

Case Officer: Gemma Magnuson

Recommendation: Approve

Applicant: Mr & Mrs A Pasteur

Proposal: Discharge of conditions 3 (Opening Details and Material Samples), 4 (Method Statement) & 5 (Insulation Details) of 19/02110/LB

Expiry Date: 18 May 2020

1. APPLICATION SITE AND DESCRIPTION OF APPROVED DEVELOPMENT

- 1.1. Cedar Lodge is a detached Grade II listed dwelling situated to the north of the village of Steeple Aston, in the designated conservation area. Other Grade II listed buildings are situated to the north and west of the site. The site is of medium archaeological interest and it is likely to contain naturally elevated levels of Arsenic. A number of protected and notable species have been identified in the area. Two TPO'd trees are within the site.
- 1.2. The application relates to an existing curtilage listed outbuilding to the south-west of the main dwelling, abutting a curtilage listed wall. Listed building consent was granted on 22 November 2019 for the amendment of external elevational treatment to the outbuilding under reference 19/02110/LB. This was an amendment to an earlier application 19/00532/LB that incorporated alterations to the existing outbuilding and main dwelling. The latter application therefore only dealt with the outbuilding.
- 1.3. Consent was granted subject to conditions. The current application seeks to discharge conditions 3, 4 and 5 from 19/02110/LB.

2. CONDITIONS PROPOSED TO BE DISCHARGED

- 2.1. Condition 3 required details of the openings and construction materials. This was submitted in the form of Mumford and Wood Ltd order details, Conservation Casement details received with the application on 23 March 2020 and Garden Office Method Statement dated 28.11.2019.
- 2.2. Condition 4 required a method statement detailing how the work would be undertaken. This was received in the form of a Garden Office Method Statement dated 28.11.2019.
- 2.3. Condition 5 required details of the insulation adjacent to the existing stone wall. This was contained within the Garden Office Method Statement dated 28.11.2019.

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 3.1. The following planning history is considered relevant to the current proposal:

Application: 19/00531/F

Permitted

17 May 2019

Removal of existing timber framed conservatory, internal alterations, new kitchen extension and the refurbishment of an existing potting shed to form a

new garden studio.

Application: 19/00532/LB Permitted 17 May 2019

Removal of existing timber framed conservatory, internal alterations, new kitchen extension and the refurbishment of an existing potting shed to form a new garden studio.

Application: 19/01418/DISC Permitted 25 November 2020

Discharge of condition 4 (biodiversity enhancements), 5 (schedule of materials) and 6 (Arboricultural Method Statement) of 19/00531/F

Application: 19/01419/DISC Permitted 25 November 2020

Discharge of condition 4 (schedule of materials), 5 (cross section and colour/finish), 7 (French drain details) and 8 (stone floor method statement) of 19/00532/LB

Application: 19/02109/F Permitted 22 November 2019

Amendments to the external elevational treatments to the potting shed/garden studio design as previously permitted under 19/00531/F

Application: 19/02110/LB Permitted 22 November 2019

Amendments to the external elevational treatments to the potting shed/garden studio design as previously permitted under 19/00532/LB

Application: 20/00844/DISC Permitted

Discharge of Condition 3 (opening details and material samples) of 19/02109/F

4. RESPONSE TO PUBLICITY

- 4.1 This application has been publicised by way of a site notice displayed near the site and by advertisement in the local newspaper. The final date for comments was **2 May 2020**, although comments received after this date and before finalising this report have also been taken into account. No comments have been raised by third parties.

5. RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION

- 5.1. CDC Conservation - It is understood that these conditions are retrospective and that the works have already taken place. If this is the case photographs should be submitted.
- 5.2. It is unclear why details of the windows have been submitted as there is no condition for windows. There are remaining concerns that the windows match those on the principal property. There are remaining concerns that the windows are not suitable as they are standard double glazed with applied glazing bars.
- 5.3. **Condition 3** *Prior to the erection of the walls of the outbuilding hereby approved, opening details at a scale of 1:20 including cross sections shall be submitted to, and samples of the proposed construction materials shall be made available for*

inspection on site, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and retained as such thereafter.

