

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

2 March 2011

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

S/1692/10 & S/1913/10 - FULBOURN Alterations and Extension to the Listed Building for a Utility/Bootroom on North Elevation (Regularisation of Unauthorised Works), at 2 Home End

Recommendation: Refuse with Enforcement Action

Date for Determination: 29th November 2010 & 3rd January 2011

Note: The applications have been reported to the Planning Committee for determination at the request of the local member.

Proposed Development

1. The scheme seeks retrospective planning and listed building consent for the erection of a single storey utility and boot room structure attached to the projecting north elevation of the existing dwelling.
2. The structure has a covered footprint of 4.5m x 3.7m, measuring 2.3m to its eaves height and 2.8m at its highest point overall. It is designed to feature oak weatherboarding on its external walls, with a small overhang, supported by oak posts, above the north facing external door and window. The roof is constructed of Cambridgeshire mix handmade clay plain tiles, with lead flashing and a small flat roof section (also lead) in the centre, obscured from public view.

Site And Surrounding Area

3. The application site is a Grade II listed building, that serves as a residential dwelling, located on a prominent corner where Manor Walk, Home End and Stonebridge Lane meet, located within the Fulbourn Conservation Area. The site is surrounded to the north and east by an approximately 2m high flint and brick wall.
4. To the south is the main frontage and vehicular entrance to the dwelling, beyond which is a business unit. To the north of the site is a public footpath along the highway edge and the roadway. Across the road to the north is a small area of trees, containing no structures. To the east of the site, across the road, is the village hall. To the north west of the site is a detached residential dwelling of approximately 1960s construction. This dwelling has some private amenity space between itself and the application dwelling, but largely faces towards the south-east.
5. The dwelling on the application site is principally a two storey timber framed structure, constructed in a broadly t-shaped footprint, with rendered facing walls and a relatively steep pitched clay tile roof. The main house is gable end on to the road, with a wide frontage of C15 origins but was almost completely rebuilt in two periods in the C17 and restored c.1965. There is a projecting C17-C18

wing to the rear (north), with twin aspect gables, which houses a breakfast/family room at ground floor and master bedroom at first floor. It is on the northern end of this structure that the proposed extension is located.

Planning History

6. In 2000 and 2001 two applications were approved (**S/1955/00/LB** and **S/1310/01/LB**) both of which included an extension for a utility room. The main difference between the two approved schemes is that the 2001 approval is slightly wider.

Policies

Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment

Planning Policy Statement 5: Historic Environment Planning Policy Practice Guide

Local Development Framework Development Control Policies 2007

DP/1 Sustainable Development

DP/2 Design of New development

DP/3 Development Criteria

DP/7 Development Frameworks

CH/3 Listed Buildings

CH/5 Conservation Areas

Local Development SPD Listed Buildings: Works to or Affecting the Setting of 2009.

Local Development SPD Development Affecting Conservation Areas 2009

Consultations

7. Fulbourn Parish Council – makes no recommendation.
8. SCDC Conservation Team – recommend refusal on the basis of two reasons: Firstly that the extension is inappropriate and complex in form and design, resulting in a visually intrusive addition that features lead and oak boarding which are uncharacteristic and inappropriate for a building of this age and type. Accordingly the development compromises the character and appearance of the building, and therefore harms the special character and appearance of the listed building.
9. Additionally the listed building makes a strong visual statement within the Conservation Area. By virtue of the inappropriate and harmful extension the character and appearance of the Conservation Area is neither preserved nor enhanced by the proposed development.

Representations

10. The local member, Councillor Williams, has requested that the application be determined by Planning Committee as the extension in question is situated behind an eight foot high wall and considers that it therefore cannot have any impact upon the Conservation Area or adjoining properties. He considers that

the materials are inappropriate but could be resolved through appropriate conditions of consent.

