

9. LISTED BUILDING CONSENT APPLICATION – REAR EXTENSION TO PROVIDE HALL, STUDIO, STAIR TO BASEMENT AND EN-SUITE AT A HALF LEVEL. REFURBISHMENT OF BASEMENT AND CONVERSION TO HABITABLE SPACE INCLUDING RESTORATION OF ORIGINAL WINDOW OPENINGS. REGRADING OF LAWN AND ACCESS TO BASEMENT DOOR. HALL COTTAGE, BAULK LANE, HATHERSAGE (NP/DDD/0716/0606, P.6188, 423186 / 381628, 23/08/2016/AM)

Applicant: Mr Michael Shuttleworth

Site and Surroundings

Hall Cottage is located on Baulk Lane in the centre of Hathersage. The property is a Grade II listed farmhouse dating from the late 18th century. The listing description includes the farmhouse, boundary wall and gate piers. The property is also located within the designated Hathersage Conservation Area.

The farmhouse stands gable end onto the street and is constructed from coursed squared gritstone with quoins, coped gables, plain kneelers, intermediate and end ashlar ridge stacks and slate roof laid to diminishing courses. The property has two stories arranged in three bays, with small paned cast iron window frames within flush stone surrounds. There is an off-centre doorway with quoined surround, heavy lintel and shallow moulded hood on moulded brackets. An external stone staircase down from the doorway link it to the front garden which lies at a lower level due to the building having a raised basement level. The garden wall to the south-west roadside boundary has half round copings, incorporating ashlar gate piers, square in plan, with plain caps. There is a doorway through the boundary wall into the garden from Baulk Lane with a semi-circular arched head, with plain planked door.

Access to the property is via Baulk Lane either through the gate in the boundary wall or via the track to the rear of the house. The nearest neighbouring properties are Further House a Grade II listed house on the far side of Baulk Lane, 3 Baulk Cottage to the south of the site and 4 Orchard House to the east of the site.

Proposal

This application seeks listed building consent for extensions to the rear of the property along with alterations to the front elevation to re-grade the garden to provide light into the basement windows and alterations to the existing external staircase to the front door to allow access to the basement door.

The submitted plans show that the proposed rear extension would have two elements. One element would be single storey with a glazed roof and the second would be a two storey with a slate roof to match the existing house. A new roof light is also proposed to the existing rear lean-to.

The side wall of the existing rear projecting 'lean-to' would be removed to provide a smaller area for a utility room and downstairs toilet with the remainder of the existing 'lean-to' and the proposed single storey extension accommodating a painting studio and hallway. The two storey extension would also accommodate a new rear external door, hallway and new en-suite bathroom. Two new stair cases within the two storey extension would provide access to the cellar and first floor via new openings in the existing external walls. A new doorway is also proposed into the ground floor.

The ground level of the front garden would be re-graded downwards either side of the path which leads to the existing stone steps. The ground level would reduce gradually to below the sill level of the existing windows into the basement. The existing stone steps which provide access to the front door would also be altered by creating steps down into a new opening in the side of the external steps to provide access to the existing doorway which leads into the cellar.

Finally, the westernmost two bays of the cellar would be converted to an office and bedroom respectively. The submitted application form states that new ceilings would be constructed from plasterboard, external windows and doors would be timber, internal windows and doors would be panelled timber painted doors, internal walls would be plaster and new rainwater goods would be painted cast iron.

An application for planning permission for the proposed development has been submitted and is subject to a separate report.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be REFUSED for the following reason.

- 1. The proposed works would harm the significance of Hall Cottage (Grade II listed), and the setting of Further House (Grade II listed). In the absence of any public benefits which could outweigh the harm that has been identified it is therefore considered that approval of the proposals would be contrary to Core Strategy policy L3, Local Plan policy LC6 and the National Planning Policy Framework.**

Key Issues

- Whether the proposed works would conserve the significance of the Grade II listed Hall Cottage, its setting and the setting of nearby listed buildings including Further House.

History

2009: Planning permission refused for change of use of field barn to domestic garaging space.

2014: Enforcement Ref 14/0260 in regard to alleged unauthorised satellite dish.

2016: Pre-application Enquiry 25636 in regard to proposed rear extension, renovation of basement, re-profiling of front lawn to form banking and steps to access basement.

The above enquiry is relevant as it relates to the development and works proposed in this application. The advice is also referred to in the submitted design and heritage statement. The detailed points of advice are copied below.