- 5.4. The statement which accompanies the application states that the roof slates were agreed on site. Need to establish whether these were the only new materials used on site.
- 5.5. **Condition 4** *Prior to the restoration/reconstruction of the brick piers, a method statement detailing how the work would be undertaken shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.*
- 5.6. The method statement submitted includes details of all works to the potting shed. There are no objections to the method for dismantling and reconstructing the piers.
- 5.7. **Condition 5** *Prior to the installation of any insulation adjacent to the existing stone wall, full details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.*
- 5.8. No details of the proposed insulation have been submitted. Not possible to discharge the condition.
- 5.9. Note that the opening details were required as part of condition 3 and the insulation details required as part of condition 5 were included within the Garden Office Method Statement dated 28.11.2019.
- 5.10. Samples of the slate had already been viewed on site on 11 October 2019 and were considered acceptable, and were subsequently approved on 25 November 2020 (see 19/01418/DISC & 19/01419/DISC). The Agent has referred to these samples as part of the Garden Office Method Statement dated 28.11.2019 submitted with the current application, and it is not considered necessary to pursue further samples.
- 5.11. I drew the above points regarding the openings and insulation details to the attention of the Conservation Officer on 19 May 2020 although no further response was received with regard to the insulation. Please see appraisal with regard to discussions relating to the openings.

6. APPRAISAL

- 6.1. Condition 3 - This current application was received on 23 March 2020 and it is my understanding that this followed the installation of the openings. However, plans of the openings were also submitted with this application.
- 6.2. I received confirmation from the Agent on 06 February 2020 that the openings in the extension had already been installed. The submission of the current application coincided with the COVID-19 pandemic, resulting in a delay in visiting the site. However, during my visit on 27 May 2019 I confirmed that the openings had also been installed within the outbuilding.
- 6.3. The current application followed the consideration of two DISC applications relating to openings (of the same type) within the extension (refs: 19/01418/DISC & 19/01419/DISC) and at this point, the Conservation Officer had already raised concerns regarding the use of standard double glazing with applied glazing bars.

- 6.4. I had raised these concerns with the Agent on 03 February 2020, advising that the openings should consist of slimlite double glazing with integral glazing bars.
- 6.5. As previously mentioned, the Agent advised on 06 February 2020 that the openings had already been installed within the extension. The determination of these DISC applications were therefore delayed whilst the Conservation Officer considered whether or not the details of the openings should be refused and enforcement action pursued. A meeting was due to be held on site on 18 March 2020 although the COVID-19 pandemic resulted in the need for this to be cancelled until further notice.
- 6.6. I received comments from the Conservation Officer on 11 September 2020 advising that *"In my view although the windows on the extension aren't ideal and the Conservation Team would usually try to push for slimlite double glazing I am not sure that it is expedient to enforce those on the extension. The harm is more limited and reversible– (this is the second extension in this location since 2000) and the building is clearly read as a modern addition."*
- 6.7. No comment has been provided specifically with regard to the same openings being used within the outbuilding, although I have applied the same principle. The outbuilding is physically and visually detached from the main dwelling and continues to be read as a separate structure. The work is reversible, with the opportunity for more traditional and sympathetic openings to be installed in future without causing harm to the original fabric of the building.
- 6.8. It is very disappointing that the applicants had installed these openings prior to discharging conditions, however on balance, it is considered that we are unlikely to be able to defend the refusal of the application at Appeal for the above reasons. I therefore reluctantly recommend that this condition is discharged.
- 6.9. The materials would consist of a slate that has already been approved for use upon the main dwelling, the re-use of existing bricks and matching brick plinth. The duck egg colouring matches that of the openings discussed above. I consider that all of these materials are acceptable.
- 6.10. Condition 4 – The Conservation Officer advised that the method statement was acceptable and I see no reason to disagree with this assessment. The works to the exterior of the building appeared to be complete during my visit on 27 May 2019.
- 6.11. Condition 5 – The Garden Office Method Statement dated 28.11.2019 explains that the north and west walls would be lined with insulated plasterboard that would allow the wall to breathe vertically into the void space of the roof. The plasterboard would be spaced off the wall face allowing for air movement. An air brick would then be placed within the north facing wall using an existing niche high up in the wall. During my visit on 27 May 2020 the plasterboard had already been installed.
- 6.12. Given the lack of further comments from the Conservation Officer with regard to the insulation I have taken this as a no objection. As the insulation would allow air flow between the wall and the plasterboard. I consider that future damp problems and potential harm to the fabric of the wall would be avoided. I therefore consider the details to be acceptable.
- 6.13. I recommend that all conditions are discharged.

7. RECOMMENDATION

That Planning Condition(s) 3, 4 and 5 of 19/02110/LB be discharged based upon the following:

Condition 3

Openings in accordance with Mumford and Wood Ltd order details, and Conservation Casement details received with the application on 23 March 2020. Materials in accordance with Garden Office Method Statement dated 28 November 2019.

Condition 4

Method statement in accordance with Garden Office Method Statement dated 28 November 2019.

Condition 5

Insulation in accordance with Garden Office Method Statement dated 28 November 2019.

Case Officer: Gemma Magnuson

DATE: 13 January 2021

Checked By: Paul Ihringer

DATE: 27/1/21
