

## **SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

---

**REPORT TO:** Development and Conservation Control Committee 5<sup>th</sup> January 2005  
**AUTHOR/S:** Director of Development Services

---

### **S/1840/04/F - Haslingfield Demolition of Existing Dwelling and Erection of One New Dwelling with Garage for David Reed Homes Ltd**

**Recommendation: Approval  
Date for Determination: 27<sup>th</sup> October 2004**

#### **Site and Proposal**

1. The existing dwelling is set back approximately 10m from the road and it is a 19th century gault brick detached villa, extended to become a shop.
2. To the north is a detached bungalow with fruit trees in its southern garden. One of two lounge windows, a door and a kitchen window are on its southern elevation (facing the site).
3. To the south is No. 44, a Grade II Listed Building. There are no first floor windows in the northern elevation of this property (facing the site). There are windows at ground floor level in this elevation, one of which serves the lounge.
4. There are a number of small outbuildings to the rear of the existing dwelling. One of these is a wash/boiler house of traditional design. It has doors in both sides allowing access to the building from both the gardens to Nos. 44 and 48.
5. To the south of the site (immediately to the north of No. 44) is the former access way to an orchard. This is now part of the garden to No. 44.
6. The full planning application, received on 1st September 2004, proposes the erection of a five bedroom dwelling approximately 7.7m in height set back from the road by approximately 20m to replace the existing and a double garage set back from the road approximately 12m.
7. The application was amended on 9th December 2004 to show the retention of the wash/boiler house (which was shown to be demolished in the submitted scheme) and the removal of a window in the first floor east elevation of the garage.

#### **Planning History**

8. In July 2002 planning permission was refused for a replacement dwelling with a two storey forward projection and a double garage on the boundary with No. 44. In February 2003 this proposal was allowed on appeal (the appeal dwelling).
9. In March 2003 planning permission was granted for a replacement dwelling which involved the rebuilding of the existing dwelling in an extended form with the two storey extensions being to the rear. A single garage was to be built on the boundary with No. 44.

10. In June 2004 a planning application for a replacement dwelling similar in scale and position to that now applied for was withdrawn following officer advice that the proposal would be refused on design grounds.

### **Planning Policy**

#### **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 (the Structure Plan) Policy P1/3 - Sustainable Design in Built Development.**

11. This policy stresses the need for a high standard of design and a sense of place which responds to the local character of the built environment, amongst a whole host of other sustainability considerations.

#### **Structure Plan Policy P7/6 - Historic Built Environment**

12. Local Planning Authorities will protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the historic built environment.

#### **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 (the Local Plan) Policy SE4 - List of Group Villages**

13. Haslingfield is listed as a Group Village

Residential development and redevelopment up to a maximum scheme size of 8 dwellings will be permitted within the village frameworks of Group Villages provided that:

- (a) the retention of the site in its present form is not essential to the character of the village;
- (b) the development would be sensitive to the character of the village, local features of landscape or ecological importance, and the amenities of neighbours;
- (c) the village has the necessary infrastructure capacity; and
- (d) residential development would not conflict with another policy of the Plan, particularly **Policy EM8**.

Development may exceptionally consist of up to 15 dwellings, if this would make the best use of a brownfield site.

All development should provide an appropriate mix of dwelling size, type and affordability.

#### **Local Plan Policy HG10 - Housing Mix and Design**

14. Residential developments will be required to contain a mix of units providing accommodation in a range of types, sizes (including 1 and 2 bedroom dwellings) and affordability, making the best use of the site and promoting a sense of community which reflects local needs.

The design and layout of schemes should be informed by the wider character and context of the local townscape and landscape. Schemes should also achieve high quality design and distinctiveness, avoiding inflexible standards and promoting energy efficiency. The District Council will support the preparation of Village Design Statements to secure these aims.

## **Local Plan Policy EN28 - Development within the Curtilage or Setting of a Listed Building.**

15. Where it appears that proposals would affect the curtilage or wider setting of a Listed Building, the District Council will require the submission of sufficient illustrative and technical material to allow its impact to be clearly established. 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.

### **Consultation**

16. **Haslingfield Parish Council**

Recommends refusal. It states:

“The design of the house is the same as previously submitted but the frontage is significantly improved by being less dominating. Parking provision is adequate. However the garage is much too high considering its proximity to No. 44 and seriously impacts upon the light to the house there. The upper floor windows appear to overlook the house at No 44 impacting upon their privacy. The scale of this should be lower.

We urge the retention of the wash-house as being an interesting and important part of village history. There is no need for this building to be demolished.”

17. **Chief Environmental Health Officer**

No objection subject to safeguarding conditions to control noise and disturbance during the period of demolition and construction.

18. **Conservation Manager**

1. ”The revised design is more modest than the previous scheme and appears to accord with earlier pre-application discussions.
2. It will be important to ensure that the mass of the building is tempered by the use of appropriate local materials, including a pale gault brick (as per existing). It will also be important to ensure that the materials generally are of a high quality, with the windows having an appropriate depth of reveal to ensure some texture and movement to the otherwise flat elevation. Windows should be timber, vertical sliding sash. I would suggest that detailed plans of the elevations are conditioned as well as material samples.
3. Setting the building deeper into the site (effectively to the rear of the adjacent listed cottage) will mean that it will become more intrusive to the adjacent dwelling. While there is currently substantial screening the proposed loss of the outbuilding will open up the boundary. The loss of the outbuilding should, therefore, be resisted for this reason in addition to the following.

