

ITEM NO: 6.4	<u>Location:</u>	78 High Street, Barkway, SG8 8EF
	<u>Applicant:</u>	Mr W Lee
	<u>Proposal:</u>	Single storey gabled rear extension, boundary fence and single storey lean to rear extension with glazed link to existing rear extension (as amended by plans received 16/05/2008)
	<u>Ref.No:</u>	07/02641/ 1HH
	<u>Officer:</u>	Naomi Reynard

Date of expiry of statutory period : 31 December 2007

Reason for Delay

Negotiations to improve the scheme.

Reason for Referral to Committee

Parish Council objection contrary to officer recommendation.

1. Relevant History

1.1 Conditional planning permission granted in 1987 for the erection of a chimney stack.

Planning permission granted in 1990 for the change of use of the post office to residential and extension to existing dwelling.

Listed Building Consent granted in 1990 for replacement sash window on front elevation following removal of existing shopfront.

Listed Building Consent was granted in 2000 for a replacement window on north west elevation and internal alterations.

2. Policies

2.1 **North Hertfordshire District Local Plan No. 2 with Alterations**
 Policy 7 - Selected Villages beyond the Green Belt
 Policy 16 - Areas of Archaeological Significance and other Archaeological Areas
 Policy 28 - House Extensions

2.2 **National Planning Guidance**
 Planning Policy Guidance 15 - Planning and the Historic Environment

3. Representations

3.1 **Parish Council** - Objection received on 18th December 2007 with the following objections:

1. The rear extension appears to be excessively large and totally out of proportion with the rest of the property and, as a result, should be significantly reduced. There was also concern about the impact on the neighbours of such a large

extension.

2. It was felt that the glass screened passage that has been added to the stairway tower is out of character for a listed building.
3. There is no issue with the remaining planned alterations.

Following re-consultation on amended plans (received 15th February 2008) the Parish Council raised the same objections (in comments received 2nd April 2008) as those set out above.

3.2 Local residents/site notice and press publicity:

Letters received from the neighbours at The White House, 76 High Street and Dashwood Barn, Church Lane, Barkway, with the following objections:

- Lack of a site plan.
- Land Registry plan is out of date and inaccurate – does not show Dashwood Barn as a dwelling with garden or the dwelling at no. 80a, or that no. 80 High Street is, to their knowledge a separate flat within no. 78 that is, they believe, let out some of the time.
- The tandem garage and driveway for no. 78 are incorrectly indicated. Query the parking arrangements set out in the Design and Access Statement - concerned the proposal could result in increased parking on the road.
- North wall of the proposed building would replace the boundary fence with no. 76 and would impinge on that property.
- The proportions of the boot room and utility extension, would result in overshadowing and loss of light to The White house and Dashwood Barn
- Potential loss of privacy from the window in the gable end
- Extension would make the house disproportionate to the size of the garden and add to the high density of buildings in the area.

Further letters were received from both these neighbouring properties with the following objections to the first set of amended plans:

- Retain the same objections as set out above, as the single storey gabled rear extension would only be 0.5m shallower.

4. Planning Considerations

4.1 Site & Surroundings

- 4.1.1 The property is a substantial detached Listed Building on the west side of the High Street within the Conservation Area. It used to house the Post Office.

4.2 Proposal

- 4.2.1 The proposal is for a single storey gabled rear extension to provide a boot room and a utility room to the rear of the existing gabled rear wing of the house. The proposal also includes a single storey lean to rear extension located to the side of the existing gabled rear wing of the house. The proposal also includes a glazed link to link the proposed lean-to rear extension with the existing single storey dining room extension.

4.3 Key Issues

- 4.3.1 The key issues in the determination of this application are the impact of the proposals on the character of the Listed Building, the Conservation Area and neighbouring properties.
- 4.3.2 These applications follow informal discussions with the Conservation team. The

Conservation Officer was consulted on the current application, however there were a number of issues that still needed to be addressed. The Conservation Officer's main concern was the removal of a substantial amount of masonry and the unsatisfactory relationship between the side lean-to extension and the end bay wing. He suggested the reduction of the depth of the lean-to by two metres. He also raised concerns regarding the number of rooflights.

