

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

6 April 2011

AUTHOR/S: Executive Director / (Operational Services)/
Corporate Manager - Planning and New Communities

S/1793/10 - LONGSTANTON

Internal and external alterations including replacement windows and doors, new window in blocked opening, rooflight, boiler flue, remove partition wall, provide boots/utility with new opening, relocate bathroom and convert bedroom to w.c to provide ensuite and dressing room.

**at The Grange, St Michaels
for Ms Lulu Boscawen**

Recommendation: Refusal

Date for Determination: 01 February 2011

Notes:

This Listed Building application has been reported to the Planning Committee for determination at the request of Councillor Riley.

Members will visit this site on the morning of 6 April 2011

Conservation Area

Site and Proposal

1. The Grange is a grade II listed building with 17th century origins but mainly dating from 1787. There is some timber framing in the rear range but the front range to the road and most of the rear range are yellow brick. Some red brick can be seen in the end walls. Roofs are tiles with end parapets and there are two end stacks. There are four 20th century dormers on the front and three 20th century hung sashes in original openings. The one and a half storey main range is L-shape in plan with a single storey range attached to the gable of the rear range. The single storey attached range comprises kitchen and outbuildings.
2. The Listed Building application proposes the replacement of single glazed windows on the ground floor of the south east elevation with windows of a different style. A new window is proposed in a blocked opening on the north west elevation of the outbuilding. The window would be smaller than the blocked opening and would light a new w.c.
3. A boiler flue and two replacement doors are also proposed on the south east elevation. The existing four panelled part glazed door in the main range would be replaced with a part glazed, part boarded door and the boarded door in the outbuilding replaced with the same style of part glazed door with a timber boarded door as a shutter. A rooflight is proposed on the inner roofslope of the rear elevation.

4. Internal alterations are proposed on the ground floor including removal of a modern partition in the inner hall and conversion of part of the outbuilding to a boots/utility and w.c with a new opening to the kitchen.
5. On the first floor the bathroom at the rear of the building would be removed and the adjacent bedroom sub-divided to form two bathrooms with a new opening from the corridor to the smaller bathroom. To create the larger bathroom and dressing room an original lath and plaster wall would be removed and a new partition formed in a different location. A new doorway would be created so that the ensuite bathroom, dressing room and master bedroom becomes a suite of rooms. A new rooflight would light the smaller bathroom.

Planning History

6. S/1792/10 – An application to replace four windows and two doors with double glazed panels and add new double glazed window in a blocked opening is recommended for refusal. The windows and doors are the same ones that are the subject of this report.

Planning Policy

7. **South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework, Development Control Policies, DPD, 2007:**
CH/3 Listed Buildings
CH/5 Conservation Areas
8. **Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment**
9. **South Cambridgeshire LDF Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)**
Listed Buildings: Works to or affecting the setting of

Consultation

10. **Longstanton Parish Council** – No response

Representations

11. None received

Comments – Key Issues

Impact on the character and appearance of the listed building

12. The existing windows on the ground floor of the south east elevation comprise three multi paned casements with night vents and a fixed multi paned window. The fixed light has lamb's tongue glazing bars and although the architect considers this to be a modern window it dates from the late 19th/ early 20th century.
13. While there is some support for replacement of the existing modern windows there is some concern about the proportions of the individual panes and it was suggested to the architect that six panes per casement rather than four would be more appropriate giving more historic and less vertical proportions. The multi paned fixed light (WG04) should be retained as it is historic and there is no practical reason why it has to be replaced, as there is another window in the kitchen that can be opened for ventilation.

14. The existing door in the rear range (DG01) is a four panelled door with the top two panels glazed. The architect states that this is a relocated internal door but has not provided an assessment of how this conclusion has been reached although this was requested. The design is wholly appropriate for the location on the rear wing and date of the building and it should be retained or replaced like-for-like. The door to the outbuilding is a relatively modern ledged, braced and boarded door but is traditionally designed and therefore wholly in keeping with this single storey ancillary range being traditional in form.
15. The replacement doors are part solid and part glazed with boarding to the lower part and a four paned glazed panel above. In addition a door to match the existing boarded door in the outbuilding is to be installed as a shutter to the boot room. The part glazed door is required to light the proposed boot room, which is part of this application. The proportions, design and details of the proposed doors are not traditional and there is no distinction between grander and less grand parts of the building. Both doors are inappropriate and will harm the character and appearance of the south east elevation.
16. There is an existing blocked opening on the north west elevation and the brickwork appears to be contemporary with the brickwork of this single storey range. The insertion of a window would result in the loss of historic fabric and would look incongruous within the larger blind opening. It is not considered necessary as the w.c could be artificially lit and mechanically ventilated. The architect is concerned about carbon emissions and considers that an opening window is preferable to mechanical ventilation and artificial light but this impact would be minimal and not constant and does not outweigh the harm to the historic fabric and appearance of the listed building.
17. There is no objection to the boiler flue, the removal of the modern partition in the inner hall or to the sub-division of part of the outbuilding to create a boots/utility and w.c with a new opening to the kitchen.
18. Currently there are two bathrooms and a w.c and the proposal is to remove the bathroom at the rear of the building and reinstate it as a bedroom. The adjacent bedroom would be sub-divided to form two bathrooms with a new opening from the corridor into the smaller bathroom. To create the larger bathroom and dressing room a 19th century lath and plaster wall would be removed and a new partition formed in a different location. A new doorway would be installed so that the ensuite, bathroom and master bedroom become a suite of rooms. The existing bedroom and w.c doors would be reused. A rooflight would be installed in the smaller bathroom, which has no window.
19. Conversion of the bedroom to two bathrooms would result in a significant loss of 19th century historic fabric and would harm the character and volume of the room. In addition the historic fireplace, which it is not clear if it is to be retained, would lose its historic relationship and look out of proportion and scale in a small narrow bathroom. The proposed rooflight would not be visible externally as it would be on an inner roofslope but would affect the historic roof structure and again is not considered necessary as the bathroom could be artificially lit and mechanically ventilated and the benefit would not outweigh the harm.

Recommendation

20. The recommendation is for refusal of the submitted plans as amended by drawings 200F and 205F for the following reason.

The proposed replacement of four windows and two doors in the south east elevation will harm the special character and appearance of this historic building due to their inappropriate design. The proportions of the proposed panes will result in glazing that is untraditional in form and disproportionate to the size of the casements and the proposed new windows WG07 and WG04 and rooflight will result in the loss of historic fabric to the detriment of this listed building. Internally the proposed alterations to provide new bathrooms and a dressing room will result in a significant loss of historic fabric and will significantly harm the character of the room. The proposals are therefore contrary to Policy CH/3 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies DPD 2007 (DPD), Policies HE7 and HE9 (including 7.2 and 9.1) of Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment, paragraphs 76, 85, 86, 179, 182 and 185 of the Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide and paragraphs 4.1, 4.4, 4.15-4.16, 8.1, 8.7, 9.39 of the South Cambridgeshire LDF Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) Listed Building SPD – Adopted July 2009.

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

- **South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework, Development Control Policies, DPD, 2007**
- **Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment**
- **Listed Buildings SPD: Listed Buildings: Works to or affecting the setting of**
- **Planning File Refs: S/1793/10**

Case Officer: Barbara Clarke – Conservation Assistant
Telephone: (01954) 713310