

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation Control Committee 13th May 2005

AUTHOR/S: Director of Development Services

S/0200/05/F - Melbourn
Erection of 7 Guest Bedrooms, The Sheene Mill, Station Road, for Mr and Mrs Saunders

Recommendation: Delegated Approval

Date for Determination: 30th March 2005

Site and Proposal

1. This full application, as amended by drawings received on 8th April 2005, proposes the erection of 7 guest bedrooms in the grounds of Sheene Mill, Station Road, Melbourn, a Grade II Listed Building
2. The proposed building is detached from, and to the south east of the main building, to the rear of the existing car parking area. The proposed building, which comprises seven 1-bedroom suites, is 24.4 metres in length and varies in depth between 8.3 and 11.6 metres. The building is mainly single storey with a ridge height 6.4 metres. However there is a higher central section, with a ridge height of 7.6 metres, that provides the seventh room. The building would replace an existing range of small outbuildings on the site
3. To the south east the site adjoins the rear gardens of properties in Dolphin Lane. The proposed building is a minimum of 9 metres from the boundary with properties in Dolphin Lane.

Planning History

4. Planning consent was originally granted for the bedroom annexe in October 1999 (**Ref S/0071/99/F**) and subsequently renewed at the January 2005 meeting.
5. In November 2004 planning and listed consent was refused for an extension to the main building to provide eight guest bedrooms (**Ref S/1888/04/LB & S/1889/04/F**) on the grounds that the scale, form massing and appearance of the building was considered to detract from the character and appearance of the Listed Building, and that the extension could not be justified as being necessary to secure the continued viable use of the historic building.
6. In 1999 consent was granted for extensions to Sheene Mill and additional parking, including an extension over the existing flat roofed projection at the front of the site. That consent has been implemented in part.

Planning Policy

Policy P7/6 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 ("The County Structure Plan") requires Local Authorities to protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the historic built environment.

Policy RT12 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 (“The Local Plan”) states that the District Council will support proposals for the construction, extension or conversion to hotels, motels and guesthouses within village frameworks having regard to other policies in the Plan.

Policy EN28 of the Local Plan states that the District Council will resist and refuse applications which would dominate a Listed Building or its curtilage buildings in scale, form, massing or appearance; would damage the setting, well-being or attractiveness of a Listed Building; would harm the visual relationship between the building and its formal or natural landscape surroundings or; would damage archaeological remains of importance.

Consultations

Melbourn Parish Council recommended refusal of the application as originally submitted. “Our comments on application S/1889/04/F still pertain. The ‘footprint’ is still virtually the same, the car parking problems have not been improved etc.”

Its comments on the revised drawings will be reported verbally.

The **Conservation Manager** recommended refusal of the application as originally submitted but considers the amendment to be more in keeping with the approved scheme. The simplified form of the proposed annexe and the relocation of the lobby to the front wing provides symmetry and reduces the bulk and scale of the annexe. The increase in height between this and the approved scheme is not considered harmful to the setting of the listed building and the annexe still reads as a subservient, ancillary building.

The **Local Highway Authority** has no objection to the principle of guest rooms but is concerned that the number of parking spaces to be provided does not meet the District Councils’ standards. Clearly, it is essential that adequate parking be provided for the uses proposed within the site. At times of highest need, i.e. wedding receptions etc, on street parking is likely to be exacerbated if some on site spaces are used by resident guests.

The **Chief Environmental Health Officer** requests a condition restricting the hours of use of power operated machinery during the period of construction.

The comments of **Meldreth Parish Council** will be reported verbally.

Representations

7. 5 letters have been received from the occupiers of properties in Dolphin Lane and Station Road objecting on the following grounds:
8. Inappropriate scale of development for this site of a listed building. It is understood that whilst planning permission was granted a few years ago for the building it is alleged that no application was granted for demolition of the existing buildings.
9. The building would have a large impact on neighbouring properties. The building is sited too close to the boundary fence with properties on Dolphin Lane bearing in mind that the Dolphin Lane properties are bungalows and as the proposal is for a two-storey building, it would be inappropriate. In addition there would be overlooking leading to loss of privacy.

