

**R04**

**F/TH/20/1746**

PROPOSAL: Erection of a single storey flat roof rear extension

LOCATION: Garden Cottage Durlock Minster RAMSGATE Kent CT12 4HD

WARD: Thanet Villages

AGENT: Mr Scott Rigden

APPLICANT: Dr Harbidge & Mr Moore

RECOMMENDATION: Refuse Permission

For the following reason:

1 The proposed development would form an incongruous and visually intrusive form of development which would compete with the existing features of the listed building and severely detract from the character and appearance of the Minster Conservation Area as a designated heritage asset which is not outweighed by any public benefits, contrary to the aims of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Thanet Local Plan Policies HE02, QD02 and paragraphs 193 and 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

#### SITE, LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

The application site is located on the corner of Church Street and Durlock in the village of Minster. The property abuts the boundary with Church Street. The property is a Grade II listed two storey brick built dwelling. To the north of the site is Minster Abbey and to the north east of the site is Durlock Lodge; both Minster Abbey and Durlock Lodge are listed. To the south of the site is Rivers Court (retirement flats). The site is also within the Minster Conservation Area.

#### RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

F/TH/20/1045 Conversion of attached outbuildings and carport into habitable space, extension of pitched roof and insertion of 2No.dormer windows to provide accommodation at first floor level, single storey extension to kitchen and entrance, new boundary masonry wall to eastern boundary, new vehicular access and erection of a two bay timber frame carport. Granted 27/10/20

F/TH/99/0445 Erection of a single storey glazed link between kitchen and workshop and new chimney stack to workshop roof. Granted 30/07/1999

#### PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey flat roof rear extension to allow a larger kitchen. The proposal would involve the loss of an existing bay window and rear sash window both serving the existing kitchen. The extension to the kitchen would project out by approximately 1.6m. The extension would extend the existing roof form at this point, which is a flat roof between the main dwelling and the rear offshoot of the dwelling.

## DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

### **Thanet Local Plan**

SP35 - Quality Development

SP36 - Conservation and Enhancement of Thanet's Historic Environment

HE02 - Development in Conservation Areas

HE03 - Heritage Assets

QD02 - General Design Principles

QD03 - Living Conditions

TP06 - Car Parking

## NOTIFICATIONS

Letters were sent to adjoining occupiers, a site notice posted close to the site and the application publicised in a local newspaper.

One letter has been received objecting to the application. Concern is raised about construction traffic blocking the right of way to Rivers Court for residents and also emergency services and the refuse lorries.

**Minster Parish Council:** No objection.

## CONSULTATIONS

**TDC Conservation Officer:** Thanet's Local Plan, policy HE02, states within Section 7 'The character, scale and plan form of the original building are respected and the development is subordinate to it and does not dominate principal elevations.' As well as Section 8 which states 'Appropriate materials and detailing are proposed and the development would not result in the loss of features that contribute to the character or appearance of the conservation area. New development which would detract from the immediate or wider landscape setting of any part of a conservation area will not be permitted.'

Under the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990, Section 16 Paragraph 2, 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. As well as Section 66 Paragraph 1 which states when considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority 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.

Previously pre application advice was sought on a separate but similar scheme, reference L/TH/20/1046, which initially incorporated the element now being proposed through this application. However, concerns were raised and it was removed from the scheme. This application looks to reinstate this previous element that was removed. The application now proposes to install an increased extension to the footprint of the 'link' between the main building and what was previously considered outbuilding or workspaces, removing the bay and sash window to enable this expansion. I can acknowledge that as part of this application further information has been submitted regarding the history of the window in question, including the 1999 application (reference L/TH/99/0444), which authorised the installation of the bay window proposed for removal.

One of the concerns raised previously was the impact to the symmetry of the building which I would still note as a concern as the sash window is being proposed for removal which forms part of the main listed building. Although I can appreciate that there is a slight disparity between the length of the two ground floor windows, I would still note that there is a sense of proportionality and ratio to the rear of the site that would be lost if the flat roof extension proposed was implemented. It has been noted in the heritage statement that the window was likely installed in the 1970s phase of the development of the building and is not original, however the property was listed in 1986, meaning that it would have been present at the time and therefore included in this listing. I would also note that it is of an appropriate design, materiality and form to appear cohesive with the rest of the building.

The bay window was included at a later date during the works undertaken in 1999, as per the heritage report. However, I would again argue that it has been present for a significant period of time and therefore considered to be of cumulative merit to that of the overall house and its aesthetic appearance, not extant, through its contributions appearing positively amongst the overall appearance of the site.

I also believe that given the size and orientation of the proposed flat roof extension it would appear quite protuberant to the rear of the site, moving further than the existing footprint outwards and encroaching onto the rear elevation of the listed property in a non traditional form of being a flat roof. This ultimately causes harm to the rear of the building, through form, design and size, and would therefore be considered unacceptable. I would also argue that it is somewhat unnecessary given that the previous scheme, following the removal of the element, was proven to be efficient as it was without the need of the removal of these two windows.

