

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

4 April 2012

AUTHOR/S: Corporate Manager (Planning and New Communities)

S/2484/11 - ICKLETON

Two-storey detached dwelling and garage – site r/o Norman Hall, Church Street, Ickleton, Cambridgeshire, CB10 1SL

Recommendation: Refusal

Date for Determination: 7th February 2012

Notes:

This application has been reported to the Planning Committee for determination at the request of District Councillor Martin

Members of Committee will visit the site on Tuesday 3rd April 2012

Site and Proposal

1. The application site is located on the south side of Mill Lane and comprises the eastern part of the grounds of Norman Hall, a Grade II listed detached dwelling of 15th century origin located at No.21 Church Street. The site lies within the Ickleton village framework and Conservation Area, and also forms part of a larger parcel of land that is designated as a Protected Village Amenity Area. The proposed plot is bounded on three sides by high walls, including a 3m high brick and flint wall along Mill Lane. It also includes a number of mature protected trees, particularly towards the southern and eastern boundaries. Norman Hall is served by a vehicular access from Church Street, whilst there is a second existing gated access serving the site via Mill Lane. On the east side of the Mill Lane access, and to the north of the main site area, is a barn that has been converted to residential use.
2. The full application, received on 13th December 2011, proposes to erect a detached five-bedroom dwelling on the site. The proposed dwelling would be a two-storey (approximately 7.5m high) property that would be sited at the eastern end of Norman Hall's garden, with vehicular access being obtained via the existing access point off Mill Lane. The dwelling would be oriented in an east-west direction, with its principal/front elevation facing towards Norman Hall. It would be based on a traditional cruciform barn, comprising oak weatherboard walls under a clay plain tile roof, and incorporating very low eaves and hipped ends to the roof. To the front and rear, the design includes centrally positioned two-storey forward projecting gables, whilst a number of conservation-style rooflights are proposed in all elevations in order to provide light to the first floor accommodation. The application also proposes the construction of a single-storey outbuilding, consisting of garaging, bin and cycle storage, adjacent to the northern boundary of the site.
3. The application has been accompanied by Design and Access, Heritage and Planning Statements. This supporting information explains that the application seeks

to address the reasons for refusal of the previous scheme by reducing the footprint, scale and mass of the dwelling and by adopting traditional design principles consisting of an oak framed building under a large expanse of clay tiled roofing. Worthy trees would be retained, thereby maintaining their public amenity value, with further planting proposed in order to enhance the landscape. Sections have been submitted showing the extent to which the dwelling would be visible from Mill Lane and the other boundaries. It is argued that the site is sufficiently far from the dwelling to preserve its setting and that it would not be prominent in public views of the site.

4. The supporting information explains that the evidence put forward within this application, as well as within the previous proposal, was not available to the Inspector in 1997, and that this represents a material difference that needs to be taken into consideration. The statements include evidence that the site upon which it is proposed to erect the dwelling was historically separated from the immediate garden to Norman Hall by a brick wall and outbuildings, and was partly occupied by farm buildings. In the enclosure map of 1814, the dwelling had a small garden immediately to the rear/east, then a wider curtilage defined along its south and eastern boundaries by farm buildings. Functional land lay beyond this to the east and south. At the time of listing (in the 1960's), the garden was clearly defined by an east bank and wall (the former barn complex had been demolished leaving a north-south wall dividing the curtilage of the house from the east grounds), and by a south wall and outbuildings. Beyond, lay the north paddock, Mill Lane wall and east grounds, the remains of a large parcel of farm land that was split up by 1867. The assessment states that the east grounds do not form part of the curtilage of the dwelling but have provided a setting since 1867 and that the presence of several mature trees are of historic value. The southern lime screen is associated with the division of the 2 acre parcel of farmland that was attached to the house at enclosure. The northern part of Norman Hall's grounds formed a separate conveyance to the dwelling in the 1930's. The 'northern paddock' is now within the ownership of Norman Hall and comprises a tennis court, whilst the wall to Mill Lane has largely been rebuilt in recent years. Part of a former range of farm buildings in the north-eastern corner is under separate ownership and has been converted to a dwelling. The heritage value of Norman Hall is argued to reside mainly in its position in the street and in its interior structure. Its garden and west flint wall are argued to make a considerable contribution to its significance, with the east grounds and north paddock being part of its setting but contributing little to its heritage significance.

