

Application Number:	P/LBC/2023/03823		
Webpage:	https://planning.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/		
Site address:	2 Long Street Cerne Abbas DT2 7JF		
Proposal:	Erect two single storey and two first floor extension to rear. Alterations internal and external to re-position stairs and renew slate roof covering and install insulation.		
Applicant name:	Karen Malim and Richard Gueterbock		
Case Officer:	Nicholas Batten		
Ward Member(s):	Cllr Haynes		
Publicity expiry date:	18 August 2023	Officer site visit date:	Planning officer visited the site on the 28 September 2023, and site notice photographs were received from the applicant/agent on the 24 July 2023.
Decision due date:	8 September 2023	Ext(s) of time:	
No of Site Notices:	1		
SN displayed reasoning:	Site notice displayed on the front gate adjacent to the highway.		

1.0 Application is considered at planning committee as the Scheme of Delegation referral requested a committee decision.

2.0 Summary of recommendation:

REFUSE for the following reasons:

- The proposal enlarges the listed building on the ground floor and the first floor and the extent and scale of the extensions would fail to conserve or enhance the significance of the building. The listed building has already been altered and extended, and the external alterations to 2 Long Street would cause less than

substantial harm to the character, original plan form, symmetry, setting and significance of the heritage asset, Holly Lodge a grade II listed building, which is listed as 2 and 4 Long Street, with no overriding public benefit. The proposal is contrary to Policy ENV4 of the adopted Local Plan, the National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 199, 202 and 206 and Section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

- The internal alterations fail to respect the original plan form and the relocation of the stairs will cause harm to the historic fabric of the building. This will have a detrimental effect on the architectural and historical significance of the listed building. This harm is considered to be less than substantial to the significance of the listed building, to which there is no overriding public benefit, as the optimum viable use is attainable without such alterations. The proposal is contrary to Policy ENV4 of the adopted Local Plan, the National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 199 and 202 and Section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act) 1990.

3.0 Reason for the recommendation:

- The proposal is considered to lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the grade II listed building, Holly Lodge.
- The harm to the significance of the heritage asset has more weight than public benefits and is not outweighed.
- The listed building is capable of use as a dwelling and so this proposal is not necessary to secure its optimal viable use.
- The harm to the historical interest of the building includes the character, setting, loss of historic fabric, and detrimental impact on the plan form and layout harming the architectural interest and features of the building.

4.0 Key planning issues

Issue	Conclusion
Impacts on heritage assets	The proposal leads to less than substantial harm to the designated heritage asset, Holly Lodge, this harm is not offset by the public benefits of the proposal, and the alterations/extensions would not contribute positively to the asset’s conservation, harming the historic fabric, character, original plan form and significance.

	The proposal is not considered to harm the nearby listed buildings or the Cerne Abbas Conservation Area.
--	--

5.0 Description of Site

The proposal relates to no.2 Long Street, which is one half of a pair of semi-detached dwellinghouses, jointly listed as 2 and 4 Long Street (Holly Lodge). The principal elevation facing the highway to the front is of significance with stone walls, stuccoed and painted white and of 19th century construction. The building is 2 storey, with an attic and a 20th century dormer on the front elevation of 2 Long Street. 2 Long Street has been extended to the rear with two storey and single storey extensions, and a single storey side extension. The walls of the extensions are painted white and the roofs are natural slate, except for the flat roof extension. The front elevation windows are timber and sash painted white, and the other windows and patio doors are timber and painted white. There are brick end chimney stacks to the two storey gables to the side and rear elevation, and a further dormer on the rear elevation. It is likely the two storey extension to the rear is a Victorian extension.

The building is grade II listed and 4 Long Street adjoins 6 Long Street, which is also grade II listed. On the other side of the highway facing the applicants building is 1 Long Street a grade II listed building, and there are a number of other listed buildings within the locality. The site is close to the historic centre of Cerne Abbas and is within the Cerne Abbas Conservation Area.

6.0 Description of Development

The proposed development is to 2 Long Street only and consists of single storey extensions to the rear to extend the kitchen, with the door and window repositioned, and a side extension to extend an existing lean-to. First floor extensions are a flat roof extension above the existing flat roof on the ground floor to provide a landing, and an extension above the single storey lean-to to form a two storey end gable. Other internal alterations include the removal of stud walls, relocation of the stairs and doors repositioned and unblocked. Work is proposed to restore the chimney fireplaces and to replace the front door.

The external materials are lime render walls, slate roofs (except the flat roof) and timber windows.

