|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Signed:** | **Officer:** | **LH** | **Date:** | **26.1.23** | **Manager:** | NH | **Date:** | 26/01/23 |
| **Site Notice displayed** | **Y** | **Photos uploaded** | **N** |  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Application Ref:** | 3/2022/0958 (LBC) |  | |
| **Date Inspected:** | 14/6/2022 |
| **Officer:** | AD/LH |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:** | | **Decision** | **Refusal** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Development Description:** | Single storey rear extension. Re-sub of 3/2022/0491 |
| **Site Address/Location:** | Crow Hill Cottage West Lane Worston |
|  |  |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | **Parish/Town Council** |
| No comments received. |  |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | **Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies** |
| **LCC Archaeology:** |  |
| No impact on the historic fabric. No further archaeological work required. | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | **Additional Representations.** |
| None received. | |
|  | |
| **RELEVANT POLICIES:** | |
| Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 - ‘Preservation’ in the duty at section 16, 66 and 72 of the Act means “doing no harm to” (*South Lakeland DC v. Secretary of State for the Environment*  [1992]).    *Ribble Valley Core Strategy:*  Key Statement EN5 – Heritage Assets  Key Statement EN2 – Landscape  Policy DMG1 – General Considerations  Policy DME4 – Protecting Heritage Assets  Policy DMG2 - Strategic Considerations  Policy DMH5 - Residential and Curtilage Extensions  Policy DME2 – Landscape and Townscape Protection  Policy DME3 - Site and Species Protection and Conservation    NPPF , NPPG | |
|  | |
| **Relevant Planning History:**    3/2022/0491 - Garden room extension. Refused  3/2022/0263 – LBC for garden room extension. Refused  3/2022/0957 – Single storey rear extension. Re-sub of 3/2022/0263. Pending consideration.  3/2008/0238 - Demolition of 1970s rear glazed porch and construction of a larger replacement green oak porch to rear. PP granted 13/5/2008  3/2008/0239 - Demolition of 1970s rear glazed porch and construction of a larger replacement green oak porch to rear. LBC granted 13/5/2008  3/2007/0909 - External and internal improvements as per attached details. LBC granted 7/1/2008  3/1995/0544 - Change of use from agricultural land to domestic garden. PP granted 31/10/1995  3/1985/0420 – Erection of single storey extension to provide passageway. PP granted 29/8/1985  3/1981/0421 – Proposed conversion of barn to form extension to dwellinghouse and division of garage to form utility room/garage. PP granted 4/8/1981  6/10/2081 – Addition of kitchen, cloakroom, 2 bedrooms and a double-garage to existing cottage. PP granted 27/3/1972  6/10/2147 – Conversion and alteration of Crow Barn for use as a single residence. PP refused 26/3/1973 | |

|  |
| --- |
| **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**  Listed building consent is sought for: demolition of an existing north elevation porch and erection of a single-storey extension to the north elevation of flat roof construction with central rooflight on top and extensive glazing to north and east elevations.    Proposed roof materials are shown as Seam zinc to replace the existing lead flat roof material. Proposed walling materials are shown as render. Windows are proposed as timber.  **Site Description and Surrounding Area:**  Crow Hill Cottage is a Grade II listed (13/2/1967) “house, possible 17th century and 18th century, altered … 2 storeys with 3 eaves heights. Southern section, with gable facing road, tallest. Northern section, a modern conversion, lower than middle section” (list description) prominently sited within Worston Conservation Area. The main building range in the list description is linked (1980s) to a converted parallel barn range. Public footpath FP20 runs northwards immediately to the east of the site.    Worston Conservation Area Appraisal identifies the barn to be a ‘Building of Townscape Merit’; the garden area to the west of the main building range to be ‘Significant Open Space’ and the view north from the site to be an ‘Important View’ (growth of the hedgerow along the site western boundary since the Appraisal survey? Townscape Appraisal Map).    Other extracts from the document are as follows:-  A photograph of the site from the north (page 3).    “Architectural and historic interest of the conservation area’s buildings, including 3 listed buildings”; “Prevalent use of local building stone”; “Rural setting of the village” (Summary of special interest).    “Most buildings are roofed with slate; a few have traditional stone slate roofs” (Architectural and historic character).    “large panes of glass are out of character with the hamlet’s historic appearance” (Local details and features).  “Crow Hill Cottage (grade II) possibly dates from the 17 century. Though altered, it retains a roof of sandstone slabs, an increasingly rare characteristic of the locality” (Listed buildings).    “Historic buildings”; “Rural setting”; “Public footpaths” (Strengths: The most important positivefeatures).    “Continuing loss of original architectural details and use of inappropriate modern materials or details” (Threats) |

|  |
| --- |