“The rear extension is considered to be too large, in combination with the existing lean-to (present on 1st edition OS map), and as such it covers too much of the historic fabric of the rear elevation, including two small rear windows and evidence of an earlier rear opening (possibly a doorway perhaps dating from an earlier phase of the building’s development): it’s not clear from the proposals where the new doorway would be positioned relative to the window and blocked earlier opening. The three new door openings which would be inserted in the historic rear wall of the house at basement, ground and first floor would require removal of significant original historic fabric.

The differing level of roof abutment between the existing lean-to and the proposed 2-storey lean-to is unsatisfactory, emphasised by the non-aligned roof lights.

The primary function of the proposed lean-to is to provide a staircase leading to, and provision of an en-suite for the master bedroom. It also provides a second staircase down to the cellar: as the ground on the rear elevation is at a higher level than the cellar, this would involve digging down a considerable distance below ground level at the rear. There are already original staircases to first floor and cellar within the house itself, and there is therefore insufficient justification for 2 new staircases.

We would prefer to see the en-suite accommodated within the existing house, either within the room itself (e.g. a narrow, rectangular structure, no more than about 900mm internal width if possible, with a central door), or utilising the space above the stairs at the front of the house, including a part of Bedroom 2.

A smaller extension westwards of the existing lean-to - single-storey, retaining the existing roof abutment level and preferably not extending as far as the blocked earlier opening - is likely to be more acceptable. A west-facing door could be inserted to allow more direct access. This would accommodate the utility and a downstairs WC and perhaps also provide some room for a painting studio: if not, then could this be accommodated within the outbuildings to the east of the property?

The door into the south elevation of the cellar is likely to date from an earlier phase of the building's development, before the creation of the existing main front door and staircase: it is improbable that the house had 2 doorways, one above the other, and to open this up whilst retaining the ground floor doorway would therefore be historically inaccurate. The supporting walls to the latter would have to be removed in order to allow access to the doorway - these are of dressed stone and this whole staircase makes an important contribution to the listed building's significance. For these reasons the re-opening of this doorway is unlikely to be acceptable.

The steps down to cellar level to either side of the existing front steps would have a negative impact on the significance of the front entrance and are unlikely to be acceptable. We would suggest that the ground levels are reduced gradually down from the garden to allow access to the windows (e.g. for cleaning and repairs), without the need for steps or for such a wide trench being excavated along the front of the house."

Consultations

Please note that the consultation period has not finished at the time this report was written. Any additional responses will be verbally updated at the meeting.

Highway Authority – No response to date.

District Council – No response to date.

Parish Council - The Parish Council have no objections to these proposals, and indeed fully support the proposals to restore and conserve a vernacular building of its time. Its original 18C design as a property for an occupant of high standing within the community is not necessarily appropriate for modern day living.

The northerly aspect is a modest rear appearance of random stonework and has had several previous modifications. The proposed rear extension does not cause harm to the listed features of the building and is a tastefully designed extension separating the 1850's and the 21st century. The half level en-suite and glass roof as proposed respond perfectly to the needs of the occupants. The Parish Council would like to see a high specification for the glazing of the proposed studio roof as befits this listed building.

The sensitive enhancement by the uncovering of the original features at the front of the property - including the reopening of the basement door - and intended use of the basement space is felt to be an advantage for an old property, allowing air circulation and preventing long term decay.

Historic England – No response to date.

PDNPA Conservation Officer – Objects to the proposed works and makes the following detailed comments.

“Proposed rear extension

The historic form of Hall Cottage shows a clear differentiation between its formal, higher-status front elevation and less formal, largely blank rear elevation, typical of a vernacular eighteenth century farmhouse. The architecturally significant south-facing frontage accessed via a pedestrian entrance off Baulk Lane, is well-fenestrated with a quoined surround and moulded hood on moulded brackets to the main entrance door, which is approached via an external stone staircase with decorative railings and dressed stone supporting walls. The front door leads to a small internal lobby with the stairs directly ahead and a doorway to each side leading to the principal rooms. Historically there were few if any openings to the north-facing rear elevation, which backs onto the original access route to Hathersage Hall Farm and to other ancillary areas. Access to the kitchen was originally via door (now partially blocked, with a window) to the rear of the east gable; entrance to the rear is now through a door on the east elevation of a later (nineteenth century) rear lean-to.