7.0 Relevant Planning History

P/PAP/2022/00817 - Decision: RES - Decision Date: 06/02/2023

Repairs and alterations to dwelling

8.0 List of Constraints

LB - Grade: II Listed Building: K6 TELEPHONE KIOSK (AT JUNCTION OF LONG STREET AND BACK LANE) NO 228 List Entry: 1119406.0

LB - Grade: II Listed Building: BROOK COTTAGE List Entry: 1323834.0

LB - Grade: II Listed Building: HOLLY LODGE List Entry: 1119445.0

LB - Grade: II Listed Building: RALEIGHS List Entry: 1119446.0

Within defined development boundary of Cerne Abbas.

Grade II listed building (statutory duty to preserve or enhance the significance of heritage assets under the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990)

Within the Cerne Abbas Conservation Area (statutory duty to preserve or enhance the significance of heritage assets under the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990)

9.0 Consultations

All consultee responses can be viewed in full on the website.

Consultees

- 1. Ward Member - Chalk Valleys Ward** - This property has been empty for many years and is in a very run down condition. It was difficult to sell due to the steepness of the stairs, which are unsafe. The new owners would like a three bed home, and English Heritage as written in the consultation response have no objections. The Parish Council request that the proposal is dealt with by the Dorset Council officers as significant matters need to be addressed, and as the Conservation Officer has an opposing view to the English Heritage consultation, this proposal should be decided at planning committee. Empty properties should be occupied.
- 2. DC - Rights of Way Officer** – No comments received.
- 3. Cerne Abbas Parish Council** - Defer to the listed building officer.
- 4. Ramblers Association** – No comments received.
- 5. Historic England** – Requested further information to demonstrate the claims of the heritage statement.
- 6. National Amenity Societies** – No comments received.
- 7. DC – Conservation Officers** – The proposals will result in the following impacts on the significance of identified heritage assets:

Ground-floor

Remove staircase and reposition in the front room. The proposal is not to place the staircase back in the position of the original staircase but in the adjacent front room. Whilst further evidence has been submitted showing that the existing staircase is not in the position of the original staircase, further concerns remain when taking into account the different phases of construction of the house along with its overall character and architectural merit. The staircase was likely located in its current position when the rear room was constructed in the mid-19th century, giving the two front rooms a reception/public character. When the rear extensions were added throughout the 19th century, the character of the original two-up two-down town house was changed, leaving the front rooms free of any utilitarian features.

Moving the staircase back in one of the front rooms, and not in its original position, would completely change the hierarchy and character of these rooms as created in the mid-19th century. It will also alter the entire circulation of the house. As such, the relocation in a new position will impact on the character of the front rooms and therefore on the significance of the house, leading to harm to the listed building.

As mentioned in the Heritage Statement, the staircase is significant of the Georgian vernacular building by its style with a mahogany handrail, and by its steep straight lift. Whilst this may not have been the original staircase, it does hold some level of architectural significance. The handrail is very steep and is therefore an indication that it was purposely built for such a steep staircase. Whilst it is proposed for the handrail to be reused, it is difficult to see how it would fit a new staircase, unless it is built as steep as the existing one. Unfortunately, removing the staircase and placing it in the proposed location would lead to harm to the historic fabric, character of the house and planform. The harm caused in this case would be greater than any benefits. Please note that existing building, and their internal features are not required to be brought up to newer building regulations standards.

Whilst some elements of the pre-application advice have been followed (removal of the first floor extension for a new bedroom), some others have been added (new first-floor extensions for a corridor and a bathroom) or have remained (relocation of the staircase).

Relocation of bathroom

The proposed bathroom will require an external wall of the original house to be partly removed which will lead to loss of historic fabric. This is not acceptable, and no clear justifications can be found.

As such, the overall proposal will lead to harm to the character and historic fabric of the listed building. No overriding public benefit can be found to outweigh the harm and this application cannot be supported.

8. Historic England – Historic England were re-consulted on the submission of further information on the 6 September 2023 and commented as follows:

We wrote to you on 20 July 2023 requesting additional information to substantiate the claim that the existing staircase is not in its original position. The applicant's photographs, uploaded to your planning website on 30th August 2023, provide the necessary proof that the staircase indeed appears to have been moved, probably when the building was used as a tea shop in the early 20th century.

The relocation of the staircase to something approximating its original position will have no impact on the building's significance, and we note that the handrail, which may be original, we be reused. This being the case I confirm that Historic England have no objection to the proposals, and are content for the application to be determined in line with National and local planning policy and guidance, and on the basis of your own internal specialist conservation advice.

