

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation
Control Committee

6th October 2004

AUTHOR/S: Director of Development Services

S/1519/04/F & S/1518/04/LB - Histon

Erection of single storey rear extension, two storey rear extension and alterations to the fenestration of the dwelling, 5 The Green, Histon For Mr and Mrs B Fisk.

Recommendation: Refusal

Conservation Area

Site and Proposal

1. No 5 The Green is a Grade II Listed Building located within the Histon and Impington Conservation Area, opposite the village pond. This two storey, 'L' shaped property is partly brick, partly render and has been extended to the rear in the form of conservatory/sun room with a utility room provided beneath a cat slide roof. An attached garage and a number of timber built outbuildings are also located within the rear garden.
2. The proposed single storey kitchen extension, sited adjacent to the detached garage, measures 3.6 metres in length, 3.5 metres in width and has a pitched roof, the ridge height of which measures 2.8 metres in height.
3. The full application, received 21st July 2004, proposed a two-storey rear extension which originally measured 7 metres in length and 5 metres in width and provided a study at ground floor level and a bathroom, bedroom and landing at first floor level. It was proposed that the roof of the extension form a gable, the ridge height of which measures 6 metres in height.
4. This two-storey extension has subsequently been reduced in size by 1.5 metres and now measures 5.5 metres in length. The size and siting of windows inserted within this extension has also been amended.
5. An additional door and two windows were also originally proposed within the north facing elevation of the existing dwelling whilst an existing window sited within the rear elevation of the building was to be replaced by a pair of patio doors. These details were also amended so there is now just one additional window and a door proposed in the flank elevation, while the rear facing window is to be retained.
6. The existing flat roof extension is also to be re-roofed in lead.

Planning History

7. Whilst there have been past planning and listed building consent applications for alterations and extensions to the dwelling, none of these are of any particular relevance to these applications.

Planning Policy

8. **Policy P1/3 ‘Sustainable Design in Built Development’** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003, (“The Structure Plan”) requires a high standard of design for all new development that responds to the local character of the built environment and details aspects of design to be considered.
9. **Policy 7/6 of the Structure Plan** requires all proposals to protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the historic built environment.
10. **Policy HG12 ‘ Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings within Frameworks’** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004, (“The Local Plan”) sets out the requirements that must be met in order for proposals to extend or alter dwellings within village frameworks to be considered for approval.
11. **Policy EN30 ‘Development in Conservation Areas’** of the Local Plan states that proposals will be expected to preserve or enhance the special character and appearance of the Conservation Area
12. **Policy EN20 ‘Unsympathetic extensions’** of the Local Plan states that extensions to Listed Buildings must be necessary to ensure the continued economic use of the building and must not dominate or detract from the special character of the Listed Building in terms of its scale, form or appearance.

Consultation

13. **Histon Parish Council** – Approves but did question the necessity for roof lights.
14. At the time of writing this report, no further comments had been received with regard to the amended plans. The consultation period does not expire until the 24th September 2004. Any comments raised will be reported verbally to committee.
15. **The Conservation Manager** – Raised objections to the fenestration of the extensions and works to the existing fabric of the building. Objections were also raised with regard to the eaves detailing to the two-storey rear extension.

With regard to the amended plans he has stated that the proportions of the two-storey extension would remain out of scale with the historic part of the building and would form a visually dominant element to the rear elevation of the building. The replacement stairs and formation of a landing area are supported but the forming of a further bedroom is not necessary to the continued economic use of the building. The fenestration of the new extension is considered inappropriate and out of scale with the windows within the rest of the property.

It is considered that the proposals even in their revised form fail to meet the requirements of Policies EN20 and EN30 of the Local Plan

Representations

16. One letter of objection was received from the adjacent property, No 3 The Green. Concerns raised related to the side facing windows originally proposed along with the length and resultant overshadowing/overbearing affect of the extension
17. At the time of writing this report, no further comments had been received with regard to the amended plans. Any comments raised will be reported verbally to committee.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

