

**SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

---

**REPORT TO:** Planning Committee

5 October 2016

**AUTHOR/S:** Head of Development Management

---

**Application Number:** S/01198/16/LB

**Parish(es):** Grantchester

**Proposal:** Removal of 5 no. fruit trees and erection of single storey studio building

**Site address:** The Old Dairy, Manor Farm, Mill Way, Grantchester CB3 9NB

**Applicant(s):** Dr Pauline Brimblecombe

**Recommendation:** Approval

**Key material considerations:** Impact on the character and setting of listed buildings

**Committee Site Visit:** 4 October 2016

**Departure Application:** No

**Presenting Officer:** John McCallum, Planning Officer

**Application brought to Committee because:** The officer recommendation is contrary to that of the parish council

**Date by which decision due:** 20 August 2016

**Planning History**

1. S/1651/15/FL – Erection of new garage and studio building – Refused under delegated powers and dismissed at appeal on 6 April 2016

S/1652/15/LB – Erection of new garage and studio building – Refused under delegated powers and dismissed at appeal on 6 April 2016

**Site**

2. Manor Farm is a Grade II\* listed property dating from the C15. Within the historical site of the Manor House are a range of former agricultural buildings converted to three residential dwellings in about 1999. The Old Dairy is a dwelling within this range of buildings.
3. The buildings take the form of a 'U' Shape around a central courtyard now used for access and garden areas. The Old Dairy is mainly two storey with a single storey lean-to comprising a range of buildings. Its garden was formerly an orchard and still

retains a number of fruit trees. The whole range of buildings is regarded as being curtilage listed and form part of the setting of the listed Manor House. The site lies within the heart of the village and within the conservation area designated in 1999.

4. The site lies within the heart of the village and within the conservation area designated in 1999.

### **Proposal**

5. The application is to be read in conjunction with the accompanying planning application reported elsewhere on the agenda. It was originally submitted as an extension linked to the host building by way of an open roofed link.
6. As amended by drawings received on 10 September 2016, the proposal is for a detached, single storey building between the eastern side of the building and an existing brick boundary wall which encompasses the larger site. The new “studio” is separated from an existing single-storey lean-to extension by a gap of 4 metres and is intended to provide accommodation for an entrance hall, tack room, wc, meeting room, studio and storage. The accommodation is sought partly to assist an existing architect's practice (which officers confirm does not require planning permission in its own right)
7. The building has overall dimensions of 11 metres by 5.4 metres with a 2.7 metre high flat roof. It sits approximately 2.5 metres in from the boundary wall that runs alongside Mill Way. The proposed materials are dark stained boarding to match the existing kitchen lean-to under a dark grey single ply membrane roof.

### **Planning Policies**

8. *National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)*  
*Planning Practice Guidance*
9. *South Cambridgeshire LDF Development Control Policies, adopted July 2007*  
CH/3 Listed Buildings  
CH/4 Setting of Listed Buildings
10. *South Cambridgeshire LDF Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)*  
District Design Guide SPD - Adopted March 2010  
Listed Buildings SPD – Adopted July 2009
11. *Draft Local Plan*  
S/1 Vision  
S/2 Objectives of the Local Plan  
HQ/1 Design Principles  
NH/14 Heritage Assets

### **Consultations**

12. **Grantchester Parish Council** – Objects. The Old Dairy forms part of a coherent group of a listed church, manor house and barns. It is the most sensitive site in Grantchester, the ‘jewel in the crown’.
13. We believe that when planning permission to convert the barns to residential was given it was in order to preserve the appearance of the barns as barns. It was not a

licence to then develop freely and contrary to the character of the existing site.

14. Where such development is invisible, it might be permissible, but this proposal is very prominent from the north. We note that even invisible proposals from neighbours (extensions to the back) have been rejected by SCDC planners in the past as contrary to the curtilage of a listed building.
15. In our view, this proposal of a single storey flat roof extension does not preserve or enhance the character of the Conservation Area and Listed Building.
16. We also regard the loss of trees as significant.
17. We see no public benefit to outweigh these losses.
18. **Historic England** – Note that the buildings when viewed in combination with St Mary and St Andrews Church make a positive contribution to the character of Grantchester conservation area. The current proposal involves the erection of a new studio building to the east of the main building range, which has been placed to follow the predominant building line along the north-east edge of the agricultural courtyard. We note that the scale of the new build is smaller than previous applications and consider this will be less obtrusive in terms of its impact on the original building and views from Mill Way.
19. However, we note that in relocating the new build, the building footprint has moved towards the schedule monument (moated site at Manor farm NHLE 1020440). Based on the plans provided, the new building appears to be on the boundary of, but just outside, the scheduled monument. The applicant is reminded that any groundworks within the scheduled monument require scheduled monument consent.
20. Historic England considers that the proposed new studio would be unlikely to detract from the character of the conservation area and the scheme therefore appears consistent with the NPPF.
21. **Historic Environment Team, Cambridgeshire County Council** – The site lies in an area of high archaeological interest (precise details provided). We do not object to the development from proceeding in this location but consider the site should be subject to a programme of archaeological investigation secured through the use of a negative condition.
22. **Consultancy Unit, Historic Buildings** – (As originally submitted). The building will be linked to the dwelling with an open flat roofed porch. The principle of a flat roofed studio within the grounds of the dwelling could be supported. However, the building is of significant size. The supporting information provides an outline to the need for a separate office, to that already in the dwelling. However, the proposal includes a meeting room, archive space and a wc.
23. The link to the studio is not acceptable. This visual and physical link between the two buildings detracts from the agricultural character of the building.
24. Through the reduction in size of the studio and the removal of the adjoining porch, this scheme could be supported.

