

## SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

---

**REPORT TO:** Planning Committee

3 August 2011

**AUTHOR/S:** Executive Director / Corporate Manager - Planning and Sustainable Communities

---

### **S/0537/11 AND S/0539/11 – ABINGTON PIGGOTS Single Storey Extension for Mrs Julie Farquhar**

**Recommendation: Refuse**

**Date for Determination: 11<sup>th</sup> May 2011**

#### **Notes:**

**This Application has been reported to the Planning Committee due to the request of the Local Member.**

**The application has been advertised as a departure on the 12<sup>th</sup> July 2011.**

**The site is within the Conservation Area.**

**S/0539/11 is the Listed Building application.**

#### **Site and Proposal**

1. The application site measures approximately 0.1 hectare. The site is located within the village framework though to the northwest of the site is the countryside. To the northeast and southwest are residential properties. The public highway defines the southern boundary. The existing dwelling is a Grade II Listed Building and is located within the Abington Piggotts Conservation Area. To the northeast are two Grade II Listed Buildings and the historic area of Homestead Moat.
2. The existing building is large in size and the ground floor has a good size kitchen, two living rooms, a small study, a water closet and utility room. It is not considered that this building requires extension in order to meet modern standards of living. The existing garden of the site is of a good size with a large and a small outbuilding. The garden is also able to host a range of planting, a sitting area, lawn, storage space and the space to currently park approximately 6 cars off road. There is no vehicle turning area on this site.
3. The application, validated on the 16<sup>th</sup> March 2011, is for a single storey extension on the rear of this Grade II Listed Building. It was requested by the agent that the application not be determined in early May in order for the application to avoid refusal and to give time for a meeting with Officers to discuss the proposal in greater detail. The meeting with officers, agents and the applicants was held on the 24<sup>th</sup> June 2011. The Local Member requested that the application go to Planning Committee on the 29<sup>th</sup> June 2011.
4. With the application being called to Planning Committee after the 8 week determination period, officers had already come to the view that the application would be harmful to the historic environment and contrary to policies CH/3 and CH/5 of the

Local Development Framework. The application has, therefore, been advertised as a departure in case the application is approved at planning committee.

## **Planning History**

*Within the previous 10 years*

5. **S/1456/10 and S/1457/10**– The proposal for the erection of a rear single storey glazed garden room was refused on the grounds of harm to the special character and appearance of the rear elevation of this 17<sup>th</sup> Century Grade II Listed Building. The proposal was considered to be detrimental to the simple appearance of the rear elevation and would obscure part of the elevation. In terms of design it was considered to be inappropriate and complex and would result in a visually intrusive addition that would compromise the simple character and appearance of this elevation. The proposal was also considered to be harmful to the Conservation Area due to its scale, form, massing, and design. Finally the application failed to provide sufficient information to assess the impact of the proposal on any heritage assets.

## **Planning Policy**

6. **National Guidance**

### **Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment**

Policy HE7 and HE9 (including 7.2 and 9.1)

PPS 5 Historic Environment Planning Policy Practice Guide (including 86, 111, 142, 178 and 182)

7. **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/4** – Development Within the Curtilage or Setting of a Listed Building

**CH/5** – Conservation Area

**TR/1** – Planning for More Sustainable Travel

**TR/2** – Car and Cycle Parking Standards

8. **South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework, Supplementary Planning Documents**

**Development Affecting Conservation Areas SPD – Adopted January 2009**

**Listed Building SPD – Adopted July 2009**

## **Consultations**

9. **Abington Piggotts Parish Council** – The Parish Council supports this application. It states that the reasons for refusing the last application are not understood and considered specious, ill informed and unprofessionally high handed (remarks to size of family). It considers the development to be a reasonable request that has no deleterious impact on either building or Conservation Area.
10. **Conservation** –. (19<sup>th</sup> April 2011) During pre application discussions the Conservation Manager suggested a less harmful alternate location for a gabled garden room at the other end of the rear elevation off the existing lean-to extension.

The advice of the Conservation Manager was not taken and the proposed development is at right angles to the rear wall in the location previously refused. The proposal is almost as deep as the refused scheme but being at 90° obscures less of the rear wall. However, the form of the structure is contrary to the linear plan form of the historic building and its position and form would dominate the rear and side elevations because the long rear elevation characteristic of the existing will be truncated.