| **Impact upon the special architectural and historic interest and setting of the listed building and the character and appearance of Worston Conservation Area:**  Context    The LPA must accord with their duties at sections 16, and 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 which state:  16. In considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works the local planning authority or the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.  66. In considering whether to grant planning permission [or permission in principle] for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.  72 Special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.  The proposed works to the listed building would be subject to careful consideration with respect to the duties above and relevant policies below.  The NPPF at paragraph 16 sets out expectations with regards to conserving and enhancing the historic environment. Applicants are required to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting.  The council should consider any loss of historic fabric to constitute harm, but to make an assessment as to the significance of the asset and apply weight to its conservation accordingly.  Para 202 of the NPPF States:  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.  Key Statement 5, DMG1 and DMH5, DME4 of the Core Strategy are relevant and state:  (KS5) there will be a presumption in favour of the conservation and enhancement of the significance of heritage assets and their settings. The Historic Environment and its Heritage Assets and their settings will be conserved and enhanced in a manner appropriate to their significance for their heritage value; their important contribution to local character, distinctiveness and sense of place; and to wider social, cultural and environmental benefits.  (DMH5) proposals to extend or alter existing residential properties must accord with policy DMG1 and any other relevant designations.  (DMG1) all development must:  (Design) be of a high standard of building design which considers the 8 Building in Context Principles (from the CABE/English Heritage Building in Context Toolkit; be sympathetic to existing and proposed land uses in terms of its size, intensity and nature as well as scale, massing, style, features and building materials; consider the relationship between buildings, which is of major importance. particular emphasis will be placed on visual appearance and the relationship to surroundings, including impact on landscape character.  (Environment) protect and enhance heritage assets and their settings.  (DME4) a presumption in favour of the conservation and enhancement of heritage assets and their settings.  (Conservation areas) proposals will be required to conserve and where appropriate enhance its character and appearance and those elements which contribute towards its significance. This should include considerations as to whether it conserves and enhances the special architectural and historic character of the area as set out in the relevant conservation area appraisal. Development which makes a positive contribution and conserves and enhances the character, appearance and significance of the area in terms of its location, scale, size, design and materials and existing buildings and open spaces will be supported. In the conservation areas there will be a presumption in favour of the conservation and enhancement of elements that make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the conservation area.  (Listed buildings and other buildings of significant heritage interest)alterations or extensions to listed buildings or buildings of local heritage interest, or development proposals on sites within their setting which cause harm to the significance of the heritage asset will not be supported.  The Worston Conservation Area Management Guidance is a material consideration and this identifies:    “Roofs: The roof is nearly always a dominant feature of a building and the retention of its original structure, shape, pitch, cladding and ornament is important. Traditional roofing materials should be retained. New materials should match existing”.    “Stone roofing slates: Stone slate roofs are a fundamental part of the distinctive local character of vernacular buildings in Ribble Valley. The character of the roof is derived principally from the colour and texture of the stone slates, their size, thickness and roughness”.    “Windows: Sliding sash and side-hung casements are the two principal window types. As a rule, windows in historic buildings should be repaired, or if beyond repair should be replaced 'like for like'. It is important that the design, scale and proportion of new windows should be sympathetic to the character of the building”.    “All development, but particularly in the Worston Conservation Area, must respond to its immediate environment, its “context”, in terms of scale, density, form, materials and detailing”.    All new development should seek to “Reinforce local identity by the use of the traditional materials used in the conservation area”; “Reflect the proportion of solid to void found in the elevations of traditional buildings and employ robust detailing, avoiding fussy or gimmicky use of applied features or detailing” (Key design principles).    The immediate landscape (Open Countryside) adjoining the site has particular interest. The Worston Conservation Area boundary has been drawn widely to include the fields around buildings. The “Rural setting of the village” is also part of the Worston Conservation Area Summary of special interest.  The following guidance and advice has also been considered:    ‘Making changes to heritage assets’ (Historic England, 2016) identifies that it is not good practice for extensions to dominate in either scale, material or as a result of siting (paragraph 41).    NPPG Historic Environment identifies that “the contribution that setting makes to the significance of the heritage asset does not depend on there being public rights of way or an ability to otherwise access or experience that setting”.    ‘The Setting of Heritage Assets’ (Historic England, 2017, paragraph 40) identifies that screening can only mitigate negative impacts (rather than removing impacts or providing enhancement) and ought never to be regarded as a substitute for well-designed developments within the setting of heritage assets.  