

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	1 st February 2006
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

S/2377/05/F – Kingston
Extension to Bungalow to Form 2 Storey Dwelling at Orchard End, Church Lane
for M Steele

Recommendation: Refusal
Date for Determination: 7th February 2006

Members of Committee will visit this site on Monday 30th January 2006.

Conservation Area

Site and Proposal

1. The site, located on a raised site within the Kingston Conservation Area and immediately adjacent to the village framework boundary, consists of an existing single storey dwelling and linked flat roof garage. The ridge of the existing dwelling, measuring approximately 4.9m high, runs parallel with the front boundary with the property. The neighbouring dwelling to the south-east of the application site is the Grade II listed Dovecote. Located slightly further away, to the west, is the Grade II listed Moat House Farm. The land immediately adjacent to Church Lane, to the south of the application site, is identified as being an important countryside frontage in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004. To the rear of the site, to the north, is located an area of orchard/paddock/fields and part of the rear garden serving the dwelling at Walkers Field.
2. This full application, registered on 13th December 2005, seeks permission to erect extensions to the existing bungalow to form a two storey dwelling, measuring 8 metres to the ridge, and featuring a gable facing onto Church Lane. The application also seeks to erect a single pitched roof garage, located along the shared boundary with the listed Dovecote.

Planning History

3. No relevant history.

Planning Policy

4. The existing dwelling at Orchard End is located within the village framework for Kingston, which partially cuts through the rear garden that serves the dwelling. It is also located within the Kingston Conservation Area and immediately adjacent to two listed buildings and an important countryside frontage.
5. Policy **P7/6** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 states that Local Planning Authorities will protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the historic built environment.

6. Policy **SE9** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 states that Development on the edges of villages should be sympathetically designed and landscaped to minimise the impact of development on the countryside.
7. Policy **SE11** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 states that Important Countryside Frontages (ICFs) are defined within village framework boundaries in order to identify frontages to land with a strong countryside character which either (a) penetrates or sweeps into the built-up area of a settlement so as to provide a significant connection between the village street scene and the surrounding rural area or (b) provides an important rural break between two nearby but detached parts of a village framework. Proposals for development along or behind such ICFs will be strongly resisted if they would compromise either of these purposes.
8. Policy **HG12** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 states that planning permission for the extension and alteration of dwellings will not be permitted where: (1) the design and use of materials would not be in keeping with local characteristics; (2) the proposal would harm seriously the amenities of neighbours through undue loss of light or privacy, being unduly overbearing in terms of its mass, or would adversely affect surrounding properties by virtue of its design, layout, location or materials; (3) there would be an unacceptable loss of off-street parking or garden space within the curtilage; (4) there would be an unacceptable visual impact upon the street scene; (5) boundary treatment would provide an unacceptable standard of privacy and visual amenity.
9. Policy **EN28** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 states that the District Council will resist and refuse applications which: (1) would dominate the Listed Building or its curtilage buildings in scale, form, massing or appearance; (2) would damage the setting, well-being or attractiveness of a Listed Building; (3) would harm the visual relationship between the building and its formal or natural landscape surroundings; (4) would damage archaeological remains of importance unless some exceptional, overriding need can be demonstrated, in which case conditions may be applied to protect particular features or aspects of the building and its setting.
10. Policy **EN30** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 states that proposals will be expected to preserve or enhance the special character and appearance of Conservation Areas especially in terms of their scale, massing, roof materials and wall materials. The District Council will refuse permission for schemes which do not specify traditional local materials and details and which do not fit comfortably into their context.

