

MAIN CASE

Reference No: 15/00632/FUL & 15/00633/LBC

Proposal: Single storey, utility room extension. Replacement patio and path paving

Site Address: Goodwin Manor 1 Station Road Swaffham Prior Cambridge CB25 0LG

Applicant: Mr Thomas Edwardes

Case Officer: Jon Pavey-Smith Planning Officer

Parish: Swaffham Prior

Ward: The Swaffhams

Ward Councillor: Councillor Allen Alderson

Date Received: 26 May 2015 **Expiry Date:**

[Q56]

1.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

- 1.1 Members are requested to **refuse** these two applications for the following reason:
- 1.2 The proposal is not acceptable and by reason of its design and relationship with the host dwelling, would result in an awkward juxtaposition of roof lines and architectural styles which would have a negative visual impact. The proposal fails to have sufficient regard to the historic significance of the listed building and would therefore cause harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset, contrary to section 12 and paragraphs 132 and 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework, policies ENV2 and ENV12 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and the East Cambridgeshire Design Guide SPD.

2.0 **SUMMARY OF APPLICATION**

- 2.1 The full planning application, plans and documents submitted by the Applicant can be viewed online via East Cambridgeshire District Council's Public Access online service, via the following link <http://pa.eastcambbs.gov.uk/online-applications/>. **Alternatively a paper copy is available to view at the East Cambridgeshire District Council offices, in the application file.**
- 2.2 The proposal seeks consent for the construction of a single storey, flat roofed rear extension to a Grade II listed building, located within Swaffham Prior conservation area. The extension would be located on what is the rear elevation of the listed

building; however this is the elevation that is now used as the principle entrance into the building. The proposed extension would project 3m from the rear elevation, have a width of 3.6m and a height of 2.3m. The materials proposed are brickwork to match the existing, timber windows and a mineral or single ply for the roof covering. The extension will accommodate a lobby and utility room.

3.0 PLANNING HISTORY

3.1

14/00214/FUL	Single storey garage extension to existing garage block to provide 6no. additional bays.	Approved	16.05.2014
14/01349/FUL	Single Storey Extension	Refused	20.01.2015
14/01388/LBC	Single storey extension	Refused	20.01.2015

4.0 THE SITE AND ITS ENVIRONMENT

4.1

The application site features a large detached dwelling, set in extensive grounds located on the edge of the village of Swaffham Prior. The property is Grade II listed and is located within the conservation area. The site is accessed from Station Road, with the drive being located to the north of the site. The property is believed to date from the mid-late 17th century and is a good example of a traditional exposed timber framed manor house. Minimal modern interventions have been carried out and the rear catslide roof is believed to have been constructed in the mid-late 1800s.

5.0 RESPONSES FROM CONSULTEES

5.1

Responses were received from the following consultees Swaffham Prior Parish Council, Ward Councillors, East Cambridgeshire's Conservation Officer these are summarised below. The full responses are available on the Council's web site:

Swaffham Prior Parish Council – No objections

Ward Councillors – As this application is set for refusal, I wish it to be called into Planning Committee. It is a small addition of less than 3% of the existing floor space. The present laundry facilities are in an unsuitable upstairs position. Sitting of the extension is not visually intrusive and will not have a negative architectural effect. The proposed boot room enables outdoor clothing to be removed and stored prior to entering the main building. It is not proposed to alter any of the existing internal layout.

Conservation Officer - Policy ENV12 states: 'Proposals that affect a listed building will not be permitted where it would have a detrimental impact on the visual, architectural or historic significance of the asset. Proposals to extend alter or change the use of a listed building will only be permitted where they would:

- Preserve or enhance the significance of the building...
- Be compatible with the character, architectural integrity and setting of the listed building...

One of the 12 core principals of the NPPF is that heritage assets should be conserved in a “manner appropriate to their significance”. Therefore where a proposal fails to have regard for the special character of a heritage asset or causes harm to its significance and there are no public benefits to weigh that harm against, then a proposal cannot be deemed to be in accordance with the principals of the NPPF.

Paragraph 133 of the NPPF states *“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...As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification”*.

The heritage statement submitted by the applicant concedes that an alternative solution would be possible, as it states on p.15 ***“Whilst a washing machine could be sited here (sic. In the kitchen), it would be less than ideal to have drying washing here and this does not enable a boot room facility to be provided”***.

