

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation Control Committee 2nd June 2004
AUTHOR/S: Director of Development Services

**S/0606/04/LB & S/0607/04/F – Horseheath
Alterations and extension – first floor weatherboarded extension above kitchen/diner
with staircase to bedroom 2 with gable window and rooflight – the Thatch Cottage for
Ms Ryan**

Recommendation: Refusal

Members of Committee will visit the site on Tuesday 1st June.

Site and Proposal

1. The cottage is a late 18th or early 19th century, two bay, one and a half storey, Grade II listed building. It is timber framed, rendered with a longstraw thatched roof. The cottage, which is orientated with the east gable facing the road, is set back approximately 30 metres from the road within a large garden. Attached to the east gable is a single storey lean-to extension and to the rear, west gable is a partly constructed single storey kitchen/diner extension. The chimneystack is situated on the external wall of the west gable.
2. The cottage is modest in scale; the existing lean-to extension on the east gable is a traditional form and does not detract from the character and appearance of the listed building. The approved single storey extension, partly constructed, is different in form with a roof in line with the main roof but at a lower level. The approved materials are weatherboarding and pantiles, to provide a contrast with the main cottage.
3. The applications, which were received on 23rd March, seek to add a first floor above the kitchen/diner with a staircase to bedroom 2, a gable window and a rooflight. The proposal also includes an access gate and fencing.

Planning History

4. Listed Building Consent reference **S/2465/03/LB**, was approved on 13th January 2004 for the replacement of the existing side extensions on the west gable by a single storey weatherboarded kitchen/diner. Planning Permission was not required.

Planning Policy

5. **Policy EN 20** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 (“The Local Plan”) states that planning permission will be refused where it is required for extensions to Listed Buildings which: (in part)
 - are not necessary to ensure the continuing use of the building:
 - would dominate or detract from the Listed Building in scale, form, massing or appearance.

6. **Policy HG13** the Local Plan states that extensions to dwellings in the countryside will be permitted where:
 1. The proposed development would not create a separate dwelling or be capable of separation from the existing dwelling;
 2. The extension does not exceed the height of the original dwelling;
 3. The extension does not lead to a 50% increase or more in volume or gross internal gross floor area of the original dwelling;
 4. The proposed extension is in scale and character with the existing dwelling and would not materially change the impact of the dwelling on its surrounding; and
 5. The proposed extension has regard to the criteria in Policy HG12 of this Plan.
7. **Policy P7/6** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 (“The County Structure Plan”) requires development to protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the historic built environment.
8. Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 15 “Planning and the Historic Environment” paragraph 3.14 states that “many Grade II buildings are of humble and once common building types and have been listed precisely because they are relatively unaltered examples of a particular type: so they can as readily have their special character ruined by unsuitable alteration or extension as can Grade I or II* structures.

Consultation

9. **Horseheath Parish Council** recommends approval
10. **The Conservation Manager** has no objection to the fence and access gate but objects to the first floor extension in that it is considered to fail to meet the tests in the local plan policy and is inappropriate and detracts from the special character of the cottage. The first floor extension will significantly increase the impact on the listed building and compromise its modest architectural form and historic interest. In addition it will unbalance the east and west elevations and obscure the majority of the chimney which is an important and dominant feature. The result will neither preserve nor enhance its character and appearance.

Representations

11. There were none

Planning Comments

12. **Key Issues**

- The effect of the extension on the character and appearance of the listed building;
- The increase in gross internal floor area of the original dwelling; and

- The impact of the development on the scale and character of the existing dwelling and the countryside.
13. This application was considered at the 13th May 2004 Chairman's Delegation Meeting. Councillor Agnew has requested that the application be considered at Committee.
 14. The cottage is modest in scale and has a two bay plan typical of many humble dwellings of this period. At some time it was extended by the addition of a small lean-to, which was until recently the bathroom. A small extension, approved in 2004, on the west gable was felt to be reasonable in order to provide essential kitchen accommodation and was not considered to have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the listed building.
 15. The principle of an additional floor on the approved single storey extension is considered to be unacceptable as it would dominate and detract from the listed building in scale, form and appearance.
 16. The applicant has not demonstrated why works, which would affect the character of the listed building, are desirable or necessary as required by paragraph **3.4 of PPG 15**. The proposal is not considered necessary to ensure the continuing use or life of the historic building.
 17. The proposed extension and the previous extension would result in a dwelling of 48% increase to the original dwelling. The dwelling is set on a large site in the countryside with open fields to the north, south and west. The proposed extension will not be visible from the road or from other neighbouring properties and there is no adverse impact upon the character and openness of the countryside. Having regard to all criteria in Policies HG12 and HG13 of the Local Plan, this proposal is acceptable and accords with the objectives of those Policies.
 18. The submitted plans did not include details of the access gate and fencing. Construction work of the gate and fencing had been finished during officers' site visits on April 2004. I have asked the agent to submit details of the gate and fencing as part of this application before the meeting. I consider that the gate and fencing are in keeping with the existing dwelling and the countryside.
 19. Compliance with Policies HG12 and HG13 of The Local Plan does not outweigh the harm caused to the character and appearance of the Listed Building.

Recommendations

Refusal

20. The proposed first floor extension would dominate and detract from the special character of this listed building by virtue of its scale, form and appearance. The additional floor space is not considered to meet the test of being necessary for the continued use of the building. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to Policy P7/6 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 and Policy EN20 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

- PPG 15: Planning and the Historic Environment

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- Applications Ref. S/2465/03/LB, S/0606/04/LB and S/0607/04/F.

Contact Officer: Barbara Clarke – Conservation Assistant
Telephone: (01954) 713179