

Item No. 9

APPLICATION NUMBER	CB/12/04207/FULL
LOCATION	35 to 39 High Street, Cranfield, Bedford, MK43 0DP
PROPOSAL	Conversion of 35 to 39 High Street Cranfield to one dwelling with single storey side and rear extensions and conversion of roof space to create a first floor.
PARISH	Cranfield
WARD	Cranfield & Marston Moretaine
WARD COUNCILLORS	Cllrs Bastable, Matthews & Mrs Clark
CASE OFFICER	Annabel Gammell
DATE REGISTERED	09 January 2013
EXPIRY DATE	06 March 2013
APPLICANT	Hartwell Trust
AGENT	Graham Wright Architect
REASON FOR COMMITTEE TO DETERMINE	Councillor Matthews called the application to committee on grounds "to bring uninhabited premises back into use and prevent the loss of a listed building."
RECOMMENDED DECISION	Full Application - Refused

Reason for committee: Councillor Matthews called the application to committee on grounds "to bring uninhabited premises back into use and prevent the loss of a listed building."

Site Location:

35 to 39 High Street in Cranfield, is a small terrace of three single storey dwellings, which were purpose built and have been used as Almshouses for the village of Cranfield. The building is Grade II Listed, it was constructed in 1834. The building is set at the back of the site, some 45 metres from the highway. The original building has a symmetrical design form with three thatched gable porches, and two pairs of ornate chimney stacks. The building has been extended to the side and the rear.

The three dwellings are set within a roughly rectangular plot some 63 metres long and 19 metres in width, there is no off road parking, there is a central path leading from a pedestrian gate to number 37 High Street, Cranfield, which splits off to serve the other two properties. The front garden is laid to grass with two trees at the frontage, and hedging to the front and sides. The plot has an open character, with views of the building prominent from the High Street.

The dwellings are on the north western side of the High Street, adjacent to residential properties and Cranfield Methodist Church. The dwellings are currently vacant.

The Application:

Planning permission is sought for the demolition of the existing side and rear extensions, the conversion of three dwellings into one dwelling and the erection of a link rear extension, a side conservatory, a first floor within the roof space, with two dormer windows, a vehicular access, and parking for four cars.

The conversion of three dwellings into one dwelling, involves internal alterations to the existing rooms, to knock through three walls to open the internal space up, and remove two existing walls entirely. A staircase would be constructed to give access to the existing roof space, the conversion of the first floor would involve the removal of internal beams, the construction of two gable dormer windows within the rear roof slope, this would facilitate three rooms upstairs. It is not clear from the plans, but it may require rafters and the chimney stacks to be lost or relocated.

The rear extension would be some 7.3 metres wide, and 6.5 metres in depth, at its widest point from the original dwelling. It is noted that the main bulk of the extension would be some 4.6 metres in depth, connected by a flat roof brick link forming a WC. The maximum height of this building would be 5.5 metres, the flat roof height and eaves height would be 2.9 metres.

The side extension would be some 3 metres by 3.6 metres, largely glazed, with a height of 4 metres.

The access would be centrally located at the existing pedestrian access, the parking area, would be hard standing creating four off road parking spaces.

The resulting dwelling would have three bedrooms, two bathrooms, a WC, entrance lobby, dressing room, study, conservatory, living room, kitchen, dining room, music zone, and two additional stores/studies, and would have a floor area of 180 sqm, each original dwelling has a floor area of 26 sqm, the original floor area of the three dwellings totalling 78 sqm. The floor area of the three dwellings with the existing extensions is some 95 sqm.

Additional information submitted during the application:

During this application, revised plans have been submitted, this showed a change in the shape of the dormers, a slight increase in floor space, a different window treatment, a glazed end to the proposed kitchen leading onto a terrace, and the replacement of the rear elevation of the conservatory roof materials (glass to tile).

This statement was provided by the agent as justification for the development:

"The Hartwell Trust has limited funds to effect any repairs, nor for the proposed conversion of the properties.