The Conservation Officer cannot support the justification put forward - a utility room and porch, whilst they may be desirable cannot be regarded as fundamental to providing modern living standards. From the information provided in the Heritage Statement it would appear that there is capacity in the existing kitchen, through the removal of a kitchen unit for a washing machine to be provided without any alterations or additions to the fabric of the listed building. The additional provision of a dryer whilst not ideal could also be accommodated with the removal of a second kitchen unit. It may even be possible to provide a more appropriately designed porch/canopy at the rear entrance to the property that had much less of an impact visually...however without detailed design discussions I’m not sure if this could be achieved.

The heritage statement correctly identifies the rear elevation of the property as having the lowest significance as it is the elevation that has been altered in the past. However, whilst this elevation would not be regarded as the principal elevation, it is the elevation that is most ‘visible’. The vehicular and pedestrian access to the site is from the northern side and the main entrance into the property is now through the door located on this elevation, therefore making this elevation effectively the public face of the building. Any alterations to this façade could be regarded as having a significant impact on how the building is viewed and approached.

Within the heritage statement the significance of the component parts of the building have been assessed. As a whole the statement concludes that the building is of high significance but it is argued that there are elements which are of lesser significance where alterations may cause less harm. The rear elevation has been identified as such an element, with its significance being moderate/low and the Conservation Officer would not dispute this assessment of significance.

However, the argument for acceptability appears to have been put forward relying predominantly on the fact that the proposal will not impact or result in the loss of

historic fabric and the fact that this elevation is located at the rear will limit the visual impact of the proposal, therefore making the proposal acceptable.

Page 9 of the heritage statement states ***“The building was renovated prior to it being listed in 1984, but there have been little by the way of modern interventions”***. The fact that the listed building is a relatively intact example of its type with no modern interventions makes it unique and to my mind this further increases its significance.

Taking all of the information on board, I would agree that the proposed location of the extension is the location that causes least harm to the building. The form of the existing dwelling, severely limits the options for extending and whilst the introduction of a flat roof is less intrusive than the previous scheme, it still results in an awkward juxtaposition of roof lines and architectural styles that does little to preserve or enhance the character, appearance or setting of the listed building. I would therefore conclude that the proposal would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the listed building.

Paragraph 134 of the NPPF states *“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”*.

In weighing up the proposal in accordance with the NPPF there can be no public benefit derived from this scheme. The proposal affects a private residence and as already detailed above the provision of a utility room and boot room would not be regarded as fundamental alterations as there is capacity within the existing building to provide a washing machine without undertaking major alterations to the historic building.

For the reasons outlined above, consent should not be granted from a conservation viewpoint.

5.2 A site was displayed and an advert was posted in the Cambridge Evening News. No neighbouring properties were notified and no responses were received.

6.0 The Planning Policy Context

6.1 East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015
GROWTH 2 Locational strategy
ENV 1 Landscape and settlement character
ENV 2 Design
ENV 11 Conservation Areas
ENV 12 Listed Buildings

6.2 Supplementary Planning Documents
Design Guide

6.3 National Planning Policy Framework 2012
7 Requiring good design
12 Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

6.4 Planning Practice Guidance

7.0 PLANNING COMMENTS

7.1 The key considerations in determining these two applications are considered to be:

- The impact on the historic environment
- The impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties. (This only applies to the planning application).

7.2 **Impact on the Historic Environment**

Any development affecting heritage assets should be of a particularly high standard of design as well as using high quality materials. Heritage assets are a finite resource that once lost or damaged cannot be replaced. Care must be taken to ensure that any proposals that affect heritage assets seek to preserve or enhance the character, appearance and setting of those assets. Goodwin Manor is a Grade II listed building of national significance, therefore any alterations must be carefully considered to ensure that no harm is caused to the significance of the heritage asset.

Policy ENV12 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 states:

“Proposals that affect a Listed Building will not be permitted where it would have a detrimental impact on the visual, architectural or historic significance of the asset. Proposals to extend, alter or change the use of a Listed Building will only be permitted where they would:

- Preserve or enhance the significance of the building and not involve substantial or total loss of historic fabric.
- Be compatible with the character, architectural integrity and setting of the Listed Building; and
- Facilitate the long-term preservation of the building.