### **Planning Assessment**

25. The key issues in relation to this application are whether the proposal would preserve

the character and setting of the surrounding listed buildings.

26. Section 66(1) of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 states:  
“In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses”.
27. Between them, Policies CH/3 and CH/4 state that proposals for extensions to listed buildings will be determined in accordance with legislative provisions and national policy and planning permission will not be granted for development that would adversely affect the curtilage or wider setting of a listed building. Advice on setting is also contained within the adopted Listed Buildings SPD at paragraphs 4.37-4.42.
28. Paragraph 132 of the NPPF states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification.
29. Paragraph 134 of the NPPF says that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.
30. The previous appeal decision for the property outlined in the planning history section above is a material consideration in the determination of this latest application. In that case the proposed extension was for a hipped roof extension set off from, and attached to, the north east corner of the building in the form of a dogleg. This was found to have been at odds with the overall form and building line of the existing courtyard and as a result would have adversely affected the original form of the courtyard and in turn the setting of Manor Farm. Because of the limited views of the extension, the inspector nonetheless concluded that neither the size nor the extent of the proposal would have an adverse effect on the setting of the more distant Church.
31. The overall degree of harm was found to be less than substantial. No public benefits were found to exist to outweigh the harm caused.
32. The current proposal differs in that its length and width have been slightly reduced; the hipped roof replaced by a flat roof and, as amended is detached from the lean-to extension of the host building. The “dogleg” has been removed so that the building is also set further back in relation to the main north elevation and adopts amore linear form.
33. These changes are considered to result in a building which does more to maintain the agricultural integrity and character of the original barns. The main, north elevation of the new building is also devoid of openings and this helps to further mitigate the building’s overall impact. This in turn means the building is much less prominent from the north, this being the most important view of the buildings.
34. Having regard to the appeal inspector’s findings on the original scheme, the building is considered to preserve the setting of the Church of St Andrew and St Mary and Manor Farm as well as the existing range of buildings and courtyard to which the site forms

part. This aspect of the proposal is therefore in accordance with the NPPF, policies CH/3, CH/4 and the Listed Buildings SPD.

#### *Other Matters*

35. The requirement for a condition in respect of archaeological evaluation is considered justified and can be added to the conditions for the concurrent planning application.
36. Historic England has referred to the possible need for scheduled monument consent and this can be added as an informative to any approval.

#### **Conclusion**

37. Officers acknowledge that the existing group of buildings and courtyard have retained a simple and coherent agricultural character. They occupy a prominent position within the heart of the conservation area and are a key part of the setting of Manor Farm.
38. Nonetheless, officers conclude that the applicant has now provided a solution to his accommodation needs which preserve the character and appearance of the existing curtilage listed building and the setting of nearby listed buildings.

#### **Recommendation**

39. Planning Committee approves the application subject to the following:

#### **Conditions**

- (a) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.  
(Reason - To ensure that consideration of any future application for development in the area will not be prejudiced by permissions for development, which have not been acted upon.)
- (b) The materials to be used in the construction of the building hereby approved shall be as described in section 8 of the planning application form.  
Reason - To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory in accordance with Policies DP/2, CH/4 and CH/5 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
- (c) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 122/121 Rev A, 122/122 Rev A, 122/123 Rev A.  
(Reason – For the avoidance of doubt.)

#### **Informatives**

- (d) The applicant is reminded that any groundworks (including services or patio surfaces etc.) within the nearby scheduled monument (Moated site at Manor Farm NHLE 1020440) require scheduled monument consent.

#### **Background Papers:**

The following list contains links to the documents on the Council's website and / or an indication as to where hard copies can be inspected.

- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework 2007

- Planning File Refs: S/1651/15/FL, S/1652/15/LB, S/1197/16/FL, S/1198/16/LB

Report Author:

John Koch

Team Leader

Telephone Number:

01954 713268