The Trust was originally constituted to provide housing for elderly people in Cranfield. The accommodation provided within these three cottages is now considered to be unacceptably substandard. Even this proposed conversion will not provide accommodation which will be suitable for elderly people. The Trust has, therefore, made the decision to sell the properties, hopefully with the benefit of planning permission, and to use the resultant funds for the Trust's intended purpose.

This proposed course of action has had to be approved by the Charity Commission, as the original intent of the Trust will be changed.

In short the Trust wish to alleviate themselves of the burden of maintaining these cottages, the cost of which exceeds their current funds.

Additionally, if they undertook the necessary remedial works the accommodation would still be inappropriate for the client group, and the income received from the potential rent would make the process uneconomic."

RELEVANT POLICIES:

National Policy Planning Framework (2012)

Section 6: Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes

Section 7: Requiring good design

Section 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Section 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Development Strategy for Central Bedfordshire - draft

Policy 45: The Historic Environment -

The Council will conserve, enhance, protect and promote the enjoyment of the historic environment: This will be achieved by:

- Requiring developers (where applicable) to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected by development, including any contribution made by their setting.
- Requiring the highest quality of design in all new development, alterations and extensions and the public realm in the context of heritage assets and the historic environment. Design which positively contributes to local character and distinctiveness, and sustains and enhances the character or appearance of Conservation Areas and the setting of Listed Buildings will be encouraged and supported.
- Safeguarding and promoting improvements to Central Bedfordshire's historic environment including securing appropriate viable uses and improvements to Listed Buildings and reducing the number of heritage assets "at risk".
- Encouraging the conservation, enhancement and enjoyment of the historic environment by supporting appropriate management and interpretation of heritage assets.
- Refusing development proposals that will lead to harm to or loss of significance of a heritage asset whether designated or non-designated, unless the public benefits outweigh the harm or loss.

Core Strategy and Development Management Policies - North 2009

CS14 High Quality Development
CS15 Heritage
DM3 High Quality Design
DM13 Heritage in Development

Supplementary Planning Guidance

Central Bedfordshire Design Guide - Design Supplements 4 (Residential Alterations and Extensions) and 5 (The Historic Environment)

Planning History

None

Representations: (Parish & Neighbours)

Town Council	No objection
Neighbour Response	Two letters of objection received from 33C High Street Cranfield

Consultations/Publicity responses

Conservation Officer **Objection - Recommends refusal**

Comments to 1st Consultation:

There are no objections to the principle of converting the three almshouses into one single dwelling as long as the original historic layout of the three almshouses remains visibly legible and important features are retained intact. The proposed layout of the ground floor of the almshouses appears appropriate.

As stated at pre-application, there are no objections to the removal of the present rear extension and replacement with a more appropriately designed modest and subservient extension. The proposed new rear and side extension however is not considered acceptable in terms of size and design. Whilst the new rear extension has been reduced in size from the first pre-application proposals, it is still considered too large and bulky, being over half the length of the whole listed building and wider than a single almshouse, and will dominate in the immediate rear setting of the building. The extension is also not considered of suitable high quality design to compliment the listed building. The flat roof link has the appearance similar to the present detracting flat roof extension and the detailing of the main pitched roof element, including soldier courses above the windows, appear crude and out of character with the elegant high quality detailing of the listed building. Furthermore, due to its size, one ground

floor window (proposed to house an en-suite) will be completely masked by the extension, as well as the one of the first floor proposed dormers.

As stated at pre-application, the conservatory style extension to the side with its abundance of glazing, is considered out of character with the listed host building, and due to its size, will interrupt with the important symmetry of the main elevation.

There are concerns regarding proposals to convert the roof space to form two bedrooms and a bathroom and the impact on the historic fabric of the building and its aesthetic appearance (in terms of the proposed introduction of rear dormers). Two dormers are being proposed to the rear of the property which are likely to involve removal of roof timbers, notably rafters, and a large part of the thatch. Sympathetic conversion of the roof space might be considered if it can be fully demonstrated as part of a clear and convincing justification, that the three almshouses could not be fully repaired and viably converted to a single dwelling without the requirement for the introduction of a first storey. Unfortunately this justification has not been provided. Indeed, the drawings significantly lack important information as it appears that a full survey of the roof structure has not been undertaken to ascertain whether there is the space to accommodate the new rooms. An assessment of the dimensions of the roof space have only been based on the external dimensions of the building, as set out in drawing SK07 and this drawing appears inaccurate as it is likely that the thatch is much thicker than shown.