Planning Comments

11. The key issues to consider in this instance are the impact that proposals would have upon the character and appearance of the listed building and upon the Conservation Area within which the proposal is located.
12. The proposed structure is not located within close proximity to any adjoining property and so does not have any physical impact in this regard. The main issue is of the design and appearance of the structure, relative to its location constructed onto a Grade II listed building, located within the Fulbourn Conservation Area.
13. As outlined above, the proposed extension is located on the northern end of the existing listed building, within the property's own boundary wall. The proposed extension has already been constructed, and therefore the application is effectively seeking retrospective consent for this structure.
14. The walls of the proposed structure are largely obscured from public view, although clearly visible within the listed building's own curtilage. From public view the roof serving the structure can be clearly seen above the height of the boundary wall. By virtue of a fall in levels outside the site, the structure appears to be higher than the surrounding footpath and roadway.
15. The roof form of the proposed extension is untraditional, uncharacteristic of the building, out of proportion with the rest of the proposed extension with a large overhang, and detracts from the appearance of the side and rear elevations of the listed building. The extension spans the whole width of the gable, obscuring the lower part resulting in awkward junctions with the gable wall and historic flint boundary wall. The junction with the boundary wall is particularly unfortunate and future maintenance of the extension and flint wall will be impeded due to restricted access.
16. In terms of materials, lead is inappropriate for a vernacular building as there is an established hierarchy of materials where lead was historically used for churches and high status buildings such as country houses, neither of which could be argued for the building on site. Oak boarding is not considered to be suitable for a building of this type or period, where facing render is typical, as evidenced by the main dwelling. Whereas oak boarding is often used for extensions to simple vernacular buildings, such as cottages, it is not appropriate for a larger house dating from the 15th and 17th centuries. The boarding has been fixed by screws that are very prominent and visually intrusive. In addition the window has a night vent, which is a modern and incongruous detail that is not seen elsewhere on the main house.
17. Noting the comments of the local Member, whilst some of the concerns expressed regarding the choice of materials could be overcome by conditions of consent typically imposed prior to the commencement of development, it must be noted that this is a retrospective application for development that has already been constructed. Accordingly, the Authority is obliged to consider the unauthorised development and determine the appropriate course of action primarily. Additionally, the concerns regarding materials must be considered

alongside the inappropriate design of the proposed extension, which, by virtue of its form, proportions and design, is considered harmful to the special character and appearance of the listed building. Whilst a large percentage of the structure is obscured from public view, the whole structure is visible from the listed curtilage, and therefore must be considered to affect its appearance and setting. Additionally, that the roof can be seen prominently from the street scene, and therefore creates a relationship between the modified dwelling and the surrounding Conservation Area, dictates that the development also has a wider impact upon the setting of the site. The revision to materials alone would not overcome these concerns.

Recommendation

1. Having regard to applicable national and local planning policies, and having taken all relevant material considerations into account, it is recommended that both applications be **refused** for the following reasons:
 1. The extension harms the special character and appearance of this 15th and 17th Century timber framed and tiled roof dwelling, by virtue of its form proportions, materials and design. The proposal is considered to be inappropriate and complex in form and design and has resulted in a visually intrusive addition that compromises the character and appearance of the side and rear elevations of the dwelling. The materials, which include lead and oak boarding, are uncharacteristic of the building and inappropriate for a building of this type and age.

The proposal is therefore considered contrary to Policy CH/3 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies DPD 2007 (DPD); Policies HE7 and HE9 of Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment (including HE7.2 and HE9.1); PPS 5 Historic Environment Planning Policy Practice Guide (including 86, 111, 142 and 178), and paragraph 4.12 of the Local Development SPD Listed Buildings: Works to or Affecting the Setting of 2009.
 2. The listed building makes a strong visual statement within the Fulbourn Conservation Area. Due to its inappropriate form, proportions, materials and design, the extension neither preserves nor enhances the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CH/5 of the adopted DPD 2007 and paragraphs 3.3 and 3.4 of the Local Development SPD Development Affecting Conservation Areas 2009.
2. Authorise **Enforcement Action** to bring about the removal of the unauthorised structure and the land and buildings be restored within 6 months of the date of refusal.

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

- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy (adopted January 2007)
- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies DPD 2007

- Local Development SPD Listed Buildings: Works to or Affecting the Setting of 2009.
- Local Development SPD Development Affecting Conservation Areas 2009
- Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment
- Planning Policy Statement 5: Historic Environment Planning Policy Practice Guide
- Planning File Refs: S/1955/00/LB, S/1310/01/LB, S/1692/10 & S/1913/10

Contact Officer: Mike Osbourn - Senior Planning Officer
01954 713379