

1.0 [WD/D/19/002093](#)

Site Address - OLD SCHOOL HOUSE, LOOKE LANE, PUNCKNOWLE, DORCHESTER, DT2 9BD

Proposal - Erect a double storey extension and alterations

Applicant name – Mr R and Miss D Kingston and Travers

Case Officer – Amelia Rose

Ward Member(s) – Cllr Roberts

Taking account of representations made during the Scheme of Delegation consultation with Members, the Head of Service considers that under the provisions of Dorset Council’s constitution this application should be determined by the Area Planning Committee.

1.1 Summary of Recommendation: Refusal

2.0 Reason for the recommendation:

2.1 The proposal would result in an unduly dominating and prominent extension to this dwelling as identified in the Conservation Area appraisal as an important local building and which makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. As such, by reason of its projection beyond the side wall of the existing house, the proposed extension would not preserve or enhance the Puncknowle Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to Policy ENV4, ENV10, and ENV12 of the adopted West Dorset and Weymouth and Portland Local Plan 2015; Section 72 (the preserve/enhance test) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the guidance as set in the Puncknowle Conservation Area Appraisal December 2007.

3.0 Key planning issues

Issue	Conclusion
Principle of Development	The site lies outside of any DDB and therefore policy HOUS6 is relevant, however the proposal is considered to comply with this policy
Design	Considered acceptable in itself as an extension to a dwelling but given the site context would be unacceptable for the reasons stated
Amenity	Not considered to result in a significant adverse effect on living conditions of neighbouring properties or future occupiers of the proposed development.
Heritage Assets	Significantly detrimental impact on designated heritage assets, eroding the character of the Old School House and Old School to which it is attached. The dwelling is mentioned 4 times within the Conservation Area Appraisal and is a locally important building, considered a key view/vista within the village and a landmark. It is therefore

	considered that the proposal would result in harm to the designated heritage assets, contrary to policy ENV4 of the Local Plan with no overriding public benefit to outweigh the less than substantial harm as set out in the NPPF.
Highway Safety	Highways raise no objections.
Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)	Not CIL liable.

4.0 Description of Site

4.1 Old School House is a two storey semi-detached dwelling situated to the east of Looke Lane in Puncknowle, outside of any defined development boundary. The dwelling is comprised of stone walls with a slate tiled roof and uPVC fenestration. The property is a historic building which is of Local Importance; though not listed it is therefore locally listed and is attached to what was the once the former School in the village which is now a Village Hall. It is understood to have once formed the school master's accommodation to the former school. The Hall and dwelling lie in a prominent location in the village, and are considered a key view/vista as well as a local landmark.

5.0 Description of Proposal

5.1 The proposal is for the erection of a two storey side extension with a gable end to match that of the existing dwelling. The proposal would be comprised of stone and render walls with a slate roof and uPVC fenestration.

6.0 Relevant Planning History

6.1 None relevant.

7.0 Relevant Constraints

- Dorset Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
- Bride Valley landscape of geological interest
- Puncknowle Conservation Area

8.0 Consultations

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

8.1 **Highways-** *no highway comment.*

8.2 **Minerals and Waste Authority-** *The MPA has no comment on this proposal, as it is within an existing building curtilage.*

8.3 **Puncknowle Parish Council-** *The Parish Council support this application which they believe will bring this property up to modern day standards.*

8.4 **Conservation Officer-** *Being an "undesigned heritage asset" with the gable end specifically mentioned in the Conservation Area Appraisal and the site as one of four local landmarks, that because of this significance the gable end (with no*

fenestration or other features) is considered the key feature of this site (and mentioned specifically) so the proposal as submitted with a first floor window and bi-fold doors at ground floor level do NOT preserve this setting and is therefore contrary to section 72 of the Planning (listed building and conservation area) Act 1990. In terms of the NPPF it would be contrary to Paras 192, 193 and 194.

9.0 Representations

9.1 Ten representations have been received in total on the application.

Eight representations are in support of the application making comments that the proposal would modernise the dwelling and enhance the community and they support the couple living within the dwelling. Many express fears that if the dwelling was not extended, then it could lead to the dwelling being used as a holiday home of which there are many within the village, however this is not a material planning consideration and therefore cannot be considered as part of this application.

Comments have also been made that the kitchen and bathroom are no longer fit for purpose, are not safe and are difficult to keep warm. Renovations are therefore called for to make the dwelling more 'safe and secure, particularly for a family, whilst making the cottage appear more appealing externally'.

A representation was also received from the Village Hall committee. They are concerned that the Old School House is an intrinsic part of the Village Hall and helps to form a significant part of the history and architecture of this Village.

10.0 Relevant Policies

National Planning Policy Framework

As far as this application is concerned the following section(s) of the NPPF are considered to be relevant;

Para 38 - Local planning authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way. They should use the full range of planning tools available, including brownfield registers and permission in principle, and work proactively with applicants to secure developments that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. Decision-makers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible.