The drawings of the proposed internal alterations also only provide an approximate location for one of the important chimney stacks and it is not clear how many rafters will need to be removed to accommodate the dormers. As such, it is not possible to fully assess the impact of this aspect of the works on the historic fabric of the building. The design of the new dormers, in the form of a disproportionate and rather modern triangular shape is also not considered appropriate and will be out of character with the traditional detailing of the listed building.

The justification provided for the proposed harmful alterations and additions to the listed set of almshouses as part of the heritage asset assessment, appears to state that the harm will be outweighed by the securing of an optimum viable use. The level of harm caused to the significance of the almshouses can not be suitably outweighed by this public benefit as it is considered that the set of almshouses can be much more sympathetically converted to a single dwelling without such a substantial rear and side extension.

In summary, it is recommended that the application be refused

on the basis that the proposed extensions, by virtue of their excessive size, bulk and inappropriate and incongruous design, will cause harm to the significance of the listed building and will dominate in its setting, contrary to Policies CS15 and DM13 of the Council's Core Strategy, Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the English Heritage 'Planning for the Historic Environment Practice Guide'. The level of harm caused by the works can not be outweighed by the public benefits of the proposals.

In addition, there is significant lack of sufficient information to assess the potential impact of the proposed conversion of the roof space of the listed building, or whether conversion would be possible in the space. The proposed conversion has the likely potential to involve negative loss of historic fabric, notably removal of rafters, a clear and convincing justification for which has not been provided, contrary to paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The proposed dormers are also not considered appropriate in terms of design and will be out of character with the listed building.

Comments to 2nd Consultation:

The pitched roof extension has been slightly improved in design with the removal of the shoulder course above the windows. The addition, however does not present any pointers or stylistic references to the architectural style of the host dwelling, its rhythm or proportions (e.g. solid walls to void, vertical or horizontal emphasis, alignments). These are very important in achieving an addition which compliments the historic and architectural values of the listed building. The extension appears as a bulky shed-like structure. In addition, from comparing the previous plans and those subsequently submitted outcome of comments provided, the extension has in fact been enlarged rather than reduced in terms of footprint. As such, the extension is still considered to be too large and bulky and will dominate in the immediate setting of the listed building. The proposed glazing on the south west elevation will serve to increase its prominence due to the incongruity of this feature.

A conservatory style extension to the side is considered out of character with the listed building. Whilst some of the glazing has been slightly reduced on the rear roof (full height glazing is still proposed on the front and side), an extension of this modern untraditional style is generally not in keeping with modest vernacular buildings such as the almshouses. A modest side extension could certainly be achieved on this building in a more appropriate traditional and subservient design as long as it is of a size and in a suitable set back location that does not interrupt with the strong symmetrical proportions of the main elevation.

There is still significant lack of sufficient information submitted as part of this application to ascertain the potential impact on the historic fabric of the roof. Within historic buildings, the roof structures are particularly important as they both provide evidence of traditional technologies such as thatching, and are usually one of the only areas of the building to remain almost unaltered from its original construction. The roof space of the almshouses has high evidential value as it has the great potential to yield further information about the original construction of the building as there is likely to be a high survival of historic original fabric.

The appearance of the proposed dormers have been altered, however, no further details have been provided regarding if or how much historic fabric might need to be removed to accommodate these proposed features and the roof conversion as a whole. This information is extremely important in order for us to ascertain how much impact the proposals will have on the historic fabric of this part of the building. As stated in paragraph 128 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the level of detail provided by the applicant should be proportionate to the asset's importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. Heritage assets, designated or undesignated, are irreplaceable and any harm or loss to their significance requires a clear and convincing justification (para.132 NPPF).

In summary, the updated plans submitted have not satisfied concerns raised in my previous comments, both regarding the design, size and bulk of the rear extension, the design of the side extension and the lack of sufficient information to assess the impact of proposals to form accommodation in the roof space. As such, my objections remain unchanged and it is recommended that the application is refused.