10. The proposed increase to the hotel would add to existing problems experienced with traffic and car parking. There is already a shortage of car parking spaces at the site and customers are using Station Road which affects the smooth flow of traffic along Station Road from Melbourn to the A10 junction and on occasions cars have backed right up to the A10 junction creating a dangerous situation. There are difficulties exiting from Dolphin Lane. The proposed extension would encroach on some of the parking area. The Highways Authority should consider this matter.
11. The proprietor of Riverside Guest House comments that the previous renewal was granted on the basis that the car parking situation at this end of Station Road had not changed since the original application in 1999. This is not correct. In 2003 consent was granted for a change of use of 30 Station Road from light industrial use to retail use. This consent was granted subject to the condition that spaces were made available within Sheene Mill car park for customers and staff at 30 Station Road, which decreases the number of spaces available for Sheene Mill staff and guests. Additional parking that was provided in the field on the other side of the River Mel is no longer available for use by Sheene Mill or 30 Station Road, which has resulted in an extra 8-10 cars parking in Station Road since Autumn 2004. Cars are now often parked on both sides of the driveway to the Guest House, obstructing the view in both directions, which makes it very difficult and dangerous for cars entering and leaving the site, especially when trying to turn left against the oncoming traffic. There have been occasions when it has been necessary to find the owners of cars parked in Station Road to get vehicles moved in order to use the entrance to the Guest House. Photographs illustrating the current parking situation in Station Road have been provided
12. The levels of noise generated by Sheene Mill, when the restaurant is open, is already frequently unacceptable and has in the past resulted in complaints to the proprietors and the Environmental Health Department. The addition of further bedrooms will increase the number of guests and the potential for disturbance.
13. Overcrowding in a Conservation Area.

Applicant's Representations

14. The applicant's agent comments that the amended drawings move the entrance to the proposed building further from the listed building and is now contained within the two storey element. The gap between the proposed annexe and the existing building has been maintained at the same distance as that approved previously. The roof has been changed from hipped to half hipped and amendments made to the fenestration. There are 45 parking spaces provided. The maximum number of spaces required for the existing and proposed buildings under the adopted parking spaces would be 49.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

15. Planning consent exists for the erection of a building providing four guest bedrooms. This proposal proposes an additional three rooms. The key issues to be considered with this application are the effect on the setting of the Listed Building, highway safety and the amenity of local residents. The site is not in the Conservation Area.
16. The proposed building is sited a minimum 9 metres from the boundary of properties on Dolphin Lane and is 4.2 metres high at this point, rising to 6.4 metres at a distance of 11.5 metres from the boundary. There is a corridor door in the south east elevation of the proposed building at ground floor level. The depth of the single storey element of the building at this end of the site has decreased from 9.3 metres to 8.3

metres. It is my view that the visual impact of the building on the adjacent properties in Dolphin Lane is acceptable and that the slight increase in height is offset by the reduction in depth.

17. The Conservation Manager has no objection to the scheme as amended in respect to its impact on the listed building. Listed Building Consent was granted in 1999 for the demolition of existing outbuildings. That consent has been part implemented.
18. On the matter of car parking and highway safety the applicants' agent has stated that the existing and proposed buildings generate a maximum requirement of 49 spaces. The drawings currently show the provision of 45 spaces. I am aware of the local concern in respect of car parking in Station Road and in my view it is therefore essential in this case that the proposal provides parking up to the maximum standard. The proposed scheme, if approved and constructed, would result in three additional rooms, over and above works already consented. However, in discussions with the applicant's agent it was indicated that should consent be granted for this scheme that the remainder of the extant 1999 consent for an additional two bedrooms and meeting room above the existing flat roofed area at the front of Sheene Mill would not be carried out. If this is the case then the current proposal for an additional three bedrooms would not differ significantly from that already consented and in my view in such circumstances the provision of additional car parking could not be reasonably required
19. I will discuss the matter of car parking further with the applicants' agent prior to the meeting and seek written confirmation that the applicant is prepared to enter into a Section 106 Agreement voluntarily revoking the unimplemented work in respect of the 1999 consent, should consent for the current proposal be granted.

Recommendation

That subject to the applicant entering into a Section 106 Agreement revoking consent for the remainder of the works approved under consent Ref: S/0073/99/F that delegated powers of approval be granted 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 – south west and south east - (Rc60);
6. Notwithstanding the details shown on Drawing 9909:13A the precise details of the fenestration including finishes of the building shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development. The development shall be carried out and maintained in accordance with the approved details. (Reason – To ensure appropriate details of the building within the curtilage of a listed building)
7. The building hereby permitted shall not be occupied other than by staff or guests of Sheene Mill (Reason – To prevent the building being used as separate units of accommodation)
8. No further openings of any kind shall be inserted into the south east elevation of the building hereby permitted without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority. (Reason – To protect the amenities of adjacent residential properties)

Informatives

Chief Environmental Health Officer

Should driven pile foundations be proposed, then before works commence, a statement of the method for construction of these foundations shall be submitted and agreed by the District Environmental Health Officer so that noise and vibration can be controlled.

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: P7/6** (Historic Built Environment);
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004: RT12** (Holiday accommodation within frameworks) and **EN28** (Development within the Curtilage of a Listed Building)

2. The development is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations which have been raised during the consultation exercise:
 - Residential amenity including noise disturbance and overlooking issues
 - Highway safety
 - Impact upon setting of a Listed Building

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

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- Planning file Ref. S/0200/05/F; S/2181/04/F; S/1888/04/LB; S/1889/04/F; S/0071/99/F; S/0070/99/LB & S/0073/99/F

Contact Officer: Paul Sexton – Area Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713255