Planning History

5. S/0704/11 – An application for a two-storey detached dwelling and garage was refused for the following reasons:

“The application site lies within the Ickleton Conservation Area on land historically associated with Norman Hall, a Grade II Listed Building. By virtue of the scale, design and form of the proposed dwelling, the development would intrude into the open and natural setting of Norman Hall, thereby adversely affecting the setting of this Listed Building, and adversely affect the special character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Consequently, the proposed development would be contrary to Policy CH/4 of the South Cambridgeshire adopted Local Development Framework 2007, to the Listed Buildings Supplementary Planning Document, and to Policy HE10 of Planning Policy Statement 5, which resist development that would adversely affect the setting of listed buildings, and to Policy CH/5 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007, to the Conservation Areas SPD, and to Policy HE9 of Planning Policy Statement 5, which state that development will not be permitted if it would harm the architectural or historic character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

The site forms part of a larger parcel of land designated as a Protected Village Amenity Area. By virtue of the harm to the character of the Conservation Area and the setting of the Grade II listed Norman Hall, the erection of the proposed dwelling on the site would be contrary to Policy CH/6 of the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework 2007, which states that development will not be permitted within Protected Village Amenity Areas if it would have an adverse impact on the character, amenity, tranquility or function of the village.”

6. S/2214/07/F – Alteration and rebuilding of boundary wall and erection of tennis court fencing – approved subject to a condition stipulating that the temporary access shall not be created unless for construction of the tennis court and its fencing.
7. S/2213/07/LB – Alterations to Mill Lane boundary wall to create temporary access and subsequent rebuilding of wall to original height in flint – approved.
8. S/1562/07/LB – Alterations to Mill Lane boundary wall to create access with a pair of timber gates. Refused on the basis that the works would result in harm to the historic curtilage listed brick and flint wall as a result of the installation of timber gates, thereby harming the setting of the listed building’s historic enclosure and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
9. S/1563/07/F – Access gates and tennis court fencing – refused on the basis that the works would result in harm to the historic curtilage listed brick and flint wall as a result of the installation of timber gates, thereby harming the setting of the listed building’s historic enclosure and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
10. Application references S/1562/07/LB and S/1563/07/F were subsequently allowed at appeal, with the Inspector commenting that the works would be located in an area of wall that has been unsympathetically rebuilt, and that there would be significant visual improvement by remedial works to either side of the gates that would result in some enhancement.
11. S/0102/97/F - Application for a dwelling and garage (a 3-storey 8.6m high house) in the garden area – refused due to the impact on the open and natural setting of Norman Hall, and due to the loss of part of the high wall along Mill Lane, resulting in harm to the setting of the listed building and to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
12. S/0103/97/F – Application for a dwelling and garage (a 2-storey 9.3m high house) in the garden area - refused due to the impact on the open and natural setting of Norman Hall, and due to the loss of part of the high wall along Mill Lane, resulting in harm to the setting of the listed building and to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
13. S/0212/97/LB – Application for listed building consent for demolition of walls to gain access to the site – refused.
14. S/0213/97/LB – Application for listed building consent for demolition of walls to gain access to the site – refused.
15. The above 4 applications were subsequently dismissed at appeal. The planning applications proposed two substantial detached dwellings within the eastern part of the curtilage of Norman Hall. The Inspector commented that the Council accepted the site was quite distinct in character to the garden of Norman Hall, which was self-

contained with views between the site and listed building being very limited due to the existence of trees on the boundary and within the rear garden. The Inspector stated that the site was historically associated with the listed building and, being enclosed by high brick and flint walls, remained an important and integral part of its setting. He acknowledged that the site has a different character to that of the formal gardens at the rear of Norman Hall but stated this would have been the case prior to the land being divided into separate ownerships. He expressed concern regarding the scale of the dwellings and the impact on the listed building, and considered that the dwelling on plot 2 would be widely visible from Norman Hall. Also, he was not convinced that the roofs of the dwellings would not be seen from Mill Lane, and considered that the development would erode the existing open setting of Norman Hall, and result in the urbanisation of the open land within the historic walled garden, and would therefore fail to preserve the setting of Norman Hall. The Inspector considered the provision of a 5m wide access to be acceptable in principle (without the requirement for 2m x 2m visibility splays requested by the Local Highways Authority) but did consider the insertion of a further opening in the boundary wall to be harmful.