English Heritage

No comments received

Ancient Monument Society

No comments received

Tree and Landscape officer

No objections - Recommends Condition

The proposals for this site include an extension to the rear of the property and a small conservatory on the west side of the property. The property is located to the north end of the site with the majority of the remaining land being laid to grass at present and located between the property and the High Street.

Plans show that there will be a new vehicle access from the road to four parking spaces located close to the High Street. This will

result in the loss of a substantial quantity of Beech hedging on the boundary and also at least one, possibly two mature Cherry trees.

From a landscaping viewpoint I cannot see a reason to object to the proposal but we would require a comprehensive landscaping scheme. As is recognised, these properties are of considerable importance within the town and will remain so. Because of the layout of the site and visibility from the High Street there will be ample opportunity to create an imaginative and well thought out scheme, which should incorporate some form of screening or partial screening of the parking area. We will require details of this including species, sizes and densities of planting.

Highways

No objection - Recommends conditions

The existing properties do not have the benefit of a vehicular access. Therefore a new dropped kerb verge/footway crossover is proposed which will serve a new driveway leading to four off-street parking spaces. The arrangement of the spaces at 90 degrees to the driveway means that vehicles will be able to enter the site, turn and leave in forward gear.

The proposed off-street parking provision is therefore considered acceptable.

Vehicle/vehicle inter-visibility at the proposed access is good and pedestrian visibility splays are shown to be provided to the rear of the footway.

The proposed dwelling is likely to give rise to an additional 6 to 8 vehicle movements per day. Such a marginal increase in turning movements onto/off the High Street, Cranfield can be considered acceptable

In a highway context I recommend that the following conditions be included if planning approval is to be issued:

- 1 Development shall not begin until details of the junction of the proposed vehicular access with the highway have been approved by the Local Planning Authority and no building shall be occupied until the junction has been constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason

In order to minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the highway and the premises.

- 2 Before the access is first brought into use, a triangular vision splay shall be provided on each side of the new access drive and shall be 2.8m measured along the back

edge of the highway from the centre line of the anticipated vehicle path to a point 2.0m measured from the back edge of the footway into the site along the centre line of the anticipated vehicle path. The vision splay so described and on land under the applicant's control shall be maintained free of any obstruction to visibility exceeding a height of 600mm above the adjoining footway level.

Reason

To provide adequate visibility between the existing highway and the proposed access and to make the access safe and convenient for the traffic that is likely to use it.

- 3 Visibility splays shall be provided at the junction of the access with the public highway before the development is brought into use. The minimum dimensions to provide the required splay lines shall be 2.4m measured along the centre line of the proposed access from its junction with the channel of the public highway and 43m measured from the centre line of the proposed access along the line of the channel of the public highway. The required vision splays shall, on land in the applicants control, be kept free of any obstruction.

Reason

To provide adequate visibility between the existing highway and the proposed access and to make the access safe and convenient for the traffic that is likely to use it.

- 4 The dwelling shall not be occupied until the access, parking areas and turning area shown on drawing number 1105/SK25 have been laid out, drained and surfaced in accordance with details previously submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and those areas shall not thereafter be used for any other purpose.

Reason:

To enable vehicles to draw off, park and turn clear of the highway to minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the adjoining highway.

- 5 Development shall not commence until a scheme detailing provision for on-site parking for construction workers for the duration of the construction period has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented throughout the construction period.

Reason

To ensure that adequate off street parking is provided during the

construction period in the interests of road safety.

Archaeology

No objection - Recommends Condition

The proposed development site lies within a known archaeological landscape that includes Iron Age and medieval occupation remains (HER's 11866, 15976 and 16931) and under the terms of the *National Planning Policy Framework* (NPPF) these are heritage assets with archaeological interest.