4. The former washhouse in the rear garden is an attractive building of its sort which contributes to the setting of the listed building. It appears to have a functional and historic relationship with the adjacent listed building and is in reasonable/good condition. It should, therefore, be retained as part of the development. I note that the previously approved scheme (planning appeal) retained this structure. The retention of this outbuilding is important to the group of buildings in my opinion.
5. Given the impact of the development on the wider character of the village, the landscaping and boundary treatment will be fundamental to the integration of the building into the site. This should be carefully detailed to retain the informality of the street frontage.

## Conclusion

I am of the opinion that this proposal is a significant improvement on the previously withdrawn scheme but its success will rely on the quality of materials utilised and the detailing of the features. I am also of the view that it is essential (and I can see no reason why it can not) that the outbuilding is retained as a contributor to the setting adjacent listed cottage.”

## Representations

19. Three letters of objection have been received, from the occupiers of 97 Barton Road, Comberton (the daughter of the occupier of No. 52 Church Street - on behalf of her father); ‘Cottisford’, 115 New Road; and ‘The Moorings’, 44 Church Street.
- 97 Barton Road, Comberton (on behalf of No. 52 Church Street)**
20. “...the two storey front section of the house is to the south of my father’s bungalow, it would have a significant effect both on the view from his sitting room window and on the light coming through it”.
  21. “Haslingfield is...a ‘Group Village’...the proposed development contradicts **Policy SE4[b]**, being insensitive to the character of the village and the amenities of my father...”
  22. “Church Street marks the western boundary of Haslingfield’s Village Framework. I do not believe that this proposal complies with **Policy SE9**, as the imposing nature of the proposed house’s design cannot minimise the impact of the development on the countryside. In addition, the land immediately to the west of Church Street is in the Green Belt and the East Anglian Chalk Landscape Character Area. Views to Haslingfield from this land cannot but be adversely affected by this proposed development.”
- ‘Cottisford’, 115 New Road**
23. “...we are sorry that the proposed development involves demolition of the clunch house containing the washroom and boiler. We have a particular interest as this building was adjacent to our previous cottage at 44 Church Street. We used it as an out-building for over 30 years and consequently are interested in the history it enfolds. It is of course much older than us and is a historic village feature that we and other villagers would be sorry to lose.”
- ‘The Moorings’, 44 Church Street**
24. The Wash/Boiler house has some historical value being traditionally built with the original fireplace/chimney intact. “Our family has enjoyed shared use of the building

for over 30 years and it conveniently has a door into each garden (i.e. 44 and 48)...It is structurally sound, aesthetically pleasing and is very close (about 5 metres) to our 'listed' cottage."

25. "The proposed garage roofline will dwarf our cottage, which is in close proximity...it is directly adjacent to our sitting room window and will block light, not to mention the view!"
26. The garage has a first floor which may be used beyond that of a storeroom in the future. A window in the rear will overlook our property.
27. Loss of the stable block at the bottom of the plot - this is not even shown on the plans.

### **Planning Comments - Key Issues**

28. The key issues in this application are the impact of the new dwelling on the amenities of occupiers of adjacent dwellings, the impact on the setting of the adjacent listed building, No. 44 and the impact on the street scene.

### ***Amenity of occupiers of adjacent properties***

#### ***Impact on No. 52***

29. This bungalow lies to the north of the site. The side elevation (south facing) of this bungalow contains a lounge window, a door and a kitchen window. There is another lounge window in the front elevation. The proposed dwelling will be approximately 13.5m away from the bungalow and 1.5-2m further away than the appeal dwelling. The two storey depth of the proposed dwelling is approximately 1m less than the appeal dwelling but the two storey bulk is positioned further back into the site which will have a greater impact on the garden of the bungalow. However as this rear projecting bulk is approximately 16m from the side of the bungalow and between 6m and 8m from the garden boundary I do not consider that the proposal will have an unacceptably greater impact on the amenities of the occupiers of this property either when viewed from within the property or from its garden than the appeal dwelling.
30. There is a bedroom window at first floor that could potentially look directly into the garden and south elevation of the bungalow. It is shown to be high level on the plans but there is no section to confirm this. A condition requiring the sill of this window to be no less than 1.7m above finished floor level will overcome any potential loss of privacy but will present problems with building regulations as this is the only window to this bedroom. In order to gain building regulations consent it may be necessary to provide an additional internal door between bedroom No. 4 and No. 5 and/or for the stairway to be 'protected'. This matter can be resolved through an application for building regulations consent and does not prevent the issuing of planning permission.