Planning Policy

16. **National Policy Guidance:**
PPS5: Planning for the Historic Environment
17. **South Cambridgeshire LDF Core Strategy DPD, 2007:**
ST/7: Infill Villages
18. **South Cambridgeshire LDF Development Control Policies DPD 2007:**
DP/1: Sustainable Development
DP/2: Design of New Development
DP/3: Development Criteria
DP/4: Infrastructure and New Developments
HG/1: Housing Density
NE/1: Energy Efficiency
NE/6: Biodiversity
CH/2: Archaeology
CH/4: Development Within the Curtilage or Setting of a Listed Building
CH/5: Conservation Areas
CH/6: Protected Village Amenity Areas
SF/10: Outdoor Playspace, Informal Open Space and New Developments
SF/11: Open Space Standards
TR/1: Planning for More Sustainable Travel
TR/2: Car and Cycle Parking Standards
19. **South Cambridgeshire LDF Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):**
Development Affecting Conservation Areas – Adopted January 2009
Open Space in New Developments – Adopted January 2009
Trees and Development Sites – Adopted January 2009
Listed Buildings – Adopted July 2009
District Design Guide – Adopted March 2010
Landscape in New Developments – Adopted March 2010
20. **Circular 11/95 (The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions)** - Advises that conditions should be necessary, relevant to planning, relevant to the development permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects.

21. **Circular 05/2005 (Planning Obligations)** - Advises that planning obligations must be relevant to planning, necessary, directly related to the proposed development, fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind and reasonable in all other respect.

Consultations

22. **Ickleton Parish Council** - Recommends approval subject to the following conditions:

- The site lies in an area of high archaeological potential and a programme of archaeological investigation should be undertaken before commencement of development.
- The applicants should enter into a Section 106 agreement under which they would undertake not to apply for any further development within the PVAA, in order to protect the remainder of the PVAA, the conservation area and the setting of Norman Hall.
- The applicants should enter into a Section 106 agreement under which they would undertake not to apply for further openings in the wall into Mill Lane, to protect the integrity of the flint wall, the conservation area and the setting of Norman Hall.

The Parish Council also comments that the majority view was that the current design was far more appealing than that refused last year. The currently proposed dwelling was significantly smaller and the design additionally reduced the visual impact on its surroundings. There was a strong feeling that a contemporary design would simply not be complimentary in this location and be most unwelcome. Concerns about the impact on the setting of Norman Hall and on the Conservation Area were considered to be over-stated. There is considerable separation and screening in place, with further improvements planned, between the proposed dwelling and Norman Hall, and considerable screening of the dwelling when seen from the public highway. It was felt that the breaching of the flint wall that took place (by permission on appeal) some years ago was the major intrusion to the setting of Norman Hall and the Conservation Area. Given the current condition of the grounds of Norman Hall and the conservation area, and the fact that the possibility of development on the site has not been ruled out, the current proposals were considered to be acceptable on balance.

23. **The Conservation Manager** – Recommends refusal. The proposal is a response to the refusal of the previous planning application and involves a change of design attempting to reflect a traditional threshing barn and a reduction in height to 7.5m at the ridge, about 0.5m lower than the previously refused scheme. The applicant has made further strong representation in respect of the curtilage of Norman Hall and that it is their view that the site should not be considered as curtilage being historically in separate ownership. The Conservation Team and Inspector in the 1997 appeals both disagree with this argument, citing the integral nature of the house and its enclosing wall and evidence of the whole being sold together historically in sales particulars. The most recent sales particulars from 1951 refers to a feature of the property being the garden and orchard enclosed by a high brick and flint wall. It is considered that the site forms part of the curtilage of Norman Hall, a view reinforced by the extent of structural tree planting that clearly runs through to the eastern end of the site. However, the curtilage issue is not decisive in dealing with the issue of setting. The setting should be considered in the context of the listed building, and the integral nature of the wall and Norman Hall is defining in respect to setting. This very oversized single dwelling would be unrelated to the development pattern of the village and the scale and massing of the surrounding built form. As a result, its impact on the

integral relationships between Norman Hall and the enclosing listed wall would be very harmful to the significance of this open relationship.

In addition, the design looks to replicate a threshing barn, but is so domestic in character, its precedent with the low eaves appearance, is more towards an Arts and Crafts dwelling. Either way, it is contrived and unconvincing, and does not reflect a functional agricultural building's simplicity of form. Its major feature is the roof, which is a confusing multitude of gables, half-hip roofs, rooflights and a central chimney stack. The roof is predominantly to eaves at ground floor level. In addition, large areas of glazing to the ground floor elevations, including a contrived central gable with heavy mullioned openings, do nothing to provide clarity of design. It may have been preferable to start with an honest, contemporary domestic precedent to the design. It is recommended that the application be refused on the grounds that the proposed dwelling, by reason of its scale, proportions and design, would intrude into the open and natural setting of Norman Hall, thereby having a detrimental impact on the setting of this listed building and the character of the Conservation Area.

