

**REFERENCE:** 10/00519/FUL & 10/00520/LBC

**SITE:** The Coach House, Little Eslington

**PROPOSAL:** 10/00519/FUL: Two storey extension with single storey glazed link

10/00520/LBC: Two storey extension with single storey glazed link and internal alterations

**RECOMMENDATION:** Refuse

## 1 PROPOSAL

The application relates to a former coach house that is curtilage listed to the principal building known as Eslington and Little Eslington. The site is wholly located within the Central Conservation Area.

The proposed extension involves the erection of a 2-storey structure which would be linked to the existing coach house by a glazed link.

## 2 PLANNING HISTORY

**09/01871/PREAPP** Contrary to policy – Officers unable to support  
Extension to rear

**10//00970/PREAPP** Contrary to policy – Officers unable to support  
Extension to rear

## 3 POLICIES AND GUIDANCE

Cheltenham Local Plan Policy  
BE9 – Alteration to Listed Buildings  
CP7 – Design

Gloucestershire Structure Plan (Second Review)  
NHE6 – Historic Environment

National Planning Guidance  
PPS1 – Delivering Sustainable Development  
PPS5 – Planning for the Historic Environment

## 4 CONSULTATIONS

**Architects Panel 11th May 2010**

1. Project Description and Reference.

10/00519/FUL - The Coach House, Little Eslington, Thirlestaine Road, Cheltenham, Two storey extension with single storey glazed link

2. Observations on Presentation.

The presentation was of a good level and explained the scheme well.

3. Principal of Development.

The garden space that is retained by the existing property is of a more than adequate size as is the garden space that has been assigned to the new dwelling. As such we believe that the sub-division of the site will not detract from the character of the existing property.

4. Quality of Design.

A very interesting a scheme, with a range of spaces of varying size and character. The scale of the new element against the existing coach house is appropriate and helps the scheme reducing in scale as it addresses the garden space.

5. Summary.

The extent of some of the external cladding may be a little excessive in relationship to the internal courtyard that is created but essentially this is a competent and well handled proposal.

6. Recommendation.

### **Heritage And Conservation 27th May 2010**

#### Comments

1. The applicants are not intending to change the existing north elevation to this curtilage listed building.
2. However there are proposed changes to the existing south elevation to this curtilage listed building such as a new window, alteration to a door opening and blocking up a door opening. A south elevation of this curtilage listed building has not been provided. Therefore this application should be made invalid and the missing information should be supplied.
3. However putting aside the omission on the proposed elevation information, I am concerned about the proposed extension. It may be possible in principle that this small former coach house building could be extended with a small extension.
4. However this proposed extension is too big. The form, mass, footprint, general design and use of materials all act together in a manner which physically and visually dominates the small vernacular coach house.
5. It should be noted that a Design and Access Statement does not appear to have been submitted. It is worth noting that in PPS5 policy HE6.1 and HE6.2 both request that applicants provide a description of the significance of the heritage asset which is affected by the development. This does not been done by this applicant.
6. In my opinion this application not only adversely affects the curtilage listed former coach house, but the proposed extension also harms the setting of the principal listed building, by its visual and physical dominance.

#### CONCLUSION REFUSE

#### Approval reason

**Refusal reason**

The Coach House is a grade II (curtilage) listed building and Little Eslington/Eslington is a grade II listed building. They are both of architectural and historic importance. The proposed alterations and extension, by virtue of the form, mass, footprint, general design, and materials of the extension would harm the character, appearance and setting of the curtilage listed building (ie Coach House) and the principal listed building (ie Little Eslington/Eslington). Accordingly, the proposals are contrary to sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990, national policy set out at PPS5 and policy CP7 of the Adopted Cheltenham Borough Local plan.

**Tree Officer 14th May 2010**

The tree section has no objections to this application providing the following information can be submitted upfront in relation to a mature cedar in an adjacent property;

- Method statement to include; how they intend to demolish existing garage and also protective fencing, storage of materials, service runs etc (basically to show that materials, service runs etc won't be stored within the root protection area of the adjacent cedar)
- Tree Protection Plan indicating the area to be fenced off to prevent compaction to the rooting area of the cedar

Basically similar information, just no need for information relating to proposed garage as no longer part of the application.

**Tree Officer 26th April 2010**

The tree section has no objections to this application providing the following information can be submitted upfront in relation to a mature cedar in an adjacent property;

- Method statement to include; how they intend to demolish existing garage and also for the construction of the foundations for the proposed garage, protective fencing, storage of materials, service runs etc
- Tree Protection Plan indicating the area to be fenced off to prevent compaction to the rooting area of the cedar

**Engineering Services 27th April 2010**

I refer to the above planning application received on 14/04/2010, to which no Highway objection is raised.

**5 PUBLICITY AND REPRESENTATIONS****5.1 Representations**

Number of contributors	<b>3</b>
Number of objections	<b>1</b>
Number of representations	<b>0</b>
Number of supporting	<b>2</b>

Park House	Reason(s)
------------	-----------

Thirlestaine Road Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL53 7AS	Support of proposal
--	---------------------

**Comments:**

Letter is attached for members to view.

