

## CASE OFFICER'S REPORT

**Application Reference:** 18/03275/FUL  
**Date of Inspection:** 24 April 2018  
**Date site notice posted:** 24 April 2018  
**Date of press notice:** 27 April 2018

### **POLICIES**

#### Local context:

*Wiltshire Core Strategy (development plan)*  
CP57 and CP58

#### National Context:

*National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)*

*Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)*

*Section 66 of the Planning (Listed building and Conservation area) Act 1990 states that the local planning authority has a duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.*

### **ISSUES**

Design and heritage;  
Neighbour amenity; and  
Any other material considerations.

### **REPRESENTATIONS**

Keevil Parish Council: No comments received.

Conservation Officer: No comments received.

Contaminated land officer: No objection.

Public consultation: This consisted of neighbour letters, the erection of a site notice, a Wiltshire Times advert and publication on the Council's website. 1 letter received setting out need for responsible disposal of any asbestos containing materials.

### **ASSESSMENT:**

#### Design and heritage:

The potential impact to this Grade II listed building is considered to be the most notable planning issue.

This is a Grade II listed end of terrace cottage. The works would affect single storey additions to the side and rear that currently provide the bathroom and the kitchen.

#### Listing description:

Cottage at end of row. English bond brick with stone dressings, tiled roof with gable end brick stack to right. Two-storey, 1- window. C20 glazed door to left, 2-light casement with stone architrave to right hand, ground and first floor. Lean-to addition to rear. Included primarily for group value.

Works to the bathroom include blocking up a window and removing a solid partition wall. This extension appears to be an older extension but not part of the original fabric and likely to be an

early to mid-twentieth century addition. The window has modern chunky joinery and blocking up the opening with matching materials would be satisfactory. Demolition of this internal wall poses no concerns given that this is not a significant part of the listed building.

The rear extension that houses the existing kitchen is a later addition and has an unsympathetic form and palette of materials (rendered walls, cement sheet roofing and uPVC door and window. The works to this building would enhance it with a steeper pitch to provide a tiled roof. The use of clay plain tiles and conservation rooflights would be an enhancement. The use of a timber door would be an enhancement. Squaring off the entrance poses no concerns and use of matching render would be pragmatic.

Internally the proposal details opening up the back room and the kitchen. This would result in the loss of historic fabric with demolition of the solid historic rear wall and loss of the door and window that occupy the apertures. This would be a regrettable loss of historic fabric, however it has been minimised through the retention of the flanking walls that would continue to allow the building's legibility to be expressed. The harm to the significance of the listed building would be at the very lower end of the less than significant harm.

This limited harm is on balance outweighed by allowing the building to adapt and evolve to meet modern living requirements. The two rooms that would be combined are very small and the back room is also the corridor to the bathroom. Opening up the space would make a more attractive space that would function better for modern living. This in turn would make it a more desirable property and help to ensure that it is occupied and maintained so that it does not fall into a further state of disrepair. The legibility of the original space would be retained through retaining nibs of the walls.

This is an on balance conclusion and it is noted that the reason for its listing is primarily its group value. That would be unaffected by the works.

Neighbour amenity:

The proposals would not cause any demonstrable harm to the neighbouring amenity given the nature and scale of the works and its relationship to neighbouring property. The nearest neighbouring window to the works appears to serve a ground floor bathroom.

Any other material considerations:

It was noted on-site inspection that corrugated cement sheeting exists on the existing building and would be removed as part of these works. This is likely to contain asbestos. It is a matter that has been raised by the neighbour also. It has been discussed with the applicant and their agent and they are aware of the need to take precautions with disposal of asbestos and they agree that the demolition will involve materials likely to contain asbestos. In the circumstances an informative is considered prudent. This has been agreed in discussion with the Council's contaminated land officer.

From site inspection and a desk based study, as well as the responses received there are no other relevant planning considerations.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approve subject to conditions.