24. **The Trees Officer** – Raises no objections, providing all tree protection is installed prior to any construction activities. In the previous application, it was recommended that the footprint of the proposed dwelling be moved further away from the lime trees, and the current proposal achieves this.
25. **The Local Highways Authority** – Raises no objections stating that no significant effect upon the public highway should result from this proposal should it gain the benefit of planning permission. In order to avoid displacement of loose material onto the highway, no unbound material should be used in the surface finish of the driveway within 6m of the highway boundary.
26. **The County Archaeologist** – States that the site lies in an area of high archaeological potential and that any permission should be subject to a condition requiring a programme of archaeological investigation to be undertaken before commencement of development.

Representations

27. The Ickleton Society at No.63 Abbey Street raises no in-principle objections but states that:
 - There should be a full archaeological survey and excavation of the site as a number of Roman remains have been found on land to the east of the site.
 - A number of trees have been felled in the in the grounds of Norman Hall in recent years and there should be a blanket TPO on the grounds of Norman Hall in order to ensure the preservation of the remaining trees.
 - The gate that will provide access to the site was inserted into the flint wall along Mill Road in recent years. A condition should be added to any consent to require the integrity of the flint wall to be maintained.
 - The site is part of the curtilage of Norman Hall and it is believed it was only in separate ownership for a very short period in the latter part of the 20th century. A new house will inevitably have some impact on Norman Hall and requires careful consideration.

28. No.16 Mill Lane expresses concern that a large tree has fallen at the site of the proposed dwelling. This has resulted in significant damage to telephone lines, a neighbour's wall and to a building within the curtilage of No.16. How will planning ensure this does not happen again given that the proposed building works may well undermine a number of other trees?
29. District Councillor Martin requests that the application be referred to Planning Committee. Ickleton PC supported the proposal with 7:2 vote in favour. This reflects much stronger support than the previous application. Further, whilst the conservation officer suggests that the size and style of the building does not fit within the Ickleton conservation area, there are similar barn like buildings on Butchers Hill and a significantly larger modern house on the land immediately east of the site. If it is now accepted that the pieces of land can be considered as separate entities, there should be no reason to stop development of this piece of land. However, in order to determine the most appropriate development, it is important that the Planning Committee visit the site to gain a further understanding of this unique site.
30. The applicant's agent has responded as follows to the comments made by the Conservation Officer:
- The Conservation Officer tries to establish a link between the two curtilages, whereas the access to the house has never gone beyond the bank at which the garden finishes.
 - The bank rises much more than 1m. The former barns are clearly shown on the 1814 map.
 - The design does not seek to resemble a barn. The mass is taken from a traditional aisled barn and designed as an arts and crafts house around the basic framing structure the form provides.
 - The courts have ruled that applicants are entitled to refer to historic material to determine matters of curtilage. The rear land has always been distinct from the house and does not serve the purposes of the house in a necessary or useful way.
 - The tree belt is of no significance to consideration of curtilage and just follows the south wall of the eastern plot. It does not link Norman Hall and its curtilage to the eastern plot. The former orchard and pig sties no longer exist. The eastern plot is not, and has never been, in the curtilage of the dwelling.
 - Conservation comments do not take any account of hierarchy of significance of heritage impacts. The wall referred to is of differing ages. The church and the street are the primary aspects of setting and not the grassed area at the eastern end of land under single ownership.
 - Concerns regarding the development pattern of the village fails to take account of the importance of farmhouses and their backland barns located in Ickleton (eg – at Butcher's Hill, Priory Farm and Abbey Farm). Backland barns of considerable size and converted to other uses are a defining feature of Ickleton.
 - Comments regarding the design are subjective.

- The Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) clearly addresses the character of the Conservation Area and the role the proposed house would play in it.
- The comments make no attempt to analyse the significance and hierarchy of the heritage assets, nor to acknowledge analysis in the HIA. This contravenes HE7.1 of PPS5.
- The comments fail to heed the scale and massing unique to Ickleton. The setting to Norman Hall is not defined by its relationship with a wall. It is more complex than this, the church, street and farmhouse context being much more important in its heritage significance.
- The recommendation of refusal fails to identify and analyse the setting of the heritage assets or the character of the Conservation Area so the conclusion is unfounded.