Garden House Thirlestaine Road Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL53 7AS	<b>Reason(s)</b> Support of proposal
--	---

**Comments:**

The proposed extension to the Coach House seems to me a sensible and logical scheme suitable for this residential location. Due to its scale I will not be inconvenienced by the extension, the design and appearance of which I like.

As the Coach House is already a separate dwelling I do not foresee traffic problems or feel that my local services will be adversely affected.

103 Old Bath Road Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL53 7DA	<b>Reason(s)</b> Poor design Out of keeping with area
--	---

**Comments:**

Below, please find our comments and concerns for the proposal of the above named property:

--The proposed design is not in keeping with the Regency buildings on three sides, and the traditional new houses on the fourth. If the proposal were to mirror the existing Coach House, this would be more pleasing to the eye for all neighbouring properties. We believe that developing a "complex with modern character" will change the traditional look of the area and is an unnecessarily obtrusive design.

--We feel that although it is stated in the application that it is not a new dwelling, it is for all intents and purposes to be one as it will be the primary living quarters for the owners, extending into new space. This new dwelling will be seen by no less than 8 neighbouring properties, therefore affecting the way these 8 neighbouring families currently live.

--The proposed building materials (including extensive use of zinc, aluminium and glass for roof, windows, and cladding) are architecturally inharmonious and inappropriate in character: they introduce a harsh mechanical aspect to what is a green, very beautiful, collective garden landscape. Is this the architect's or the applicants' intention? Why so obtrusive? Why not keep to brick and tile in keeping with the Coach House itself?

--Please also note, glass and metals cause reflective glare. Has this impact been taken into account? - it is not easy to predict, nor rectify after the event. If this should occur persistently to the neighbouring properties, it will undermine good neighbourhood relations.

--Is there a guarantee that, in any future application, the proposed new footprint will not be used as de facto grounds to support a more substantial in-filled building plan?

--From our situation, we overlook the proposed new building along our western boundary. Unless the garden wall is raised several feet, we would expect to be exposed to the additional lighting from the Glazed Conservatory Link. Also, we can assume that there will be security lights for the car turning circle, which will very much affect us.

## **6 OFFICER COMMENTS**

6.1 Pre-application discussions in respect of extending the former coach house to achieve an increased level of residential accommodation to that which currently exists have been on-going between the agent, on behalf of the applicant, and Officers since December 2009. This pre-application discussion approach is advocated in national planning policy and guidance - PPS1. It is therefore unfortunate, following these lengthy pre-application discussions, that Officers advice has not been reflected in this current proposal.

6.2 The main considerations of this proposal are i) any impact the proposed may have on the special interests of the curtilage listed building and the setting of the nearby principal grade II listed building and ii) the protection of adjoining residential amenities.

### **6.3 Historic Environment**

In the consideration of proposals involving buildings of historic and architectural importance it is fundamental to consider the nature or status of the building you are dealing with and the special interests which it processes. Typical of this type of lower status ancillary building is its simple linear form and modest level of architectural detailing.

6.4 Architectural and historical information, which in this case, refers to the buildings functional ancillary nature which is, architecturally expressed through its simple form and modest level of detail should subsequently inform and influence the evolution and formation of any design proposals. Unfortunately, the special interests of this curtilage listed building have not been properly assessed or used to inform these current design proposals.

6.5 Contemporary styles of architecture that create honest buildings and additions to building where appropriate and sympathetic to their context are welcomed by Officers. The proposed design approach of this scheme although considered contemporary in appearance does not take account of the building, its valued historic context or wider setting.

6.6 Officers consider that the proposal would result in an addition that would be harmful to the character of this building. The proposed by virtue of its scale, form, mass, footprint, general design approach and materials would not preserve or

enhance this functional buildings simple linear form and modest level of architectural detail and thus result in the loss of its remaining special interests.

6.7 Furthermore, the resulting harm to the character of the coach house would subsequently be detrimental to the relationship between the principal building and this, its subordinate ancillary building. Accordingly, the proposal would not preserve or enhance the special interests of the curtilage listed building, nor protect the setting of the nearby listed building and would be harmful to the character and appearance of the wider conservation area. For these reasons the proposal would be contrary to Local Plan Policy CP7, Structure Plan Policy NHE6 and national policy & guidance set out in PPS5.

#### 6.6 Protection of Adjoining Residential Amenities

The coach house sits comfortably within a good sized plot and an independent residential use already exists. Whilst Officers are aware of the proposed high levels of glazing this would not materially compromise the residential amenities of the adjoining occupiers.

6.7 In conclusion, the proposal would not comply with relevant development plan policies or national policy and guidance and should therefore be refused for the following reason:

### **7 CONDITIONS/REFUSAL REASONS**

- 1 The Coach House is a grade II (curtilage) listed building and Little Eslington/Eslington is a grade II listed building. They are both of architectural and historic importance. The proposed alterations and extension, by virtue of the scale, form, mass, footprint, general design, and materials of the extension would harm the character, appearance and setting of the curtilage listed building (ie Coach House) and the principal listed building (ie Little Eslington/Eslington). Accordingly, the proposals are contrary to sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990, national guidance contained within PPS5, Policy CP7 of the Adopted Cheltenham Borough Local Plan and Policy S6 of the Gloucestershire Structure Plan (Second Review).