Recommendation Historic England has no objection to the application on heritage grounds. Your authority should take these representations into account in determining the application. If there are any material changes to the proposals, or you would like further advice, please contact us. Please advise us of the decision in due course.

Representations received

Total - Objections	Total - No Objections	Total - Comments
0	10	

10 letters of support were received containing the following summarised points:

- The property has remained unoccupied for several years, with interested buyers concerned on the safety of the staircase. It is narrow, vertiginous, and has little natural light. It has no historic value, moving it, contrary to the Conservation view, would benefit all and everyone who enter the house. There is no external change involved in the movement of the staircase. Many of us in the village are conscious of our building heritage, caring for the buildings as best as possible involves being able to live practically and safely.
- The alterations would enhance the street scene, the property has evolved over the years and these additions would make it fit for modern living.
- The current staircase is discriminatory under the Equalities Act and does not meet building regulations standards.

- Historic buildings can only survive and benefit the environment if flexibility is incorporated to take account of the realities of modern living.
- The relocation of the staircase will not affect the architectural and historic value of the house, given that the staircase has already been moved. It is not necessary for the listed building consent system to preserve every internal detail of residential buildings.
- Support the re-rendering, removal of external cables, replacement of front door and the roof and staircase need repair.
- The proposals enhance the property in accordance of the aims as well as the detail of the Neighbourhood Plan, without approval the property is unlikely to be suitable for the applicants, and the building is at risk of further unsightly deterioration.

10.0 Duties

The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990- section 16 requires that in considering whether to grant listed building consent, special regard is to be had to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

11.0 Relevant Policies

Adopted West Dorset and Weymouth & Portland Local Plan:

The following policies are considered to be relevant to this proposal:

- INT1 - Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development
- ENV1 - Landscape, seascape & sites of other geological interest
- ENV4 - Heritage assets

Made Neighbourhood Plans:

Cerne Valley Neighbourhood Plan:

Policy 2 All applications for new development should demonstrate high quality of design, use of materials and detail, which reflect local distinctiveness; also having regard to prevailing scale, massing and density and the development principles as set out on page 10 of the Cerne Valley Neighbourhood Plan.

National Planning Policy Framework:

National Planning Policy Framework in particular section 16, paras. 194-208

- Section 16. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment:
Para 199. 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.

Para 202. 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.

Para 206. Local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites, and within the setting of heritage assets, to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to the asset (or which better reveal its significance) should be treated favourably.

National Planning Practice Guidance

The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990- section 16 includes a general duty 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.

12.0 Human rights

Article 6 - Right to a fair trial.

Article 8 - Right to respect for private and family life and home.

The first protocol of Article 1 Protection of property.

This recommendation is based on adopted Development Plan policies, the application of which does not prejudice the Human Rights of the applicant or any third party.

13.0 Public Sector Equalities Duty

As set out in the Equalities Act 2010, all public bodies, in discharging their functions must have "due regard" to this duty. There are 3 main aims:-

- Removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by people due to their protected characteristics
- Taking steps to meet the needs of people with certain protected characteristics where these are different from the needs of other people
- Encouraging people with certain protected characteristics to participate in public life or in other activities where participation is disproportionately low.

Whilst there is no absolute requirement to fully remove any disadvantage the Duty is to have “regard to” and remove or minimise disadvantage and in considering the merits of this planning application the planning authority has taken into consideration the requirements of the Public Sector Equalities Duty. It is considered that the application would not materially affect people with protected characteristics and in particular those with impaired mobility.

14.0 Planning Assessment

Impact on heritage asset

The proposal is considered to lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the grade II listed building – no. 2 Long Street. The building has already been extended and enlarged; this includes relatively modern ground floor extensions to the rear of the house to form a flat roof extension and a lean-to. The first-floor extensions above the flat roof extension to form a box room, landing and the end gable extension, would not respect the character and original plan form of the listed building, and when considering the previous extensions, the bulk and symmetry of the building is significantly adversely affected harming the setting and significance of the listed building.

The Conservation Officer has raised objections to the planning permission and listed building consent, by virtue of the harm to the historical interest of the building including the character, setting, loss of historic fabric, and detrimental impact on the plan form and layout harming the architectural interest and features of the building.

Conservation have concerns regarding the internal alterations to relocate the staircase and to the proposed first floor alterations.