Planning Comments

Impact on setting of Listed Building, character of Conservation Area and openness of Protected Village Amenity Area

31. The site is located inside the Ickleton village framework, within the Conservation Area and in a Protected Village Amenity Area. It is also within the grounds of Norman Hall, a Grade II listed building located on Church Street.
32. The site has an extensive planning history. In 1997, applications proposing the erection of two substantial detached dwellings facing Mill Lane and located on a larger parcel of land (equating to the size of the current PVAA) were refused, partly on the grounds that the development would harm the open and natural setting of Norman Hall, and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. These applications were then dismissed at appeal. The Inspector considered that the site was historically associated with the listed building and, being enclosed by high brick and flint walls, felt it formed an important part of its setting. He acknowledged the site had a different character to that of the formal gardens of Norman Hall and that this would have been the case prior to the land being divided into separate ownerships. He concluded that the development would erode the setting of Norman Hall and result in the urbanisation of the open land.
33. Since the appeal decision relating to the 1997 applications, the site has been designated as a Protected Village Amenity Area (PVAA). Policy CH/6 of the Local Development Framework states that development will not be permitted within or adjacent to PVAAs if it would have an adverse impact on the character, amenity, tranquillity or function of the village. The supporting text to this policy states that PVAAs have been designated on sites within village frameworks in order to safeguard those areas of undeveloped land within villages that are important to retain. It states that PVAAs include land that has an important amenity role in providing a setting for buildings, and can include land that may be enclosed or semi-enclosed. There is no specific information available regarding the reason behind the inclusion of this site as a PVAA, and it appears that it was designated as such following the 1997 appeal decision. In this instance, Officers have come to the view that the main role and purpose of this PVAA is to protect the open setting of the east side of Norman Hall, in the interests of preserving the setting of this Listed Building as well as the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. As such, if any proposed dwelling was considered to be sympathetic to the setting of Norman Hall and to the character of the

area, Officers consider the PVAA designation need not preclude the principle of development of the site.

34. The supporting information submitted with the application shows that the land has historically been divided from Norman Hall by ranges of outbuildings that lay between the immediate garden curtilage of the house and the farmland/eastern grounds beyond. Whilst these outbuildings have since been demolished, their original line is still defined by walls/banks. The information provided (which was not available at the time of the 1997 appeals) seems to give compelling evidence that the curtilage of Norman Hall comprises the line of the eastern and southern outbuildings that lay beyond the immediate formal garden associated with the dwelling. From the evidence available, Officers consider that the land beyond to the east (of which the application is part) is not part of this curtilage. Nevertheless, it does form part of the open setting of the east side of the dwelling, and the evidence provided suggests that, other than the north-eastern corner (which historically comprised barns in a courtyard arrangement), the land has historically remained open and undeveloped.
35. The current application proposes a substantial detached dwelling facing towards Norman Hall, with the design being dominated by a large expanse of roof, with centrally positioned gables to the front and rear. When compared to the previously refused scheme, the height, scale and massing of the dwelling has been reduced, and the design revised to a traditional barn-style property. The Conservation Officer has advised that the scale and massing of the dwelling would be out of keeping with the character of the area. In addition, the design, consisting of a multitude of gables, half-hip roofs, rooflights, large areas of glazing and a central chimney stack, would be contrived and unconvincing, and would not reflect the simple character of a functional agricultural building. The proposed dwelling would be sited around 90m from Norman Hall itself and approximately 38 metres away from Mill Lane. The application has been accompanied by cross-sections that purport to demonstrate the proposed dwelling would not be visible from Mill Lane and would be sited sufficiently far from Norman Hall to result in harm to its setting. However, the Conservation Officer considers this detail highlights the incompatibility of the design, scale and proportions between Norman Hall and the proposed dwelling. With regards to the view from Mill Lane, the boundary with this road is defined by a 3 metre high wall. The section drawings indicate that, given the narrow width of the road and the height of the wall, the dwelling would not be readily apparent in views from directly outside the access point. However, due to the scale and size of the proposed dwelling, the presence of a building on the site would be evident in more oblique views from further along Mill Lane as well as from the curtilages of residential properties on the north and south side of Mill Lane. The proposal would represent an intrusion into a presently open area of land and would therefore be unacceptable, eroding the setting of Norman Hall and resulting in harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
36. Planning and Conservation Officers met with the applicant and architect in order to discuss possibilities for the development of the site. In this meeting, Officers indicated that support may be given in principle to a single-storey building in a courtyard arrangement. However, the applicant has since advised that such a form of development would compromise the family's preferences and requirements, and has therefore requested that the application be determined in its current form.

