

20/04079/FUL - 20/04080/LBA Vine Cottage

Demolition of existing stone wall. Replacement with new stone wall to improve vehicular access and parking provision and change of garage door material from softwood to steel.

Key Points:

- Listed Building
- Within the conservation area
- The neighbouring property Rowan House had an application (16/03713/FUL) to remove a smaller section of wall approved at appeal.

A key objective of the adopted Freshford and Limpley Stoke Neighbourhood Development Plan is to protect the local Conservation Area. This is expanded on further within the Freshford and Sharpstone Conservation Area Character Appraisal, in which boundary rubble walls within the village are specifically highlighted as a feature of special interest. It states: *"Protection of the boundary walls is a high priority and they should not be neglected. Traditional repairs with lime mortar should be encouraged. The removal of boundary walls to provide access or parking should be resisted."*

In addition to the Conservation Area Appraisal, saved Local Plan policy BH.7 states that the total or substantial demolition of structures which make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area should not be permitted, unless the proposed development would make a significantly greater contribution to the Conservation Area.

Although this is a similar application to the one next door, there are two key differences. Firstly, Vine Cottage already has parking spaces, whereas Rowan House did not. Secondly, this application seeks permission to demolish 5 meters of wall whereas the Rowan House application was for 2.5 meters.

Part of the application refers also to a proposal to replace the wooden doors of the garage with a single metal roll over door. We don't believe this is a suitable or acceptable alternative to what already exists.

Recommendation: Object

The application fails to preserve or enhance the Conservation Area. Any degree of public benefit does not outweigh the visual harm to the Conservation Area.

20/04186/FUL 6 Upper Mount Pleasant

Erection of single storey outbuilding following removal of existing.

Key Points:

- Within the conservation area.
- Neighbourhood Plan - Planning and Development Policy - Heritage: "The historic fabric of buildings should be preserved and repaired wherever possible".

Comments in brief:

- The current proposal would not be larger than the existing building, and it seems probable that it will not be regarded as inappropriate development.
- The proposed development lies within the conservation area and so regard must be had to the desirability or preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the area.
- The build is not very visible as it lies to the back of the property and cannot be seen from Rosemary Lane.

- Despite being in a dilapidated state the existing building has some charm, and conservation value. Therefore we would like to see the stone building retained with a pitched roof.
- Whilst we agree with the Design and Access Statement; *"The proposed new building makes very good use of the land and enhances the environment and being utilised for home working encourages the sustainable approach, reducing commuting and strengthening community ties as referenced within the National Framework for planning and Freshford and Limpley Stoke Neighbourhood plan (section 2.1)". The same might be achieved by renovating the existing building.*

Recommendation: Comment Only

In line with our Neighbourhood Plan Policy. We believe the building does have some conservation value, and would like to see the building preserved and repaired wherever possible rather than demolished and replaced.

20/03390/FUL The Under Galleries

Key Points:

- The property is inside Greenbelt and AONB.
- The property is outside of the Conservation area but does abut the boundary, and is in a prominent position particularly when viewed from the Tynning.

Key differences to last proposal:

- According to the correspondence from the applicant's architect an original volume has now been agreed.
- No carport is now being added.
- John Adler has brought it to my attention that the recently added Bat survey does not appear to be accurate in stating there are no roosts within 4km of the property, as he has found one c.850m away. John will expand on this point at the meeting.
- Little alteration has been made to the proposed design, other than a reduction in glazing on the West Elevation, which is considered an improvement.

Planning Advisory Groups previous comments:

- It is the view of the Working Group that the design lacks architectural merit, and it would be helpful to have more detail provided. Craig's notes below provide detail on how the lack of design quality relates back to planning policy.
- The size of the extension is in our view disproportionate, and the additional volume calculation provided in the Design and Access Statement of 36% appears to be incorrect. It does not seem take into account three extensions which have already been made under previous application 00/01062/FUL. The volume of which should be included when calculating the total additional volume, and considering the Banes SPD Greenbelt Guidance "a well designed extension resulting in a volume increase of about a third of the original dwelling would be more likely to be acceptable". It is also unclear whether these past additions may also have been included in the calculation of the "Original Volume" as "Existing Volume" is the term used in calculation table provided. If this is the case, it will result in a smaller percentage volume increase being calculated i.e. the original volume of the property would have been smaller than the existing volume, so the addition is proportionally larger when compared to the original instead of existing volume.

Recommendation: Comment only