The proposals would effectively reverse the historic form of the listed building, transferring its main entrance from front to rear and creating a duplication of function within the property, with main entrance door, internal lobby and doorway into each principal room mirrored to front and rear. This would undermine and devalue the historic status of the front elevation of the house, effectively rendering it redundant, and at the same time would compromise the character and appearance of the historically blank rear elevation, elevating its status both visually and functionally.

The proposed extension, part of it 1.5 storeys, would extend across the entire rear elevation of the house, and together with the existing lean-to would cover most of the rear wall of the main house. This would have a significant negative impact on the simple form and detailing which characterises the rear of the listed building, and would obscure historic fabric, including the quoins to the south-west corner, a blocked earlier opening (possibly a doorway) and 2 small windows to ground and first floor.

The three new door openings which would be inserted in the original rear wall of the house at cellar, ground and first floor would require removal of significant historic fabric, as well as evidence of the earlier blocked rear opening.

The D&AS refers to the current “indirect and circuitous” rear access to the property and one of the stated requirements is for a more useable entrance and hall, space for cloaks and WC (although the existing lean-to already accommodates the latter, along with a utility room). These functions could be accommodated through a reorganisation of the existing lean-to and the insertion of a west-facing door to allow easier and more direct access from the rear with, if necessary, a small, single-storey extension westwards of the existing lean-to, retaining the existing roof abutment level and not extending as far as the blocked earlier opening: this solution would be considerably less harmful to the character and appearance of the house than the proposed extension. The applicant could consider utilising the unused outbuilding to the east of the property as an artist’s studio.

The D&HS concludes that the proposed extension “does not harm the listed building”, as the rear elevation is of “less significance”. However, no explanation or analysis accompanies this statement and the application provides no clear Statement of Significance. Contrary to the assessment in the D&HS, the comments above clearly indicate that the proposed rear extension would have a negative impact on the historic form, appearance and architectural significance of Hall Cottage, and would therefore harm the historic significance of the listed building.

It should be noted that the Design and Heritage Statement (D&HS) refers to the nearby property, known as Further House, as a rear extension of ‘similar form’ to what is being proposed in the current application. However, the rear elevation of this house is clearly eighteenth century and is likely to pre-date the frontage of the house, so a comparison in this instance is not appropriate.

Proposed new staircase to cellar

The D&HS concludes that this would cause ‘no harm’ to the listed building, although no explanation or analysis accompanies this statement. However, the proposals would involve considerable excavation at the rear of the property as the cellar is largely below ground level here, which could have implications for the rear wall and foundations of the house. There is already a traditional stone staircase to the cellar within the house itself, and insufficient justification has been provided for a second staircase, which would harm the significance of the listed building through the insertion of the new doorway in the external rear wall and could potentially raise structural issues.

Proposed en-suite

One of the primary functions of the proposed lean-to is to provide a staircase leading to, and provision of an en-suite for the master bedroom. However, the proposed extension would harm the significance of the listed building, as explained above.

In addition, it is questionable as to whether a doorway of sufficient height could be accommodated adequately in the space available, as the junction between the wall and the lower slope of the ceiling appears to be at a relatively low height (indicated by the arrow on photo below – note the existing doorway into the room is very low).

The proposed en-suite is relatively sizeable, larger than the existing bathroom, and is described as a “reasonable sized bathroom in scale with the other rooms in the house”. If the existing bathroom is of insufficient size, the applicant could consider enlarging it slightly in its current position rather than creating a new full-sized bathroom.

A more acceptable solution, if fully justified, would be to insert an en-suite of minimal dimensions within one of the existing bedrooms, if the room’s dimensions, architectural detailing and form allow. This would be entirely reversible and would have minimal impact on historic fabric and on the significance of the listed property, whereas the proposed extension would harm the significance of the whole building.

New rear doorway into lobby and new doorway into living room

The new doorway appears to be in the position of the small ground floor rear window (note: this window is not shown on the proposed plans or elevations). It is questionable as to whether there is adequate space for a new external doorway here, without impacting on the existing doorway into the Dining Room, and also whether there is sufficient headroom beneath the staircase for the proposed entrance lobby and new doorway into the Living Room (see photos below; note underside of stairs visible beneath top left corner of existing doorway, in second picture): there is no assessment of the potential impact on historic fabric of the new door into the Living Room. There are steps down into the rear lean-to from the main house, but there is no indication of how potential level changes would be handled for the new entrance.