Furthermore, looking at the information has been submitted through the heritage report, it would appear that there would be views through the site from the public realm of the flat roof extension. This is demonstrated in the images through the gate of the site and therefore would have a perceivable public impact. Appearing poorly against the listed property would also appear poorly from outside of the site causing a level of impact to the overall setting of the listed property. Again, a flat roof extension is not something that would be expected in this location and at this level of encroachment to the rear of a listed building.

Overall I do not believe that this singular element of his application would cause more than substantial harm to the Grade II listed property in question, however I also believe that it does not conserve or enhance the property either and is instead a detriment to its

appearance and character. Therefore does not meet with the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990, Section 16 Paragraph 2 or Section 66 Paragraph 1. The proposed flat roof extension protrudes from its proposed siting, impacting the rear of the listed building in a contemporary and somewhat bulky form. I would also like to highlight that this is further demonstrated by the previously authorised application ref L/TH/20/1046, of which the removal of the window in question was removed from the application, proving that a scheme can be successful without its incorporation. For the aforementioned reasoning above and that previously stated through pre application and the previous application I would object to the application proposed.

## COMMENTS

This application is referred to the Planning Committee at the request of Cllr. Pugh as he considers the perceived harm to the listed building and the conservation area do not outweigh the wider benefit that this scheme will bring to the surrounding area.

### **Principle**

The site is located within the confines Minster Conservation Area. The proposed development relates to alterations to a dwellinghouse within the urban confines and is, therefore, considered acceptable in principle, subject to the assessment of material considerations, and determined in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Local Plan Policies.

### **Character and Appearance**

Garden Cottage is a Listed Building and occupies a prominent roadside location within the Minster Conservation Area. It is proposed to erect a single storey extension to the rear elevation.

The impact the proposed scheme may have upon the character and appearance of the area and in particular the Minster Conservation Area as designated heritage assets falls to be assessed.

The site lies within the Minster Conservation Area. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, in relation to conservation areas, requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area. Thanet Local Plan Policy HE02 supports development within conservation areas where the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area. Thanet Local Plan Policy QD02 likewise supports development that promotes or reinforces the local character of the area and is compatible with neighbouring buildings and spaces and inclusive in its design for all users and is supported by paragraph 192 of the NPPF.

The proposed extension would project approximately 1.6 metres out in front of the rear elevation of the building. The extension would extend approximately just under halfway across the rear elevation and also project out further than the rear off shoot and entrance hall making it appear more dominant within the rear facade. It would have a flat roof, as the

existing does but its fenestration style, scale or detailing would not be a reflection of the building. It is therefore considered that the proposed flat roof extension protrudes from its proposed siting, encroaching onto the rear of the listed building in a contemporary and somewhat bulky form.

The traditional materials proposed, of timber glazing, would be appropriate for use within a conservation area, however, the structure and detailing including fenestration design itself would have a bulky appearance and have a poor relationship with the existing rear elevation in an uncomfortable and jarring manner.

The current extension linking the house and what was the workshop/garage was subservient in nature and not extending out in front of any windows and a lesser extent of the rear elevation due to its depth and does not appear overly prominent on the rear elevation and within the streetscene (from Durlock).

The depth of the extension, together with its form, design and size would form an incongruous and visually intrusive form of development that would be severely detrimental to the appearance of the listed building and would fail to preserve or enhance the Minster Conservation Area. The proposed development would detract from the appearance of the building and the contribution the building makes to the Conservation Area as a whole.

Paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework advises 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 (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). The harm caused by the development of the heritage assets could be considered as "less than substantial harm". Paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), advises that "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. It is noted that the development would provide benefits to the occupiers of the dwelling through providing a larger kitchen area. However, the justification provided is not sufficiently outweighed by any public benefits, as required by the Framework in this case, and the proposal is therefore contrary to paragraphs 193 and 196 of the NPPF.

Given the above it is considered the proposed development would fail to preserve and enhance the Minster Conservation Area and the proposal therefore would be contrary to the aims of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Thanet Local Plan Policies HE02, QD02 and the NPPF.

### **Neighbour amenity**

The proposed development is located away from the site boundaries of the property and therefore is a distance from adjoining properties. Given its location the proposed development would be unlikely to result in loss of amenity to nearby residential occupiers and in this respect the application accords with the aims of Thanet Local Plan Policy QD03 and the NPPF.

## **Highways**

This application does not increase the number of bedrooms within the property. The property currently benefits from off street parking for a number of vehicles. It is therefore considered that the proposed development would not result in any significant increase in demand for on street parking or harm to highway safety.

## **Conclusion**

Whilst the proposed development would provide additional space within the kitchen to the dwelling it is considered the development would form an incongruous and visually intrusive form of development that would severely detract from the character and appearance of the Minster Conservation Area as a designated heritage asset which is not outweighed by any public benefits. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to the aims of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Thanet Local Plan Policies HE02, QD02 and paragraphs 193 and 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

## **Case Officer**

Gill Richardson

TITLE: F/TH/20/1746

Project Garden Cottage Durlock RAMSGATE Kent CT12 4HD