I am pleased to see the inclusion of a Heritage Asset Assessment with this application (Albion Archaeology, 8th January 2013). However, I am a little concerned by some of its conclusions and the way in which the significance the Almshouses (HER 6367, Grade II Listed) and the potential for heritage assets with Saxon and medieval archaeological interest have been rather trivialised. For example, whilst slight, archaeological evidence from the medieval period has been recovered on the site immediately adjacent to the application area (HER 15976). Saxo-Norman and medieval features were also recorded during investigations at Home Farm, Cranfield (HER 13418) which is approximately 150 metres south-east of the proposed development site. The failure to mention these features particularly in section 3.1.4 of the Heritage Asset Assessment is perplexing and a touch concerning given that all phases of work were undertaken by Albion Archaeology.

Understanding landscape development and settlement patterns, the relationship between settlement and enclosure (Going and Plouviez 2000, 21 and Oake et al 2007, 11 - 12) during the later prehistoric periods and the investigation of rural Saxon and medieval settlements to examine diversity, characterise settlement forms and understand how they appear, grow, shift and disappear is a local and regional archaeological research objective (Wade 2000, 24-25, Oake 2007, 14 and Medlycott 2011, 70), are regional archaeological research objectives.

Paragraph 141 of the NPPF states that Local Planning Authorities should require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of heritage assets before they are lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible (CLG 2012).

The proposed development will have a negative and irreversible impact upon any surviving archaeological deposits present on the site, and therefore upon the significance of the heritage assets with archaeological interest. This does not present an over-riding constraint on the development providing that the applicant takes appropriate measures to record and advance understanding of the heritage assets. This will be achieved by the investigation and recording of any archaeological deposits that may be affected by the development. In order to secure this, please attach the following condition to any permission granted in

respect of this application.

No development shall take place until a written scheme of archaeological investigation has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The said development shall only be implemented in full accordance with the approved archaeological scheme.

Reason: To record and advance understanding of the archaeological resource which will be unavoidably destroyed as a consequence of the development.

This is in line with the requirements of paragraph 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework

Determining Issues

The main considerations of the application are;

1. Principle of development and background
2. Design and impact upon Listed Building
3. Impact upon residential amenity considerations
4. Highway
5. Pre-application Advice
6. Any other considerations

Considerations

1. Principle of development

The development is for the conversion of three dwellings into one dwelling, with extension and alteration of the existing building.

It is considered that the principle of converting the Listed Building from a terrace of three dwellings into one family home is acceptable, providing it respects the character of the original building. It is considered that it is reasonable to allow a degree of internal changes to ensure the future use of the Listed Building.

The additional text within the draft Development Strategy states:

The repair, renovation, alteration and extension of a Listed Building should not be at the expense of its intrinsic special interest and significance. It is important to guard against unnecessary change or over-restoration. In any change, materials should be sympathetic and appropriate to those used in the original building. In particular the Council will resist applications that result in the loss of traditional local features such as long straw thatched roofs, locally manufactured clay tiles and bricks and local stone.

The National Planning Policy Framework (2012) states:

Paragraph 126

Local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. In doing so, they should recognise that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance.

Paragraph 128

In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes or has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

Paragraph 130

Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of or damage to a heritage asset the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision.

Paragraph 132

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. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification.

Principle and Policy Conclusions:

It is considered that the principle of conversion to one dwelling, and appropriate extension could be acceptable.

2. Design and impact upon Listed Building

The Central Bedfordshire draft Development Strategy (2013) specifies that the Authority should be:

"Refusing development proposals that will lead to harm to or loss of significance of a heritage asset whether designated or non-designated, unless the public benefits outweigh the harm or loss."

The National Planning Policy Framework (2012) specifies that:

"Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of or damage to a heritage asset the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision."

Impact upon the character and appearance of the area:

It is accepted that the largest extension and dormer windows would be mainly to the rear of the site, and therefore would be unlikely to have a significant impact upon the character and appearance of the area. This is with the exception of the side extension, which is significantly larger than the modest side addition. As the dwelling is some 45 metres from the road, it is unlikely that public views would be significantly affected.

Design Considerations in relation to the Listed Building:

The dwellings are Grade II Listed Buildings, one of 18 Listed Buildings within the village of Cranfield. All design considerations have been made in the light of the significance of the Heritage Asset.

The condition of the existing building is of concern, as there is evidence of the building not being maintained to a standard that is desirable for a building of this importance. However as in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework the condition of the existing building is not a factor in the determining of this application. In addition it is considered that the conversion and extension of the building would have no significant public benefit.