New rear doorway into kitchen and blocking of existing doorway from lean-to

No justification is provided for blocking up the existing doorway into the house from the rear lean-to, nor any assessment of the historic significance of this doorway; there is also no assessment of the impact on historic fabric of the proposed new doorway into the kitchen. Additionally, the entire external west wall of this lean-to is to be removed but there is no assessment of the significance of the lean-to and assessment of the impact on historic fabric.

Unblocking the cellar door to the south elevation and lowering the level of the garden

The blocked doorway to the front elevation of the cellar is positioned directly beneath the existing front door. Opening up the doorway to enable access to the garden would require the removal of one of the dressed stone walls which support the external staircase to the front door. The staircase, including its dressed supporting walls, is a key feature of architectural significance and removal of any historic fabric associated with this feature will harm the significance of the staircase and of the listed building as a whole; in addition, removal of any part of the supporting walls would undermine the structural integrity of the staircase. However, the application does not assess the historic significance of the staircase and does not explain how the staircase will be supported following removal of the wall.

There is no clear justification for a new doorway into the garden from the cellar, and no evidence that this doorway was ever opened to the outside with the external staircase in situ: it is below the current ground levels around the house and on Baulk Lane. The main access from house to garden is through the front door, at the top of the external staircase. If the current owners choose not to utilise this doorway, this is not sufficient justification for adding a second doorway beneath, nor for the harm to significance which would result.

At pre-application, Officers advised lowering the ground level in front of the cellar windows. However, the proposals show the whole level of the garden being graded downwards towards the windows, so that the entire cellar level of the house would be visible. This would alter the principal, south elevation, from a 2-storey farmhouse with cellar largely below ground level, to a more imposing 3-storey house, which would have a significant impact on the historic form, character and appearance of the listed building, harming its historic significance. There would also be structural implications for the external stone staircase, as the bottom step would no longer be at ground level and would require some form of additional support / additional steps etc.: the application does not address these issues, but the alterations required would harm the significance of the historic staircase.

Works to the Cellar

New 6-paned timber windows are proposed for the cellar windows. However, there appear to be stanchions in situ to the east bay window, suggesting that the original windows may have had leaded lights. A full assessment of any remaining historic evidence is required in order to determine, as far as possible, what form the original cellar windows took, before any proposals for new windows to the cellar can be considered.

The D&HS states that the floor level is to be lowered and a new floor (it is not clear what this would be) laid to “replace dirt floor”. However, there is no justification for lowering the floor level, nor assessment of impact on features or elements of historic significance, and the existing and proposed floor levels are not clearly indicated on the submitted drawings. In general lowering historic floor levels in listed buildings is unlikely to be acceptable – a very strong justification would be needed. There are stone flags to at least some of the cellar floor (although these appear to be in a fairly poor condition) but these are not mentioned in the application. As stone flags exist, these should be retained (if in good enough condition) or replaced like-for-like, at least in the areas where there is evidence of flags. There is no indication in the application of the

proposed finish to the walls. There is no evidence that the cellar walls have previously been plastered, although there may be evidence of a limewash in places. If the intention is to plaster those areas to be made habitable, only a lime plaster would be acceptable as this would be traditional in appearance and finish, and would allow the walls to breathe. However, a full assessment of the significance of any historic features which may be obscured by plastering would first be required. A plasterboard finish to the walls would not be acceptable as this would remove the historic character and appearance of the cellar. It should be noted that the Authority's Design Guide (Alterations and Extensions) advises that cellars do not generally make good living rooms or bedrooms as the work needed to make them habitable "will inevitably lead to their cellar character being lost".

There is a possible blocked fireplace at the west gable wall, and a structure against the east wall to the central bay, possibly supporting the fireplace above. There is no mention in the application of these structures (although they are marked on the Existing plans) and neither is shown on the Proposed plans. An analysis of what these are and of what their function may have been, and an assessment of their historic significance will be required, as well as clarification of whether the proposals are to retain or remove them, with a very strong justification if the latter.

There is no assessment of the historic significance of the existing beams and joists to the cellar ceiling. The proposals imply insertion of a ceiling beneath these, but there is no indication as to whether any of the cellar originally had a ceiling: if there is no evidence, then a strong justification will be required for this alteration.

Conservation Area Impact

The application site falls within the Hathersage Conservation Area, adjacent to Baulk Lane. The photo below clearly indicates that the proposed extension will be visually prominent along Baulk Lane, and is also likely to be prominent in views towards the Conservation Area from public rights of way to the north of the site. As a result, the proposed extension is likely to harm the significance of the conservation area.