Consultation

11. **Kingston Parish Council** recommends that the application is approved (no comments).
12. **SCDC Conservation Officer** recommends refusal of the current proposals and states "Orchard End is a modest bungalow of no particular architectural merit that occupies an important site in Kingston, being located between two listed buildings (the Dovecote immediately to the east and Moat House Farm slightly further away to the west). The site is visually prominent, being visible across the fields in front of the property.
13. Last year I was asked to comment on proposals to demolish the bungalow and replace it with a new dwelling. Although those proposals were different to the current proposals, the end result is much the same and the comments I made last year are

therefore equally relevant to the current proposals. It is apparent that the current proposal is contrary to the advice given last year, in that it will significantly increase the visual impact of the existing building, with a very prominent gable facing the lane which would vie for attention with the two adjacent listed buildings. The style of architectural treatment adopted is also not relevant to the Kingston Conservation area.”

Representations

14. The following comments have been received from the owner/occupiers of **South Sea House, Bourne Road; Dovecot, Walkers Field and Moat House, Church Lane; Meadowland, Rectory Lane; and 1 Field Row, Kingston:**
 - a. A sympathetic design approach.
 - b. Largely used the existing footprint – environmentally friendly and will cause minimum disturbance.
 - c. Will create valuable interest and character – current bungalow detracts from area, poor design.
 - d. Alternative approach to adjacent sites – would not wish to see extension with rows of rooflights.
 - e. Modern design – sits comfortably between the Manor House and Dovecote.
 - f. Improves appearance of property.
 - g. Would prefer status quo – however appreciate need to improve and enlarge existing bungalow. Do not consider plans an adverse impact.
15. The **agent** for the scheme has submitted further representations, dated 3rd January 2006, in response to the Conservation Officer’s comments by stating that “I assure you that I do understand your concerns but am not totally convinced that our proposals are without merit in their own right.”

Planning Comments – Key Issues

16. The key issues to consider in the determination of this application relate to:
 - a. The impact of the development upon the amenity of nearby dwellings;
 - b. The impact on the setting of the two adjacent listed buildings; and
 - c. The visual impact of the development upon the character and setting of the Conservation Area.

The impact of the development upon the amenity of nearby dwellings

17. The proposed extensions, by virtue of their design, would not unduly impact on the amenities of the adjacent dwellings either by loss of light, privacy or overbearing impact. The proposal has been designed so that, although the dwelling increases by approximately 3.1m at ridge height, the bulk of the overall dwelling is kept away from any shared boundaries. Furthermore the development appears to have been careful to avoid any windows at first floor in either side elevation or rear elevation that would facilitate direct overlooking into the private amenity areas serving the dwellings at Dovecote and Manor House Farm.

The impact on the setting of the two adjacent listed buildings and the visual impact upon the character and setting of the Conservation Area

18. As described by the Authority's Conservation Officer, the application site is located on prominent, marginally raised land that is viewed within the village across the adjacent fields to the south of the site. The proposed development features a tall, wide span gable facing onto Church Lane. By contrast the existing dwelling is a modest property, whose ridge runs parallel to the lane. By virtue of the proportions of the proposed front elevation, and particularly the bulk of the gable feature, the development would significantly increase the impact of the site in the Conservation Area and would therefore also draw attention from the adjacent listed buildings, harming the visual relationship between the listed buildings and their surroundings
19. Furthermore, although it is accepted that a number of dwellings in the vicinity have been the subject of roof conversions which have been facilitated by the use of rooflights, none has increased the impact of the site to the extent that the current proposals would. The design proposed is not a feature that would be traditionally seen in a South Cambridgeshire village and although the materials proposed are of a good quality they would not serve to significantly lessen the overall impact of the proposal in the street scene.

Recommendation

20. Refusal

Reasons for Recommendation

The proposed extension to the bungalow to form a two storey dwelling, by virtue of its design, location, scale and form, would damage the setting of the Grade II listed Dovecote and Manor House Farm buildings located adjacent to the site. Furthermore it would neither preserve nor enhance the setting of the Conservation Area. The proposed extension is therefore considered contrary to Policy P7/6 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 and Policies HG12, EN28 and EN30 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.

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

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- Planning file Ref: S/2377/05/F

Contact Officer: Michael Osbourn – Assistant Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713379