The submitted Heritage Statement identifies that “The north end of the house and its link to the former barn are late 20th century, and do not confer significance, but they are clearly subservient in size, and their position in relation to the more prominent historic components means that the latter remain dominant in most views” (6.1).  The submitted Design and Access Statement identities that “This new proposal is an improvement on the previously approved design (3/2008/0239 and 0238) and offers a very simple standing zinc flat roof form which removes the pitched roof design from the scheme. There is already a lead rolled flat roof construction at the rear and this proposal shows the removal of this and the porch/windows to create the new extension. We are also retaining the existing windows to the side and rear which were previously proposed to be altered and adapted”.  Assessment  It is acknowledged that this re-submission scheme, by reason of replacing a proposed pitched roof with a flat roof and by keeping the existing windows on the north elevation unchanged, will have a lesser impact than the previous scheme that was refused (2022/0491 and 0263). However, the amendments are not sufficient enough to override the previous concerns raised.  It is still considered that the proposed extension is unduly prominent, incongruous and conspicuous because of its size, location, form and materials.  The existing modern link on the north elevation offers a series of modest roof elements which together with the modest footprint and projection, make the built form subservient to the historic house and barn. The proposal extends this subservient link between historic house and barn. It sits in front of the historic house as seen from the north elevation thereby projecting into the same frame of – and drawing the eye from – the distinct descending series of historic and modern gable roofs (see photograph in Worston Conservation Area Appraisal) of the house. Its square footprint in this location would result in a prominent projection which bears no resemblance to the existing form. Its singular flat roof design would sit in front of both historic house and modern link as seen from the north elevation reducing their distinction.  The proposed zinc roof (with central rooflight on top) attempts to introduce something contemporary yet this would sit on top of rendered walls which are attempting to match the existing historic fabric. The design concept is neither contemporary nor a pastiche and fails to have synergy with the existing built form. The four large windows (reflective; illuminated) proposed on the north elevation of the extension would bear no resemblance to the existing gable and simple functional form.  There are views from the public footpath and roadside (the latter restricted by recent hedgerow). However, as established in guidance above, “the contribution that setting makes to the significance of the heritage asset does not depend on there being public rights of way or an ability to otherwise access or experience that setting”. Note is also made of the recent appeal at 2 Moorend Cottages, Langho (APP/T2350/W/20/3251911; 25/8/2020) in which the Planning Inspector concluded “i*n any case, while planting can help assimilate development into its surroundings, it should not be used to screen inappropriate development from view*”.  The agent refers to a permitted scheme in 2008 (3/2008/0238 and 0239) which allowed for a 3.4m x 3.8m extension on this north elevation, part flat roof, part pitched roof. This included a rear extension which was sympathetic to the distinct descending series of historic and modern gable roofs by incorporation of a parapet roof. Regardless, this scheme was not implemented and it does not represent a fall-back position. Furthermore, guidance and policy has altered significantly since then, so the council are justified in reaching a different decision.  In conclusion the proposals are harmful to the special architectural and historic interest and setting of the listed building and the character and appearance of Worston Conservation Area and contrary to the NPPF and Key Statement EN5 and Policy DMG1, DMH5 and DME4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.  The harm to thespecial architectural and historic interest and setting of the listed building does not include loss/alteration to irreplaceable historic fabric and is termed ‘less than substantial’. The harm to the character and appearance of Worston Conservation Area is only partial in respect to the extent of this designated heritage asset and is termed ‘less than substantial’. This harm is not outweighed by the public benefit of contractor employment (the applicant does not suggest any other public benefits for consideration). Therefore the application is in conflict with Para 202 of the NPPF. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Ecology:**  RVBC Countryside have no concerns. | |
| **Conclusion:**  In giving considerable importance and weight to the duties at section 16, 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, in giving ‘great weight’ to the conservation of the designated heritage assets (NPPF) and in consideration to Key Statement EN5 and Policies DME4 and DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy, the refusal of listed building consent is recommended. | |
| **RECOMMENDATION**: | That listed building consent is refused for the following reason:    The proposals are unduly prominent, incongruous and conspicuous and harmful to the special architectural and historic interest and setting of the listed building and conservation area because of the extension size, location, form and materials. |