pre-existing state if required. The accompanying documents point out that the alterations mainly affect the 1910 extensions rather than the original 17th century wing.

5.3.4 The Conservation Officer notes that the Heritage Statement reveals that the 1910 extensions were designed by Eden and Hodgson.

5.3.5 Francis Charles Eden(1864-1944) is a well-known architect, originally articulated to the famous Victorian architects Bodley and Garner, who formed a partnership with Victor Tyliston Hodgson from 1902 (Hodgson himself had been a former

assistant to another prominent Victorian architectural partnership Alfred Waterhouse and Son). Eden is particularly known for his designs for church fittings and stained glass, and he was a member of the Art Workers Guild, an important body within the Arts and Crafts Movement to which many of the most prominent architects and designers belonged. A number of buildings designed by F C Eden have been listed.

- 5.3.6 The Conservation Officer notes that the large extensions added to Fairbourne Manor in 1910 are well-designed in the Arts and Crafts vernacular manner and although of lesser significance than the original building, are nevertheless of considerable value, with great care having been taken to fit them in with the original building. He notes that unfortunately, the alterations for which retrospective consent is now being sought have unfortunately not shared this care in terms of them being designed to fit in with the original building.
- 5.3.7 The Conservation Officer notes that the porch to the east elevation is of unfortunate proportions and features an inappropriate false-pitched roof with a flat top; that the porch to the north elevation has an inappropriately pitched roof, being of a markedly shallower angle than the other gables on this elevation of the house with which it sits uncomfortably.
- 5.3.8 With regard to the Loggia, the conservation officer notes that the open loggia is a feature which became popular in the late 19th/early 20th Century, particularly in Arts and Crafts houses (it was popular with Sir Edwin Lutyens for example) and may therefore be seen as a typical feature of such houses. Its infilling with crude plate glass windows significantly alters its character and detracts from the qualities of the 1910 work. The loss of its openness is unacceptable in principle.

5.4 Other Matters

- 5.4.1 Harrietsham Parish Council wish to see the application approved, however do not provide any further comments.
- 5.4.2 The LPA in considering this listed building consent application have identified and assessed the particular significance of this heritage asset and how it is affected by the proposal and have taken this into account when considering the impact the proposal has on the heritage asset in accordance with Paragraph 129 of the NPPF 2012.

6. CONCLUSION

- 6.1 The Conservation Officer objects to the application on heritage grounds for the reasons detailed above, and as such consent should be refused for the unauthorised works which have been carried out to this Grade II Listed Building.

7. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION for the following reasons:

1. The design of the subject alterations fail to fit in well to this well-designed part of the Grade II listed building and therefore results in substantial harm to the designated heritage asset with there being no substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm. The porch to the east elevation is of unfortunate proportions and features an inappropriate false-pitched roof with a flat top; the porch to the north elevation has an inappropriately pitched roof which is of a markedly shallower angle than the other gables on this elevation, hence it does not fit comfortably with this elevation of the house; and the loss of openness of the Loggia is unacceptable in principle with the use of crude plate glass windows significantly altering the character and detracts from the qualities of the 1910 work. The development is therefore contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, in particular paragraphs 126, 132 and 133.

Note to applicant

In accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the NPPF, Maidstone Borough Council (MBC) takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions. MBC works with applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by:

Offering a pre-application advice and duty desk service.

Where possible, suggesting solutions to secure a successful outcome.

As appropriate, updating applicants/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application.

In this instance:

The application was not considered to comply with the provisions of the Development Plan and NPPF as submitted, and would have required substantial changes such that a new application would be required.

The application was considered to be fundamentally contrary to the provisions of the Development Plan and the NPPF, and there were not considered to be any solutions to resolve this conflict.

It is noted that the applicant/agent did not engage in any formal pre-application discussions.

The applicant is advised to seek pre-application advice on any resubmission.