18. The key issues to consider in this application are the impact of the extensions on the adjacent properties and the impact of the extensions/alterations on character and form of the Listed Building and surrounding Conservation Area.
19. **Residential amenity of adjacent properties**
20. The additional door and window now proposed in the north facing flank elevation of the property will not adversely affect the adjacent property, No 5a The Green. The proposed openings will look out over the applicant's driveway and will not increase the overlooking potential of the existing ground floor and first floor openings.
21. The proposed single storey side extension will also have a minimal impact on the adjacent property, No 5a sited to the north. The proposed structure is low and has no flank windows that face the neighbouring dwelling. The majority of the structure will also be screened from view by the boundary hedge/fence and detached garage.
22. The proposed two-storey rear extension is to be set slightly off the boundary shared with No 3. Whilst a number of single storey out buildings currently line this boundary, the two storey structure will significantly increase the built up appearance of the site.
23. The height of the extension is relatively low, (6 metres at the ridge and just 4 metres at the eaves) and the extension is sited to the north of the neighbouring property. Furthermore, No 3 has an unusual window arrangement to the rear of the property, with no first floor openings whilst the nearest ground floor window that serves a habitable room is set some distance away from the site boundary and is situated within the rear elevation of a flat roof extension. This structure extends 3 metres out from the rear elevation of the dwelling.
24. No 3 The Green does have a first floor window sited within the gable of the dwelling however this opening is already overshadowed by the application property.
25. It was originally proposed that a secondary window that served the proposed bedroom be inserted within the south elevation of the extension at first floor level. This window would directly overlook the rear garden of No3. This opening was omitted on the amended plans. The agent has also confirmed that the two roof lights that are to be inserted in the south facing roof slope of the extension are to be fixed shut and obscurely glazed.
26. Given the above it is not considered that the proposed extension will significantly increase the overlooking or overshadowing affect of the application property.
27. Irrespective of the above, an extension of the length proposed, located so close to the boundary will however appear overbearing and oppressive when viewed from within the rear garden of No 3 The Green. At present the rear of garden of this property is heavily overgrown. Whilst the garden space is currently inaccessible, having viewed the proposed from within a small cleared area, it is clear that the two storey rear extension will appear overly dominate and will for this reason detrimentally affect the residential amenity of the adjacent property. The overgrown nature of the neighbour's garden does not justify support being given for an extension in the form proposed.
28. This proposal was discussed pre-application and whilst some concerns were raised with regard to the adjacent property No 3, it was considered that for the reason

mentioned in paragraphs 23 and 24 the relationship might be acceptable. At this pre-application stage it was not possible to view the extension from the adjacent property. Once access was available into the rear garden of No3, it was clear that this relationship was not acceptable.

29. The amended plans that were received do help to reduce the Impact on the adjacent property however a reduction of just 1.5 metres is considered insufficient given the proximity of the extension to the site boundary.

Character and appearance of the listed building and surrounding Conservation Area.

30. The single storey kitchen extension that will replace the existing long conservatory and will form a compact structure, which will appear more in keeping with this historic building. The omission of patio doors in the rear elevation of the dwelling and the retention of the existing window will ensure that the historic fabric of the building is also retained. Following the submission of amended plans, no objections are raised to the proposed door and window to be sited within the flank elevation of the dwelling. As originally proposed, the insertion of a doorway and two windows would have caused an unacceptable degree of harm to the timber frame of the building. The re-roofing of the existing flat roof structure with lead is also welcomed.
31. With regard to the proposed two-storey rear extension, the resulting size of this structure would be out of scale with the existing historic building. The two storey extension is much wider in proportion than the historic cottage and it is considered that the two elements would not only sit uncomfortably together but the proposed structure would form an overly dominant element on the rear elevation of the building. The fenestration of the extension is also of different proportions to the existing and whilst this style of windows without glazing bars is considered to be acceptable, the form, positioning and size of the openings proposed fails to reflect that of the existing windows.
32. For the reasons given above an extension of this form would also fail to enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Following the development to the rear of the site the proposed structure will form a more visible feature within the Conservation Area.
33. The existing property has four bedrooms and it is considered that an additional bedroom, whilst desirable to the current occupiers, is not necessary for the building to remain in economic use. This is a requirement of Policy EN20 of the Local Plan.
34. The proposed works seek to replace the modern second staircase, which is very steep and form a landing area to enable independent access to two of the bedrooms. If the extension were reduced in size these elements could still be accommodated in a more acceptable form.

Recommendations

Refuse Planning and Listed Building Consent

Reasons for Refusal:

1. The proposed two storey rear extension would, by means of its height, length and proximity to the boundary, appear overbearing when viewed from within the rear garden of No 3 The Green, totally dominating the narrow rear garden of this

modest sized cottage. The proposed extension would therefore have a significant detrimental impact on the residential amenity of this property, and is therefore considered contrary to Policy P1/3 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 and Policy HG12 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.

2. The proposed two storey rear extension by reasons of its length and width is considered overly large and out of proportion with the form of this historic, Listed Building. The proposed extension would form a dominant and intrusive element to the rear elevation that would adversely affect the special character of the Listed Building. The extension is also not considered necessary for the continued use of the building.

This proposal is therefore contrary to Policy P7/6 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 and Policy EN20 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004

3. The proposed two-storey extension would form a prominent feature within the Conservation Area and due to the size and poor design would fail to either protect or enhance the special character and appearance of the area. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to the provisions of Policy EN30 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.

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

- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Planning file S/1519/04/F
- Listed Building file S/1518/04/LB

Contact Officer: Charmain Hawkins Historic Buildings Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713178

Paul Belton Planning Assistant
Telephone (01954) 713253