Proposals that affect the setting of a Listed Building will only be permitted where they would:

- Preserve or enhance those elements that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the heritage asset.
- Not materially harm the immediate or wider setting of the Listed Building. This setting may extend well beyond the immediate building curtilage and may include an extensive street scene or a wider urban design context, especially when the proposal is within a Conservation Area; and
- Facilitate the long-term preservation of the building.

The village of Swaffham Prior contains an exceptionally high number of listed buildings, 45 in total with the majority being located along the southeast side of High Street. The quality of the historic environment is very high throughout the village with a number of properties to the northwest being large detached dwellings set in private grounds; Goodwin Manor is one such property.

The proposal is for a single storey rear extension with a flat roof on what was the rear elevation of the building, outside what is now the main entrance. The property features a very large catslide roof on this elevation which is thought to date from the mid-late 1880s and is a prominent feature of the building, contributing to its significance. The proposed extension measures 2.3m to the eaves and is 3m deep, the introduction of a flat roof does little to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the listed building. It is not felt by officers to be an appropriate addition to a listed building of such architectural and historic quality.

The Historic Environment section of the Council's Design Guide SPD states on p.37 when dealing with extensions: "Acceptability will depend on the site, landscape, scale and form of the existing building and the proposed extension. The following general principles should be applied... Flat roofed extensions will rarely be acceptable, unless they form a link or are appropriate to the character of the original building.

The justification put forward for the extension is to provide a utility room and porch; whilst this may be desirable, it cannot be regarded as fundamental to providing modern living standards. From the information provided by the applicant, it would appear that there is capacity in the existing kitchen to provide space for a washing machine and tumble dryer through the removal of existing kitchen units. This solution would not result in any harm being caused to the listed building.

Within the heritage statement the significance of the component parts of the building have been assessed. As a whole the statement concludes that the building is of high significance but it is argued that there are elements which are of lesser significance where alterations may cause less harm. The rear elevation has been identified as such an element, with its significance being moderate/low and officers would not dispute this assessment of significance. However by virtue of how the building is used it is this elevation that is now the most 'visible'. The vehicular and pedestrian access to the site is from the north and the main entrance into the property is through the door located on this elevation. This therefore results in this elevation now being the 'public face' of the building and any alterations to the façade could be regarded as having a significant impact on how the building is viewed and appreciated.

The fact that there will be no alterations to the historic fabric of the building is only one consideration when dealing with applications affecting listed buildings. Whilst it is desirable that there are no alterations being proposed that will affect the fabric of the building; the fact that the building is being extended has the potential to result in harm to the appearance and setting of the asset. The fact that this building has been relatively unaltered and is a very good example of its type, makes it quite unique and further increases its significance.

By the very nature of listed buildings, it is not always possible for them to be altered or extended without harm being caused to their significance. The form of the existing dwelling severely limits the options for extending. The proposal is not acceptable and by reason of its design and relationship with the host dwelling, would result in an awkward juxtaposition of roof lines and architectural styles which would have a negative visual impact. The proposal fails to have sufficient regard to the historic significance of the listed building and would therefore cause harm to the

significance of the listed building, contrary to the principles set out in section 12 of the NPPF.

Paragraph 132 of the NPPF clearly states “**When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation...As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification**”.

Paragraph 134 of the NPPF also states “**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**”.

In weighing up this proposal in accordance with the NPPF, officers believe that the proposed development would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset. However, there can be no public benefit derived from the scheme as the proposal affects a private residence. Not only that, but there is capacity within the existing kitchen to provide space for a washing machine downstairs without any harm being caused to the listed building or its setting.

7.3 The impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

The property is situated in extensive grounds with mature and well established trees on each boundary. There are no neighbouring properties situated within close proximity of the site and therefore the proposed extension will have no impact on the residential amenity of any nearby properties.

7.4 Summary – In summary, the proposed extension would be detrimental to the visual amenity, character, appearance and setting of the listed building and would be contrary to policies ENV2, ENV12 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015, section 12 and paragraphs 132 and 134 of the NPPF and the East Cambridgeshire Design Guide SPD.

<u>Background Documents</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Contact Officer(s)</u>
Previous application: 15/00632/FUL & 15/00633/LBC	Jon Pavey-Smith Room No. 011 The Grange Ely	Jon Pavey-Smith Planning Officer 01353 665555 jon.pavey- smith@eastcamb.gov.uk