#### ***Impact on No. 44 (amenity)***

31. The two storey bulk of the proposed dwelling is between 10m and 15m from the garden boundary of this property and is a similar distance to the appeal dwelling. I consider that this distance is sufficient so that the dwelling will not appear any more overbearing or dominant to the occupiers of No. 44 either when viewed from within the dwelling or from its garden than the appeal dwelling.
32. There are no windows at first floor level in the side elevation facing No. 44 so there is no loss of privacy.

33. The garage is to be situated approximately 4-5m away from the side of No. 44. A lounge window will be affected. The garage is 0.6m taller than the garage approved at appeal but is set approximately 0.8m further off the boundary. In my opinion the increase in height is compensated for by the re-siting so that the bulk of the new garage will have no materially greater impact on the amenities of the occupiers of No. 44 than the appeal dwelling.
34. As submitted the garage had a window facing to the rear. This window overlooked the side garden of No. 44 which is an area of garden well used by the family. This window has been excluded in the amended scheme.

#### ***Impact on Street Scene***

35. The new dwelling is approximately 7.7m tall which is not excessive and is set well back into the site. The hipped roof design will lessen the bulk and with appropriate landscaping it will not in my view adversely impact on the street scene.
36. The garage, although bulkier in construction is better designed and does not have the dormer windows that were in the north elevation of the appeal scheme.

#### ***Setting of adjacent Listed Building, No. 44***

37. The scale and the bulk of the dwelling is not in my opinion in keeping with the setting of the smaller listed building and the proposed dwelling is approximately 0.6m taller but the bulk is similar to the appeal dwelling and it is set further back into the site. I am mindful of the comments of the Conservation Manager and consider that the proposed dwelling will not have a materially greater impact on the setting of the listed building than the appeal dwelling.

#### ***The Wash/Boiler House***

38. This small building is important to the setting of the listed building and is now shown to be retained. From the comments of the Conservation Manager it is clear that this building has a historical relationship to the listed building and is in my view protected by means of it being historically curtilage listed. However it has not been possible to establish this beyond any doubt and I feel that a condition requiring its retention is therefore justified.

#### ***Car Parking***

39. There is sufficient space within the site for parking and turning.

#### **Recommendation**

40. Approval as amended by letters dated 29<sup>th</sup> October 2004 and 25<sup>th</sup> October 2004 and plans reference 04005-03 and 04005-04 and subject to the following conditions:
1. Standard Condition A - Time limited permission (Reason A);
  2. Sc5a - Details of materials for external walls and roofs (Rc5a(ii));
  3. Sc51 - Landscaping (Rc51);
  4. Sc52 - Implementation of landscaping (Rc52);
  5. Sc60 - Details of boundary treatment (Rc60);
  6. Sc5f - Details of materials to be used for hard surfaced areas within the site including roads, driveways and car parking areas (Reason - To protect the visual quality of the area);
  7. No development shall commence until details of the design and materials to be used for the external windows and doors have been submitted to and

approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority; the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

(Reason - To ensure that visually the development accords with neighbouring buildings and respects the visual quality of its surroundings.)

8. The development shall not be occupied until space has been laid out within the site (in accordance with plan no. 04005-04 attached hereto) for 2 cars to be parked and for vehicles to turn so that they may enter and leave the site in forward gear, and that area shall not thereafter be used for any purpose other than the parking and turning of vehicles.  
(Reason - To ensure adequate space is provided and thereafter maintained on site for the parking of vehicles.)
9. No power operated machinery shall be operated on the premises during the period of demolition and construction, before 08.00 hours on weekdays and 08.00 hours on Saturdays nor after 18.00 hours on weekdays and 13.00 hours on Saturdays (nor at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays) unless otherwise previously agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority in accordance with any agreed noise restrictions.  
(Reason - To minimise noise disturbance to adjoining residents.)
10. No windows, doors or openings of any kind shall be inserted in the first floor north or south elevations of the dwelling nor in the first floor east elevation of the garage, hereby permitted, unless expressly authorised by planning permission granted by the Local Planning Authority in that behalf.  
(Reason - To safeguard the privacy of occupiers of the adjoining properties.)
11. The first floor window in the north elevation of the dwelling, hereby permitted, shall have a sill height of not less than 1.7m above finished floor level and shall be maintained at this height.  
(Reason - To safeguard the privacy of occupiers of the adjoining properties.)
12. The building known as the wash/boiler house and annotated on the approved plans (reference 04005-04) to be retained shall not be demolished.  
(Reason - To protect the setting of the adjacent listed building.)

## **Informatives**

### **Reasons for Approval**

1. The development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:
  - **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003:**  
**P1/3** (Sustainable design in built development) and  
**P7/6** (Historic Built Environment)
  - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:**  
**SE4** (List of Group Villages)  
**HG10** (Housing Mix and Design) and  
**EN28** (Development within the Curtilage or Setting of a Listed Building)
2. The proposal conditionally approved is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations which have been raised during the consultation exercise:

- Residential amenity including overlooking issues
- Visual impact on the locality
- Impact upon setting of adjacent Listed Building

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

- Planning Files reference S/1840/04/F, S/1081/02/F, S/1919/02/F and S/0997/04/F
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003

**Contact Officer:** Nigel Blazeby - Senior Planning Assistant  
Telephone: (01954) 713256