11. A garden room is not typical of the date of the house and is contrary to the character and status of this simple vernacular building. Paragraphs 10.2 and 10.2 of the SPD giving specific guidance on conservatories and state “historic examples of conservatories, greenhouses and orangeries were typically found on grander and larger, not cottages or vernacular architecture”.
12. The heaviness and complexity of the design with visible roof framing at intervals in the glazing and heavy bargeboard would compound the inappropriate form and result in a dominant structure that would detract from the character of this simple former farmhouse.
13. The Conservation Manager has commented on an amended scheme and this provides the wording which it is requested that the application be refused upon.
14. (12<sup>th</sup> July 2011) The Conservation Manager states that the amended design is an improvement on the previous proposal but does not address the concerns about the location and form of the garden room. The extract of the 1903 Ordnance Survey map submitted as part of the application shows that there was an extension on the rear elevation but this is in the location of the existing extension and there is no precedent for an extension in the proposed location.
15. Following the submission by the agents that there are similar examples in the locality, the examples have been investigated. The Conservation Manager confirms that most of the examples are modern buildings and the listed buildings shown were all extended in the mid 1980s. In addition to this the main objection to the current scheme is the amount of rear elevation that would be covered together with the position, which is almost central and would obscure and truncate all view of the rear elevation from close the building. However, only two examples show a combination of rear extensions and both have main projections to one side, not almost central, and both examples are unlisted. None of the examples given would therefore give a precedent for the proposal.
16. The Conservation Manager has examined the additional reasons given by the applicant as to why the extension onto the existing lean to would not work:
17. “It would cause that part of the site to be cramped” – The report suggests that an extension in this location would be cramped versus the proposed location but the drawing of the proposed location (890C – 08 Rev A) does not show the proximity of the tree and the suggested location would be no more cramped than the proposed location, which is equally close to existing buildings and the tree.
18. “Access through the utility would be awkward due to differing levels” – there are no details of where or how much the levels change or what solutions have been considered. On the floor plan submitted there appears to be no changes of level and this would remain the case if the new floor level matched the existing.

19. "Structural Changes would add unacceptable expense" – There is no indication of how much or what is considered to be an unacceptable sum and the scheme could retain the entire structure of the existing unchanged if costs were the main issue.
20. "The purpose of enjoying the garden would be lost" – This is an emotive statement, unrelated to planning policy, and which is not agreed as views across the garden would still be visible from the suggested location.
21. "Cars parking the driveway restrict access to the garden" – There is nothing on drawing 890C – 09 to qualify this statement and an extension in the alternative location would appear to be no more restricted than the existing.
22. "Alternative system for storing waste and recyclables would need to be established" – It would not be too difficult to find an alternative location that is still convenient for the drive and not too far from the house.
23. The Conservation Manager concludes that all views of the listed building are relevant to its interest including non-public views. The rear elevation is significant as it emphasises the long linear character of the building and the traditional and less formal layout of openings at the rear. These views of the rear elevation within the garden would be obscured and restricted by an extension in the proposed location.

### **Representations**

24. None currently received

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

25. The key issues to consider in the determination of this application are:
  - Impact upon Listed Building and Conservation Area
  - Residential Amenity
26. Impact upon Listed Building and Conservation Area – The existing Grade II Building has a simple linear shape following the orientation of the road, apart from a small ground floor lean to on the northeast rear edge of the building. The proposed garden room is located approximately in the middle of the rear elevation and seeks to create a much more complex historic plan of the dwelling that no longer follows a clear linear pattern nor follows side boundaries in a traditional form. In addition to this the depth of the proposed garden room is approximately the same as the existing building, rather than being clearly subservient.
27. The applicant considers that the development is required in order to provide a space filled with natural light in order to enjoy the garden. While this request is fully understood the harm to the historic form of the Listed Building is not outweighed by the wish for a better view of the garden space. Furthermore, this is achievable by a more appropriate alternative.
28. The alternative scheme of proposing a similar size development extending from where the current lean-to currently would follow the historic form of the Listed Building. It is considered by officers that the existing roof and structure could remain as an alternative to being altered therefore the cost differences could be minimal and that it is justified in order to allow the owners of this property to extend in a less harmful way to the Grade II Listed Building.

29. The argument that the proposed development will not be viewable from public views does not prevent there being specific and detrimental harm to the Listed Building and the Conservation Area. The fact that the development cannot be seen from any public views only means the development does not have a detrimental impact upon the streetscene and therefore the proposal will not be refused under the specific Policy DP/2. The harm to other views and character of the building would still occur.
30. The advice and proposed reasons for refusal as stated by the Conservation Manager are supported.
31. Residential Amenity – The proposed development is a single storey rear extension in the middle of a two storey building, so it will have no impact upon the residential amenity of any adjacent residential property.

### **Conclusion**

32. The proposed development goes contrary to the historic plan of this Grade II Listed Building and the scale, form and massing of the development is considered to be inappropriate.

### **Recommendation**

33. **Refuse, for the following reasons:**

1. The proposed garden room will cause harm to the special character and appearance of the rear and side elevations of this 17<sup>th</sup> Century timber framed and tiled former farmhouse by virtue of its scale, form and massing. The proposal would be detrimental to the simple character and appearance of the rear elevation and contrary to the linear plan and form of the existing building. In addition it would result in a visually intrusive addition that would compromise the simple character and appearance of the rear and side elevations and obscure part of the rear wall. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to Policy CH/3 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies DPD 2007 (DPD); Policy 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, 178 and 182) and paragraphs 10.2 and 10.3 of the Local Development SPD Listed Buildings: Works to or affecting the setting 2009.
2. The Listed Building makes a strong visual statement within the Conservation Area and due to its inappropriate scale, form and massing the proposed conservatory will neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CH/5 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies DPD 2007 (DPD).

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

- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework 2007

**Contact Officer:** Andrew Phillips, Planning Officer  
Telephone: (01954) 713169