

## SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

---

**REPORT TO:** Planning Committee

1 June 2011

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

---

**S/0428/11 & S/0429/11(LBC) – GT & LT CHISHILL  
Extension and Alterations to Dwelling and Formation of Opening in Gable End -  
17, Hall Lane for Mr & Mrs Scott**

**Recommendation: Refuse**

**Date for Determination: 12 May 2011**

**Notes:**

**This Application has been reported to the Planning Committee following a request from Cllr Barrett**

**The Site lies within the Chishill Conservation Area**

**Members will visit the site on the 1 June 2011**

**Site and Proposal**

1. 17 Hall Lane is a detached dwellinghouse dating back to the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> century. The dwelling has a narrow linear plan form and thatched roofs and is Grade II Listed. The site falls within the Chishill Conservation Area, the dwelling is set within a modest plot and projects away from the adjacent highway (Hall Lane) running roughly south to north.
2. Thatched outbuildings also serve the dwelling and the site is bounded by a mixture of fencing and soft landscaping. Views of the dwelling are afforded through the vehicular access onto Hall Lane and also from the area of open space and public footpath to the east.
3. Hall Lane is a typical residential street comprising a mix of dwelling form and design. Hall Lane is a classified road (B1039) and serves as part of the through road through Gt and Lt Chishill, subsequently small estate roads feed off from Hall Lane. Plaistow Way is one such example within the vicinity of the application site.
4. The full planning application, submitted on 28<sup>th</sup> February 2011, proposes the formation of a modest two storey extension to project from the northern gable of the dwellinghouse. To facilitate internal access to the extension (which forms a garden room and bedroom) a doorway is proposed at ground floor level within the existing dwelling in a location on the northern gable adjacent to a historic fireplace.

## **Background**

5. The applicants sought pre-application advice with the Council's Conservation Team whose advice in response to phone calls and a letter was that if the wall identified for the insertion of the opening was historic, the principle of extension in this location would not be supported and if the range on which it was to be attached was modern, there would potentially be issues regarding the cumulative extent of extensions. The dates for this end of the building put forward by the applicant varied and subsequently an area of opening up to date the bricks took place after submission of the application. The bricks revealed accord with average dimensions given by the applicant's reference source for seventeenth century brickwork (i.e that the bricks average a height of 2"). Although the exact dates of the brickwork are not yet agreed, all parties have now agreed that both areas at least predate 1800, so are at least three hundred years old.
6. Parallel pre-application discussions also took place regarding the design of an extension if the principle of the opening could be agreed. The proposed roof was lowered and dormer and window positions were moved in accordance with agreement during those discussions.

## **Heritage assets which are affected by the proposal and the significance of the aspects affected**

7. The heritage assets in relation to this case are the listed building and conservation area. Apart from the front porch and glazed lean-to, all bays of the house predate 1800 and are of high significance. The listing criteria notes that most buildings prior to 1840 are worthy of statutory protection, so both historic extensions would be afforded statutory protection in their own rights (DCMS Principles of Selection for Listing Buildings and specifically para 12). The westerly extension would be affected by the current proposed extension and dates from the seventeenth century. Its gable end comprises a substantial inglenook fireplace bay of circa 1700 with large central open hearth and two alcoves to the sides, following a typically subdivided arrangement for larger inglenooks, containing the oven (here on the right of the hearth) and the other originally containing seating and wood storage (on the left of the hearth).
8. The vernacular scale, form, design and thatched roof of the building are attractive and characteristic of historic rural cottages in the locality. The historic extensions to the house with their large and complex brick fireplace bay represent a later period of greater wealth circa 1700. Both the original building and the historic extensions are highly significant due to their architectural characteristics and evidence of social and architectural development of the house.

