CASE OFFICER'S REPORT

PL/2023/03053

ELCOMBE COTTAGE, ELCOMBE LANE, ALVEDISTON, SALISBURY, SP5 5LG

Proposal - The proposal for Elcombe Cottage is to renovate the existing building and form an extension to provide sufficient accommodation for a family house.

Date of Inspection: N/A
Consultation Expiry: 22/05/22
Press Notice: N/A

POLICIES
National Planning Policy Framework and the NPPG

Wiltshire Core Strategy
CP51 Landscape
CP57 Design
CP58 Ensuring the conservation of the historic environment
CP60 Highways

Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990
Section 72

ISSUES

- Principle
- Scale, design and impact on the character of the area and impact upon a Heritage Asset and AONB
- Impact on neighbouring amenity
- Highways

REPRESENTATIONS :

Highways – No objection

Parish Council – None received.

Neighbours – Four letters of support were received. These welcomed the proposed design and the property being renovated to a standard for modern family life.

ASSESSMENT:

The application site is an attractive detached property set within a sizeable plot. The property itself is not listed. However, the neighbouring property known as Elcombe House to the North, is Grade II Listed.

The proposal seeks approval for a single storey extension to the rear and the erection of a detached home office in the Eastern corner of the plot.

1. **Principle**

The application must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The NPPF confirms that applications must be determined in accordance with the development plan and that proposals which conflict with the development plan should be refused unless material considerations indicate otherwise. (Section 70(2) of the Town

and Country planning Act and Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compensation Act 2004). The NPPF is also a significant material consideration and due weight should be given to the relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency of the framework.

2. Scale, design and impact on the character of the Conservation Area, Heritage asset and the wider character of the AONB

Wiltshire Core Strategy Core Policy 57 states:

A high standard of design is required in all new developments, including extensions, alterations, and changes of use of existing buildings. Development is expected to create a strong sense of place through drawing on the local context and being complimentary to the locality. Applications for new development must be accompanied by appropriate information to demonstrate how the proposal will make a positive contribution to the character of Wiltshire….

Furthermore, there is a duty placed on the local planning authority under Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, which requires local planning authorities to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas when considering planning applications.

In relation to heritage assets, the NPPF states:

189. In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

190. Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

193. 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). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

The Conservation policies of the local plan and the NPPF seek to ensure that the existing significance, character and setting of the Conservation Area and listed buildings would be preserved or enhanced.

It is noted from the submission that this attractive property has been unoccupied for some time and is in need of some refurbishment. The proposed extension, although sizeable is considered to be of an appropriate scale and design for the host dwellinghouse and would appear subservient and sympathetic.

Its rear position and singles storey scale ensures it would not be visually overbearing and would not negatively impact the overall character and appearance of the area.

The position of the extension is well stepped back from the shared boundary with Elcombe House and the application site sits further rearward within its plot. These combined elements, along with being

single storey, results in the extension being a significant distance away from the neighbouring Heritage Asset itself and therefore is considered to preserve the historic significance of that property and its setting, in accordance with the NPPF and Core Policy 58.

In addition, the proposed extension would be seen in the context of the existing built form and is not considered to pose any harm upon the wider landscape character of the AONB.

The proposed single storey home office is proposed within the Eastern corner of the plot. The overall scale and design sits comfortably within the plot and ample garden area remains. A condition can be imposed upon any approval ensuring the office remains ancillary to the main house only.

It is also noted from the plans that the existing porch is to be removed. This is considered to be a minor alteration with no negative impact upon the streetscene.

Therefore, on balance, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in scale, design, detailing and appearance in relation to the existing building and would not have any appreciable impact on the wider character of the Conservation area or AONB. The proposed materials would be appropriate for and sympathetic towards the neighbouring Listed Building and wider locality. The development would not result in a level of harm upon the setting of nearby listed buildings and the proposal would therefore comply with CP51, CP57, CP58, the NPPF and S72 of the 1990 Act.

3. Impact on neighbouring amenity

Policy CP57 also states:

vii. Having regard to the compatibility of adjoining buildings and uses, the impact on the amenities of existing occupants, and ensuring that appropriate levels of amenity are achievable within the development itself, including the consideration of privacy, overshadowing; vibration; and pollution (such as light intrusion, noise, smoke, fumes, effluent, waste or litter)

Due to the ample plot size, position of the proposed scale of the proposed extension in relation to neighbouring properties and the separation between the properties in this location this element of the proposal is not considered to raise any concerns in regards to residential amenities.

The proposed home office is a significant distance away from the neighbouring properties and has been designed to ensure its scale and window openings would not impact upon any residential amenities.

Conclusion:

In light of the above, on balance, the proposal is considered to be acceptable and would not result in any adverse harm which could warrant a refusal. The proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with the NPPF and Core Policy 51 57, 58, 60 and S72 of the 1990 Act.

RECOMMENDATION: Approve, subject to conditions.