Residential amenity

37. The site is surrounded by a number of residential properties including Norman Hall itself, some 70m to the west, and No.10 Mill Lane (to the north-east). Given the substantial size of the plot, the proposed dwelling would not result in harm to the

amenities of occupiers of adjoining properties by reason of overlooking, overshadowing or loss of light. It should be stressed that none of the responses received from local residents have raised any concerns regarding the impact of the development upon their amenities.

Impact on trees

38. The site includes a number of mature trees. During the consideration of the previously refused scheme, the Trees Officer requested that the dwelling be resited in a position further away from the lime trees. These concerns have been addressed in the current application, as a result of which the Trees Officer has raised no objections to the proposal subject to works being carried out in accordance with the submitted arboricultural assessment.

Highway safety

39. The existing access and gates were allowed on appeal in 2007. The proposal seeks to utilise this existing access, and the Local Highways Authority has therefore raised no objections to the proposal.

Archaeology

40. The County Archaeologist has advised that the site lies in an area of high archaeological potential and that any permission should be subject to a requirement for investigative works before commencement of development. The applicant's agent has indicated the applicants agreement to undertake such works and this does not therefore form part of the reason for refusing the application.

Density

41. The site measures approximately 0.26 hectares in area. The erection of one dwelling on the land would equate to a density of approximately 4 dwellings per hectare and the proposal would therefore conflict with the requirements of Policy HG/1 of the Local Development Framework, which requires new residential developments to achieve a minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare, unless material considerations indicate a different density of development would be more appropriate. In this instance, given the sensitivity of the location and the constraints affecting the site, the erection of any more than a single dwelling on the site would compound the impact upon the character of the area and upon the setting of the Listed Building.

Infrastructure requirements

42. The proposal would result in the need for a financial contribution towards the provision and maintenance of open space, in accordance with the requirements of Policies DP/4 and SF/10 of the Local Development Framework. For the 5-bedroom dwelling proposed, this amounts to £4,258.90, as calculated at the time of the application. It would also result in the need for a contribution towards the provision of indoor community facilities (£718.78), together with additional costs relating to the provision of household waste receptacles (£69.50), Section 106 monitoring (£50) and legal fees (minimum £350). The applicants' agent has confirmed, in writing, his clients agreement to such payments and this does not therefore form part of the reason for refusing the application.

Recommendation

43. Refusal:

1. The application site lies within the Ickleton Conservation Area on land that forms part of the open setting of Norman Hall, a Grade II Listed Building. By virtue of the scale, proportions and design of the proposed dwelling, the development would intrude into the open and natural setting of Norman Hall, thereby having a detrimental impact upon the setting of this Listed Building, and adversely affecting the special character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Consequently, the proposed development would be contrary to Policy CH/4 of the South Cambridgeshire adopted Local Development Framework 2007, to the Listed Buildings Supplementary Planning Document, and to Policy HE10 of Planning Policy Statement 5, which resist development that would adversely affect the setting of listed buildings, and to Policy CH/5 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007, to the Conservation Areas SPD, and to Policy HE9 of Planning Policy Statement 5, which state that development will not be permitted if it would harm the architectural or historic character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
2. The site forms part of a larger parcel of land designated as a Protected Village Amenity Area. By virtue of the harm to the character of the Conservation Area and the setting of the Grade II listed Norman Hall, the erection of the proposed dwelling on the site would be contrary to Policy CH/6 of the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework 2007, which states that development will not be permitted within Protected Village Amenity Areas if it would have an adverse impact on the character, amenity, tranquility or function of the village.”

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

- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework (LDF) Development Control Policies, adopted July 2007
- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy, adopted January 2007
- Supplementary Planning Documents: Development Affecting Conservation Areas, Open Space in New Developments, Trees and Development Sites, Listed Buildings, District Design Guide, Landscape in New Developments
- Circular 11/95 and 05/2005
- Planning File References: S/2484/11, S/0704/11, S/2214/07/F, S/2213/07/LB, S/1562/07/LB, S/1563/07/F, S/0102/97/F, S/0103/97/F, S/0212/97/LB, S/0213/97/LB.

Contact Officer: Lorraine Casey – Senior Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713251