## **Planning History**

9. None of relevance.

## **Planning Policy**

10. **South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies DPD 2007:**

**DP/2** - Design of New Development

**DP/3** - Development Criteria

**CH/3** - Listed Buildings

**CH/5** - Conservation Areas

11. **South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Supplementary Planning Documents:**

Listed Buildings SPD - Adopted July 2009

Conservation Areas SPD - Adopted July 2009

12. **National Planning Policy**

PPS5: Planning for the Historic Environment

### **Consultations**

13. **Gt and Lt Chishill Parish Council** – Recommends approval.
14. **Country Council Rights of Way and Access Team** - No objections but recommend standard informatives relating to the adjacent public footpath.
15. **Conservation Officer** - Comments form the substance of this report

### **Planning Comments – Key Issues**

16. The key issues to consider in the determination of these applications are:
- The impact upon the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building.
  - The impact of proposals upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area

### ***Special Architectural and Historic Interest of the Listed Building***

17. On the basis that the Conservation Officer now considers that the bricks within the northern gable elevation predate 1800, with a more precise date being sought from a brick specialist by the applicant, it has been possible to make a more informed conclusion about the extent of harm to that offered during the pre-application discussions outlined above.
18. The proposal would remove most of the rear wall of the fireplace seating alcove to form into a corridor to gain access to the extension. There would be substantial and permanent harm due to the loss of the space, a significant part of the inglenook fireplace and fabric of the historic gable wall.

19. The loss to public benefit caused by the harm to the heritage assets is not outweighed by the level of public benefit and under PPS5 HE9.2 the level of public benefit would need to be substantial if it were to outweigh the substantial harm. The benefits as a result of the proposals would be private rather than public, and no further special planning case has been presented for consideration.
20. Due to the removal of the historic walling, the impact would therefore be seriously harmful to the special interest and character of the listed building, contrary to policy CH/3 of the LDF and national planning policy PPS5 policies HE7 and HE9 (including HE7.2, HE7.5, HE9.1 and HE9.4).

### ***Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area***

21. The proposed extension is considered appropriately scaled and detailed so as not to have a significant adverse impact upon the special character of the listed building or the surrounding conservation area. In addition the Heritage Statement that accompanies the application provides evidence that a lean-to weatherboarded structure at one time projected from the northern gable of the dwelling in the location of the proposed extension.
22. The Council's Conservation Officer has raised some concerns for the proposed roofing material, however it would be reasonable and justified to agree the roof material via a conditional requirement in the event of approval of the application and therefore this does not form a significant material concern.
23. The Council's Conservation Officer considers the proposed dormer to be overlarge in proportion with the roof in which it sits and that the detailing adds to its complexity and therefore its apparent bulk. There is thus considered to be some harm in this instance, but it would be reasonable and justified to agree the precise details of the dormer window via a conditional requirement in the event of approval of the application and therefore this does not form a significant material concern.
24. Although 17 Hall Lane is an important building within the conservation area, the harm identified relates to an aspect of the dwelling that is not considered to contribute to the character and appearance of the conservation area, being an aspect of the internal fabric of the dwelling. While the Conservation Officer considers that some aspects of the extension would be harmful to the interests of the conservation area, these aspects could be dealt with through the use of an appropriate condition.

### ***Conclusion***

25. There is considered to be a significant adverse impact upon the special historic interest of the listed building as a result of the proposed loss of historic brickwork required to facilitate the proposals.
26. This is sufficient in its own right to warrant refusal of both the applications.

### ***Recommendation***

27. Refuse both applications

**Reason for refusal:**

In order to facilitate internal access into the proposed extension at ground floor level the scheme would remove most of the rear wall of the fireplace seating alcove to form the requisite doorway. This is considered to constitute a substantial and permanent harm to the listed building due to the loss of a significant part of the inglenook fireplace and fabric of the historic gable wall. To this end the proposal is considered to be contrary to policy CH/3 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control policies DPD 2007 which seeks to ensure that development proposals do not adversely harm the special architectural or historic interest of listed buildings.

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

- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework 2007
- PPS5

**Contact Officer:** Matt Hare – Senior Planning Officer  
Telephone: (01954) 713180