Other Issues

The application form refers to new ceilings being plasterboard and affirms that there will be stripping out of internal wall, ceiling or floor finishes, but no details are provided of these works in the application. The house appears to have original lath and plaster ceilings (possibly throughout, but unable to confirm this), which should be retained or repaired like-for-like if required. Any removal of walls, ceilings or flooring will require consent."

PDNPA Archaeology – No objections.

Representations

Four representations have been received to date; three letters support the proposals while one raises concerns as part of general comments. The reasons for support are summarised below. The letters can be read in full on the website.

- The proposed plans are an imaginative way to bring the very difficult layout of the accommodation up to acceptable modern standards, while maintaining all the important historical aspects of this old farmhouse.
- The proposals will enhance the property without compromising its historical place in the village.
- Without these alterations it is difficult to see the building retaining any attraction for residential use, in the longer term.

The concerns raised as summarised below.

- From the perspective of Baulk Lane, the extension will project some two feet to the left of, and immediately behind, the right hand gatepost. This seems to me too intrusive and to detract from the character of the driveway entrance.
- The extension reduces the availability of parking at Hall Cottage. The applicant also owns adjoining land in the business park and we are concerned that parking will be made between Hall Cottage and the Orchard Offices an area which lies in front of neighbouring properties. There should be no further car parking in that area.

Main Policies

Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP3 and L3

Relevant Local Plan policies: LC4, LC5, LC6, LH4, LT11 and LT18

Policy Framework

Paragraphs 128 – 134 in the Framework are relevant for considering development which affects heritage assets. Appropriate evidence to describe the significance of any affected heritage asset should be required to inform decision making and local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any affected heritage asset taking into account available evidence and necessary expertise. This assessment should be taken into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

Great weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets within the National Park. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent unless there are exceptional circumstances. 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 securing its optimum viable use.

The Authority's conservation policies reflect the approach taken in the Framework. L3 and LC6 together says that development must conserve and where appropriate enhance or reveal the significance of heritage assets and their setting and that other than in exceptional circumstances, development will not be permitted where it is likely to cause harm to the significance of any cultural heritage asset.

In considering whether to grant listed building consent for the proposals the Authority is obliged to 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.

Assessment

Hall Cottage is a Grade II listed building and therefore for policy purposes is a designated heritage asset of national importance. Further Cottage is also a Grade II listed building located on the south side of Baulk Lane. Hall Cottage is an important building within the designated Hathersage Conservation Area. Local and national planning policies are clear that while extensions and alterations to designated heritage assets such as listed buildings are acceptable in principle, the works must conserve or enhance the significance of the affected heritage assets.

The key issue is therefore considered to be whether the proposed development would conserve the significance of Hall Cottage and its setting and the setting of nearby listed buildings including Further House. These issues are dealt with in detail by the Authority's Conservation Officer (as set out above)

There is a strong presumption against works which would have a harmful impact upon significance unless that harm can be demonstrated to be outweighed by the public benefits arising from the works. In this case however Hall Cottage is an established dwelling and there is no evidence to suggest the existing three bedroom property is not habitable or viable or that the proposed works are necessary to secure the optimal viable use of the heritage asset. Therefore while the Parish Council's view that the existing property is not necessarily suitable for modern living is noted, it is considered that the proposals would not result in any public benefits.

The submitted application is supported by a design and heritage statement which concludes that when taken as a whole that the proposed works would result in a neutral impact upon the significance of the listed building.

By virtue of its age, historic relationships and vernacular design it is considered that the significance of Hall Cottage is primarily historic and architectural. The property is a good example of an 18th century vernacular farmhouse, the principal and formal front elevation of which faces south towards a generous walled garden with the gable of the property facing Baulk Lane. To the rear of the property is the access and the rear elevation of the farmhouse which is mainly blank with the existing historic rear 'lean-to' element and few small window openings.

It is likely that working access to the farm would have been via the track which leads around the rear of the farmhouse with more formal access for visitors to the property provided via the pedestrian access leading through the front garden and up the external stone steps to the front door. The dwelling is two storeys in height but with a cellar which is accessed by an internal staircase. The cellar is not habitable space but there are existing window openings to each of the three bays which have been blocked by the raised level of ground within the garden. There is also evidence of a doorway from the front garden into the cellar which has been blocked by the external steps to the front door above.