Part 2 - Achieving sustainable development

Part 5 - Delivering a sufficient supply of homes

Part 12 - Achieving well- designed places

Part 16 Conserving the Historic Environment

Adopted West Dorset and Weymouth & Portland Local Plan (2015)

As far as this application is concerned, the following policies are considered to be

relevant:

INT1. Presumption in favour of sustainable development
ENV1. Landscape, Seascape and Sites of Geological Interest
ENV4. Heritage Assets
ENV10. The landscape and townscape setting
ENV12. The design and positioning of buildings
ENV16. Amenity
HOUS6. Other residential development outside defined development boundaries

Other material planning considerations:

- Dorset Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Management Plan 2019-24
- West Dorset Landscape Character Appraisal 2009
- Puncknowle Conservation Area Appraisal

11.0 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.

12.0 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 PSED.

In the context of the above PSED duties the scheme includes some parking spaces in close proximity to the units to provide easier access, the proposal involves units on the ground floor all at one level and the provision of a lift and mobility scooter storage.

13.0 Financial benefits

Material benefits of the proposed development

Affordable Housing	N/A
CIL Contributions	Will not be CIL Liable

Non-material benefits of the proposed development	
Council Tax	Not known
New Homes Bonus	N/A

14.0 Climate Implications

14.1 Energy would be used as a result of the production of the building materials and during the construction process. However that is inevitable when building extensions to houses and a balance has to be struck between meeting the needs of the population versus conserving natural resources and minimising energy use.

14.2 The development would also be built to current building regulation standards at the time of construction.

15.0 Planning Assessment - The following issues are considered the key relevant issues to this proposal:

- Design and impact on character and appearance of the area including Conservation Area
- Impact on neighbours amenity

15.1 Design and impact on character and appearance of the area including Conservation Area

15.1.1 The site is situated outside of the defined development boundary and therefore Policy HOUS6 is relevant which states how extensions to dwellings should not exceed generally more than 40% of the original dwelling. This is important to retain a variety of sizes of dwellings in the countryside, some more affordable than others. Although the extension is considered to be a large, it is considered acceptable and therefore not contrary to policy in this respect.

15.1.2 The site is also situated within the Dorset Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty however it is within a residential area adjoined to an existing building, and the proposed two storey extension is not considered to result in significantly detrimental landscape impact in AONB terms.

15.1.3 The dwelling is mentioned four times within the Conservation Area Appraisal. It is firstly listed as an important local building, recognised for its 'mid-Victorian Tudor rubble and ashlar dressings, large mullioned windows with stone relieving arches over and wooden casement to Hall, conspicuous stone coped gables, simpler casements with cambered stone lintels to House, porch and good stone boundary wall to Looke Lane; of architectural and group value.' A key view and vista of the village includes 'the first full view of the Church from the bend in the lane by The Old School House', and the dwelling is also listed as a landmark.

15.1.4 The existing dwelling forms part of the existing diminutive and subservient character associated with the Old School and the proposed extension is considered to result in a more dominant and conspicuous feature in the street scene. This would erode the existing historic and rare relationship which can still be seen between the former school and Old School House, and would be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

15.1.5 It is therefore considered that the gable end, with no current fenestration or other features, is the key feature of this site as specifically mentioned in the Conservation Area Appraisal. Therefore, the proposal as submitted with the first floor window and bi-fold doors at ground floor level do not preserve this character and the extension would as a result not preserve nor enhance the character of the Conservation Area and is therefore considered contrary to Section 72 (the preserve/enhance test) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. In terms of the NPPF it Para 192 states:

192. In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:
a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

15.1.6 Para 193 states:

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.

15.1.7 and para 194 states in part:

194. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification

15.1.8 Para 196 states:

196. 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.

15.1.9 In this case there would be harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area but this would be less than substantial. However there would be no public benefits arising from the proposal other than the private interests of the applicant wishing to extend their dwelling and for them wishing to make use of what they consider to be optimum use of it. However it appears to have long since existed in its current form and is only now proposed to be extended as a result of the current occupiers wishes. The conclusion remains that the character and appearance of the Conservation Area would not be preserved or enhanced.

15.2 Impact on neighbours amenity

15.2.1 The dwelling lies on the corner of Looke Lane and is situated in close proximity to Offley and Myrtle Cottages. To the rear elevation (east) lies Offley, of which the proposed extension would be adjacent to the dwelling and garden of, however a bathroom is proposed to the rear first floor of the extension, and therefore there would be no direct outlook into the neighbouring dwelling or garden. The proposed extension would be set in from the boundaries of its curtilage and is therefore not considered to pose an overbearing or dominating impact to Offley.

15.2.2 With regards to Myrtle Cottages which lie to the north of the site, the proposed extension would lie around 12m away from the cottages, and this is considered sufficient distance to not result in an overbearing or dominating impact being detrimental to the amenity of those occupiers. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in terms of amenity.

16.0 Conclusion

16.1 The conclusion remains that the character and appearance of the Conservation Area would not be preserved as a result of the proposal and hence the unfavourable recommendation.

17.0 Recommendation -

17.1 Refusal for the following reasons:

The proposal would result in an unduly dominating and prominent extension to this dwelling as identified in the Conservation Area appraisal as an important local building and which makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. As such, by reason of its projection beyond the side wall of the existing house, the proposed extension would not preserve or enhance the Puncknowle Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to Policy ENV4, ENV10, and ENV12 of the adopted West Dorset and Weymouth and Portland Local Plan 2015; Section 72 (the preserve/enhance test) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the guidance as set in the Puncknowle Conservation Area Appraisal December 2007.