It is considered that the scale and design of the proposed extensions are unacceptable. It is judged that the massing of the additions would cause harm to the heritage asset and therefore is unacceptable in accordance with Policy 45 of the draft Development Strategy. The harm would be caused by the rear and side elevations being dominated with modern incongruous elements which do not relate to the Listed Building. The proposed brick flat roof link which would form a corridor and WC to the kitchen area, would be of similar design to the existing rear extension. As the removal of the existing additions would be considered a benefit to the building, the replacement should be with something of a significantly higher quality. The dormer windows to facilitate the use of the first floor, would appear awkward and undesirable within the rear elevation. Although the principle of using 1st floor accommodation is not unacceptable it would have to have careful detailing to ensure the historic fabric of the building was not damaged, insufficient information on this element of the design have been received, further information was requested, it was acknowledged that the dimensions were based on photographs, and no formal structural survey of the roof had been undertaken. It is considered that the removal of beams would have an unacceptable harmful impact upon the historic fabric of the Listed Building.

It is considered that the design would not be of high enough quality to warrant approval in this sensitive location. It is considered that the resultant development would lead to the over restoration of the building, with substantial loss of the traditional features and special character of the building. This is in accordance with the Central Bedfordshire Design Guide, the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy DM3 of the Central Bedfordshire Core Strategy and Development Management Policies. The Central

Bedfordshire Design Guide and the draft Development Strategy (2013).

3. Impact upon residential amenity

Due to the location and scale of the proposals it is unlikely that there would be any significant impact upon the residential amenities of any adjacent properties, this has been considered in terms of loss of light, the causing of an overbearing impact, loss of privacy, or loss of outlook.

Two letters were received from the adjacent property number 33C High Street Cranfield, the concerns raised were regarding loss of the Almshouses, the impact upon the Listed Building (loss of importance for Cranfield), and concerns regarding roof height. It is considered that these concerns are addressed elsewhere within the report.

4. Highway considerations

No objections have been received from the highway officer, there would be a suitable level of off street parking for a dwelling of this size.

5. Pre-application Advice

Pre-application advice was sought before the submission of the planning application. It was stated that the application would be unlikely to receive officer support. It is considered that this recommendation is in accordance with the advice given.

6. Other Considerations

Loss of Almshouses:

The Use Class of an Almshouse is the same as that of a dwelling (C3), it is considered that it would be up to market forces and the charitable trust to run this provision within the village.

Bring uninhabited premises back into use:

Currently the situation is that there are three uninhabited premises, and there is no objection to the principle of converting the three properties into one dwelling. This matter only requires Listed Building Consent and not Planning Permission. It is considered that it would be desirable to have these properties in active use, as this would likely protect the Listed Building, however it is considered that the extensions and alterations proposed are such that it would cause greater harm to the building. It is considered that although the current dwellings are modest, this is the character and style of the building, and no evidence has been put forward that the premises can not otherwise be suitably converted into a single dwelling.

The recommendation is made in light of The National Planning Policy Framework (2012) specifies that:

"Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of or damage to a heritage asset the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision."

Recommendation

That Planning Permission be Refused for the following reasons:

- 1 The proposed single storey extensions and dormer windows, by virtue of their excessive size, bulk and inappropriate and incongruous design, will cause harm to the character and significance of the listed building and will dominate its setting. The proposed development is contrary to Policies 43 and 45 of the Development Strategy for Central Bedfordshire (2013), Policies CS15 and DM13 of the Council's Core Strategy, Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the English Heritage 'Planning for the Historic Environment Practice Guide'.

Statement required by the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No. 2) Order 2012 - Article 31

Planning permission has been refused for this proposal for the clear reasons set out in this decision notice. The Council acted pro-actively through early engagement with the applicant at the pre-application stage. This positive advice has however not been adequately followed and therefore the Council remains of the view that the proposal is unacceptable. The applicant was invited to withdraw the application to seek pre-application advice prior to any re-submission but did not agree to this. The requirements of the Framework (paragraphs 186 and 187) have therefore been met in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No. 2) Order 2012.