

## SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

---

**REPORT TO:** Planning Committee

7 March 2012

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

---

### **S/2516/11 & S/2517/11 - TEVERSHAM**

**Two-storey side extension, and alterations to single storey range of linked outbuildings – The Rectory, 30 Church Road.**

**Recommendation: Refusal**

**Date for Determination: 14 February 2012**

#### **Notes:**

**These Applications have been reported to the Planning Committee for determination at the request of the local Member of the District Council.**

**Members will visit this site on Tuesday 6 March 2012**

#### **Teversham Conservation Area**

##### **Site and Proposal**

1. The Rectory is a Grade II Listed Building and Heritage Asset and falls within the village development framework and within Teversham Conservation Area. The Rectory was re-built to replace an earlier house and later listed in 1984. The dwelling is constructed of grey gault brick with slate roofs and end stacks to each gable end.
2. The site comprises the main dwelling with existing extensions and outbuildings and a conservatory. To the east of the site is No.24 Church Road and 75m away is All Saints Church, which is a Grade II\* Listed Building, to the west is Teversham Church of England Primary School, to the north is open space and to the south are dwellings.
3. The application proposes a two-storey side extension, and alterations to single storey range of linked outbuildings. The existing house is roughly 275 sq m. The existing extension has a floor area of about 45 sq m. The proposal would result in a ground floor area of extension roughly 75 sq m and 50 sq m to the first floor; a total proposed extension of 125 sq m. The extension would provide an additional bedroom and garden room.

##### **Planning History**

4. In 2000, planning permission and listed building consent was granted for extensions and internal and external alterations, which is now part of the subject of this application (**S/0113/00/F** and **S/0122/00/LB**). The extensions and alterations are sited to the rear of the main dwelling and are single storey.
5. Planning permission and listed building consent was approved for a wall and conservatory to the north of the dwelling in 2002 (**S/1681/02/F** and **S/1680/02/LB**).

## Planning Policy

6. National Policy
  - (i) Planning Policy Statement 5 (PPS5): Planning for the Historic Environment
  - (ii) Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment: Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide
7. South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework, Development Control Policies, DPD, 2007:
  - DP/1 Sustainable Development
  - DP/2 Design of New Development
  - DP/3 Development Criteria
  - DP/7 Development Frameworks
  - CP/3 Listed Buildings
  - CP/4 Setting of Listed Buildings
  - CP/5 Conservation Areas
8. South Cambridgeshire LDF Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):
  - Development Affecting Conservation Areas – Adopted 2009
  - Listed Buildings: Works to or affecting the setting of – Adopted 2009
  - District Design Guide – Adopted 2010

## Consultation

9. **Teversham Parish Council** – Recommends approval.
10. **English Heritage** – Recommends the application be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance and on basis of Council specialist conservation advice. It is believed that the scale, form and massing of the proposed extension would not impact on the character of the conservation area given the distance set back from the road behind a high wall nor would it encroach on the surrounding open spaces. The proposed windows should be set back 100mm into the reveals and there should be careful detailing of the glazing bars. On the north-east elevation there should be hardwood boarding left to weather to a silver-grey.
11. The Council's **Conservation Officer** – Recommends refusal. The proposed extension would cause harm to the listed building by virtue of its scale, form, massing and appearance. The addition of another storey would increase the bulk of the existing extension, would dominate the front, rear and side elevation and would visually and physically detract from the special character and appearance of this grade II listed Building contrary to South Cambridgeshire LDF Development Control Policies DPD, 2007, CH/3 Listed Buildings, Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment Policies HE 7.1, HE 7.2, HE 7.5, and HE 9.4 Listed Buildings: Works to or affecting the setting of SPD, 2009.
12. Pre-application correspondence has taken place regarding a two-storey extension. In responses the Conservation Team has stated that they would be unable to support an extension of this size due to its scale, form, massing and appearance. In the letter attached to this application the English Heritage Advisor's comments are in respect of the impact on the Conservation Area from the proposed two-storey extension. It considers that the principal views of the Rectory from the public realm are up the drive looking toward the principal elevation, which is considered to have high significance. The view is that the proposed extension is set back from the face of the southwest elevation and the two-storey element will not impact in this view. Both letters also go beyond, scale, form and massing issues and reflect in some detail on design, which would appear unnecessary following their decision that the extension would not impact on the important

public views of the building and that The Rectory is almost completely screened from the public realm and makes little contribution to the streetscape.