Conservation provided the following consultation response:

Pre-application advice suggested the staircase revert back to the position of the original staircase. The application does not follow this advice, with the staircase proposed in the adjacent front room. Whilst further evidence has been submitted showing that the existing staircase is not in the position of the original staircase, concern remains when taking into account the different phases of construction of the house along with its overall character and architectural merit. The staircase was likely located in its current position when the rear room was constructed, giving the two front rooms a reception/public character. When the rear extensions were added, the character of the original two-up two-down town house was changed, leaving the front rooms free of any utilitarian features. Moving the staircase back into one of the front rooms and not its original position, would completely change the hierarchy and character of these rooms as created in the mid-19th century. It will also alter the entire circulation of the house. As such, the proposed relocation will impact on the character of the front rooms and on the significance of the house, leading to harm to

the listed building. The staircase is significant of the Georgian vernacular building by its style with a mahogany handrail, and by its steep straight lift. Whilst this may not have been the original staircase, it does hold some level of architectural significance. The handrail is very steep and is therefore an indication that it was purposely built for such a steep staircase. Removing the staircase and placing it in the proposed location would lead to harm to the historic fabric, character of the house and planform. The harm caused in this case would be greater than any benefits. Conservation advise that that listed buildings and their internal features are not required to be brought up to modern building regulations standards, in order to preserve their special interest.

With regard to the proposed first-floor extensions, the pre-application advice stated that “the addition of an extension to a listed building should not greatly compromise the original planform of the building, nor distract from its character.” Whilst a larger rear bedroom extension was removed from the proposal, following the advice offered, the two proposed first-floor extensions raise several concerns:

- The bathroom extension will completely hide the first-floor extension and change the shape of the ground-floor lean-to at the rear. It will require an external wall of the house to be partly removed, which will lead to loss of historic fabric. This is not acceptable, and no clear justifications can be found. The variety of shape created by the different extensions makes the different phases of the house legible. Squaring and extending the first-floor will compromise this understanding. Considering that there is already a bathroom on the same floor, no clear and convincing justifications can be found to outweigh the harm. While the extensions to improve the current kitchen area and the 20th century garden room are considered acceptable, any further extension would change the historic planform and symmetry with the paired cottage too much.*
- The first floor corridor extension will not only change the “L” shape planform of the building, but also lead to loss of historic fabric and create an incongruously shaped, flat roofed element to the external appearance of the listed building.*

As such, the proposal is contrary to policy ENV4 of the adopted Local Plan, and paragraphs 199, 202 and 206 of the NPPF. The change in the setting and appearance of the building, 2 Long Street, would not make a positive contribution to the significance of the building, contrary to paragraph 206 of the NPPF, and the proposal should not be considered favourably.

In assessment of the less than substantial harm to the significance of the heritage asset, there would be limited public benefit through the rearrangement of the dwelling to make it more accessible, but this benefit is not outweighed by the harm to the asset. The current house is liveable and optimum viable use is possible in its

current form, therefore it is not considered that the works are required to secure the optimum viable use of the building, with regards to paragraph 202 of the NPPF.

Impact on other heritage assets

The proposal is not considered to harm the nearby listed buildings of Cerne Abbas including 1 and 6 Long Street, 1 Long Street is on the opposite side of the highway, and 6 Long Street is adjacent to 4 Long Street. The proposal is single storey to the side elevation and to the rear of the building, therefore, the setting and significance is preserved of the nearby listed buildings, and the character and appearance of the Cerne Abbas Conservation Area, in accordance with policy ENV4 of the Local Plan.

15.0 Conclusion

The proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the listed building and there are no public benefits that outweigh the harm. The harm is to the setting, historical fabric and character of the listed building. The proposal is contrary to policy ENV4 - Heritage assets of the adopted Local Plan, and paragraphs 199, 202 and 206 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

16.0 Recommendation: Refuse

1. The proposal enlarges the listed building and the extent and scale of the first floor extensions would fail to conserve or enhance the significance of the building. The listed building has already been altered and extended, and the external alterations to 2 Long Street would cause less than substantial harm to the character, original plan form, symmetry, setting and significance of the heritage asset, with no overriding public benefit. The proposal is contrary to Policy ENV4 of the adopted Local Plan, the National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 199, 202 and 206 and Section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
2. The internal alterations including the relocation of the stairs fail to respect the original plan form and will cause harm to the historic fabric of the building, to the detriment of the architectural and historical significance of the listed building. This harm is considered to be less than substantial to the significance of the listed building, for which there is no overriding public benefit, as the optimum viable use is attainable without such alterations. The proposal is contrary to Policy ENV4 of the adopted Local Plan, the National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 199 and 202 and Section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act) 1990.