The proposed rear extension would be formed by two distinct elements including a single storey element with a glazed roof and a taller 'one and a half storey' element. The extensions would provide additional living accommodation including a painting studio and en-suite bathroom along with providing a new 'front door' on the rear elevation.

Officers still have significant concerns in regard to the impact of the proposed rear extensions which in combination with the existing 'lean-to' element would extend across the entire rear wall of the building and cover most of the historic fabric of the rear wall. The current simple form and detailing of the rear elevation would be replaced with essentially three different visual elements with differing heights and materials. The proposed rear extensions would be clearly visible from Baulk Lane and it is considered that the extensions would result in harm to the significance of the listed building through the introduction of significant and un-resolved new extensions.

The proposed extensions would also create a new entrance point into a hallway at the rear of the building which historically is a role reserved for the formal front doorway. The proposed extension would also require the removal of the side wall of the existing 'lean-to' extension along with the creation of three new door openings into the rear wall of the dwelling, at ground floor, first floor and into the cellar which would result in the removal of significant historic fabric. The existing doorway from the utility room is also proposed to be blocked up and a new door opening into the kitchen created. The extension would also extend beyond the gate post and partially block the rear access which would result in an awkward visual appearance which would relate poorly to the historic access.

When taken together it is considered that the proposed rear extensions and related internal changes would result in harm to the significance of the listed buildings through the introduction of new extensions which would not conserve the existing simple form, massing and detailing of the existing building and would also result in the removal of historic fabric and alterations to the plan form.

The application also proposes the conversion of the westernmost two bays of the basement to habitable space including an office and a fourth bedroom. The proposed extension would create a second staircase down to the proposed office. The application also proposes to alter the garden levels outside to provide light into replacement timber cellar windows along with re-opening a historic doorway which is currently blocked by the external stone steps which lead to the formal front door.

While there is no objection in principle to the conversion of this part of the cellar to habitable accommodation Officers do have significant concerns in regard to the changes to the garden level which as proposed would result in the dwelling being read as a three story building rather than two storey above a cellar along with the alterations to the external stone staircase required to facilitate access into the cellar door. There is also some evidence that the cellar window frames may have been metal rather than timber which is proposed in this application.

This door into the south elevation of the cellar is considered likely to date from an earlier phase of the building's development, before the creation of the existing formal front door and external stone staircase. The reason for this is because it is improbable that the house would have had two doorways, one above the other. It is also reasonable to conclude that the cellar door was intentionally blocked up when the external stone steps were constructed. These historic phases of the building's development are a key element of the historic significance of the heritage asset and it is considered to be inappropriate to create a new access by removing part of the external dressed stone steps as proposed because this would harm that historic significance.

Officers are also concerned in regard to the lack of detail on the submitted plans in regard to the proposed reduced finished floor level in the cellar and proposed floor and wall finishes. There are also no detailed drawings to show proposed window and door detailed design, finish or joinery work.

It is therefore considered that that when taken as a whole that the proposed works would harm the significance of Hall Cottage. The proposed rear extensions can be viewed from and in the context of Further House which is a Grade II listed house of similar age to Hall Cottage and therefore it is considered that the proposed extensions in particular would result in some harm to the setting of Further House.

Officers have therefore come to a different conclusion than the submitted design and heritage statement which concludes that the proposals would result in a neutral impact. Officers consider that the submitted application does not attach sufficient weight to the historic relationship between the formal front of the farmhouse and the 'working' rear elevation which historically would have been blank with few openings. There is also no clear explanation in the submitted heritage statement why the rear elevation of the dwelling has less significance. It is also considered that there is no clear explanation why the historic fabric in the walls and external stone staircase which would be removed is of little significance.

The submitted heritage statement also refers to the form of Further House as setting a precedent for the proposed rear extensions because the form of Further House would be similar to that of the proposed one and a half storey extension. However it appears that the element referred to is historic rather than a recent extension and therefore is considered to be materially different to the proposals now under consideration rather than setting a precedent in support of the proposals.

Conclusion

It is considered that taken as a whole the proposed works would harm the significance of Hall Cottage and the setting of Further House. In the absence of any public benefits which could outweigh the harm that has been identified it is therefore considered that approval of the proposals would be contrary to Core Strategy policy L3, Local Plan policy LC6 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

In the absence of any further material considerations the application is therefore recommended for refusal.

Human Rights

Any human rights issues have been considered and addressed in the preparation of this report.

List of Background Papers (not previously published)

Nil