13. The existing extension off the kitchen is successful and of an appropriate siting, scale, massing, height and design so that it does not compete with the existing house. The existing house has a clear, refined and proportioned appearance especially in respect of the plan form and the principal elevation and the early drawing of the house reinforces this clarity. It is considered that it has such clarity of design that any extension will have a significant effect.

### **Representations**

14. **Councillor Hunt** – It is my view that the proposed extension would not be detrimental to the conservation area or detract from the fabric of the listed part of the house. In my opinion the present extension does not sit comfortably with the older part of the house and I feel that the proposed new extension would in fact 'marry' the two together. The planning committee should make the decision.

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

15. The key issue to be judged in the determination of the application is the impact of the development on the Grade II Listed Rectory.

### **Impact on the Grade II Listed Rectory**

16. The proposal is assessed with close regard to comments of objections from the Conservation Officer and historic environment policy that seeks to preserve the significance of listed buildings and ensure that historic buildings remain the main features following any changes. Planning Policy Statement 5 carries significant weight in the determination of planning applications, which affect the historic environment. Particularly relevant to this application is Policy HE9.1 which states the following: 'There should be a presumption in favour of the conservation of designated heritage assets and the more significant the designated heritage asset, the greater the presumption in favour of its conservation should be...'. Policy HE9.2 goes on further to say, 'Where the application will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance local planning authorities should refuse consent unless it can be demonstrated that: i) the substantial harm to or loss of significance is necessary in order to deliver substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss; or ii)(a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site...'
17. Even where a proposal has a perceived harm to a heritage asset which is considered to be less than substantial harm Planning Policy Statement 5 Policy H9.4 states that, 'in all cases local planning authorities should: (i) weigh the public benefit of the proposal (for example, that it helps to secure the optimum viable use of the heritage asset in the interests of its long-term conservation) against the harm; and (ii) recognise that the greater the harm to the significance of the heritage asset the greater the justification will be needed for any loss.' The justification put forward in the application is clearly understood but heritage policy does not allow the Council to give special weight to the needs of individual owners; instead the impact of the changes must be balanced against the best general use (in this case residential) and the significance that the building holds for future generations. Policy HE 7.5 states that 'Local planning authorities should take into account the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to the character and local distinctiveness of the historic environment. The consideration of design should include scale, height, massing, alignment, materials and use.'
18. The two storey scale and form of the proposed extension is contrary to guidance set out in paragraphs 4.12 and 4.13 of Supplementary Planning Document Listed Buildings, which outlines that works to a Listed Building should be subservient to the original building and two storey

extensions will generally not be supported. The increase in the bulk and massing of the proposed extension would physically dominate the front, rear and side elevations of the property detracting from the character and identity of the Listed Building.

19. The concerns raised above are considered to highlight a significant objection to the proposed extension, particularly given the status of the building and the irreversible harm that would be caused to its character and historical interest. Consequently, the development is recommended for refusal for the reason outlined below in paragraph 23.

#### **Impact on the Conservation Area**

20. The listed building is situated behind a high wall so is set off from the streetscene but located within the Teversham conservation area. It would not be prominent in the Conservation Area.

#### **Residential Amenity**

21. The development would not be sited close to neighbouring properties so would not have a significant impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties.

#### **Conclusion**

22. The development is considered to cause significant harm to the Grade II Listed Building and in such circumstances the local planning authority is guided by national planning policy to give presumption in favour of conserving the building and its special architectural or historic interest.

#### **Recommendation**

23. Refuse both the planning and listed building applications for the following reason:
  1. The proposed extension would cause harm to the listed building by virtue of its scale, form, massing and appearance. The addition of another storey would increase the bulk of the existing extension, would dominate the front, rear and side elevations and would visually and physically detract from the special character and appearance of this grade II Listed Building contrary to South Cambridgeshire LDF Development Control Policies DPD, 2007, CH/3 Listed Buildings, Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment Policies HE 7.1, HE 7.2, HE 7.5 and HE 9.4, and Listed Buildings: Works to or affecting the setting of SPD, 2009.

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

- Circular 11/95 – Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions
- Planning Policy Statement 5 (PPS5): Planning for the Historic Environment
- Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment: Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide
- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework (LDF) Development Control Policies, adopted July 2007
- Development Affecting Conservation Areas SPD – Adopted 2009
- Listed Buildings: Works to or affecting the setting of SPD – Adopted 2009
- District Design Guide SPD – Adopted 2010

**Contact Officer:** Natalie Westgate – Planning Officer  
Telephone: (01954) 713250