- 4.3.3 Amended plans were received on 16th May 2008. The Conservation Officer raised no objections to the amended scheme. The reduction in length of the single storey side lean-to extension, which leaves one bay of the original wing fully expressed. He was disappointed that the existing plank door and smaller window within the end bay would be replaced by a sliding sash window, however considered this to be acceptable. He considered that the reduction in the number of rooflights from the initial 5 to 2 is a positive measure, thereby, lessening their cumulative impact on the special architectural interest of this listed building. The Conservation Officer discussed a few minor matters with the architect and these issues can be resolved by conditions, recommended below. In particular a condition requesting a 1:20 scale drawing showing the framework of the link and the relationship of the link with the flanking lean-to's, has been recommended as the proposed rear elevation drawing is not sufficiently accurate. The Conservation Officer concluded as follows:

"Although the loss of the plank door and small window on the side elevation within the end bay is a disappointment, subject to the conditions above, I consider that the scheme will preserve the special character of this grade II listed building and the character and appearance of Barkway Conservation Area. I, therefore, raise no objection on the basis that the scheme complies with Sections 16 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990."

- 4.3.4 The Conservation Officer has recommended a series of conditions in order to ensure that the development will have an acceptable appearance which does not detract from the appearance, setting or character of the listed building. It is recommended that these conditions are imposed on the listed building consent.
- 4.3.5 It is considered that the proposals would be acceptable in the conservation area. As such the proposed extensions would comply with Policy 7 (selected Villages beyond the Green Belt), as they would positively preserve the character of the conservation area.
- 4.3.6 The County Archaeologist was consulted on the applications. He commented that the site has the potential to contain medieval and post-medieval archaeological remains. He believes that the position of the proposed development is such that it should be regarded as likely to have an impact on significant archaeological remains. The condition he suggested is recommended below.
- 4.3.7 With regard to the Parish Council's objection to the glazed link, this was considered by the Conservation Officer to be acceptable, as is a very 'light touch' in architectural detailing thus enabling the vertical form of the stair turret to be more fully expressed in comparison to earlier proposals.
- 4.3.8 With regard to the Parish Council and neighbours' concerns about the single storey gabled roof extension, the Conservation Officer raised no objections to this element of the scheme. I carried out a site visit from no. 76 and in my view the single storey gabled rear extension would not have any adverse built impact on no. 76 or Dashwood Barn in terms of loss of light or over dominance. I did ask the agent to consider reducing the depth of this extension in light of the neighbours' concerns about intrusion into aspect. The extension was reduced by approximately 0.5m in depth in the amended plans received 15th February 2008 and the 1.5m section of garden wall extended beyond the single storey rear extension has been omitted in the most recent amended plans. The fence would

continue along the boundary, as existing. The plans were also amended so that the guttering would not encroach onto the neighbouring property. It was not considered necessary to reconsult neighbours on the second two sets of amended plans, as they did not further reduce the depth of the single storey rear gabled extension.

- 4.3.9 With regard to the neighbours' concerns with regard to the accuracy of the site plans, in my view sufficient information was submitted in order to determine the application. Parking is not an issue as the proposals do not result in the loss of parking spaces or the addition of bedrooms. In my view the overall size of extension would be acceptable. I do not consider that the window in the rear elevation would result in a material loss of privacy to the neighbouring properties, given that it would be at ground floor level. However I have recommended a condition removing permitted development rights for the insertion of windows in the side wall, as it does constitute a boundary wall.

4.4 **Conclusion**

- 4.4.1 In conclusion the proposed extensions and alterations would not have an adverse impact on the character of the Listed Building, the Conservation Area and neighbouring properties.

5. Legal Implications

- 5.1 In making decisions on applications submitted under the Town and Country Planning legislation, the Council is required to have regard to the provisions of the development plan and to any other material considerations. The decision must be in accordance with the plan unless the material considerations indicate otherwise. Where the decision is to refuse or restrictive conditions are attached, the applicant has a right of appeal against the decision.

6. Recommendation

- 6.1 That planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out wholly in accordance with the details specified in the application and supporting, approved documents and plans, or with minor modifications of those details which have previously been agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority as being not materially different from those thereby permitted.

Reason: To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with details which form the basis of this grant of permission.

3. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking or re-enacting that order) no windows shall be installed on the north flank elevation of the single storey gabled rear extension hereby permitted without the specific grant of planning permission by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To prevent new windows being installed that would overlook the neighbouring property and to enable the Local Planning Authority to exercise control over future alterations to this dwelling.

4. No development shall take place within the proposed development site until the applicant, or their agents, or their successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation, which has been submitted to the planning authority and approved in writing. This condition will only be considered to be discharged when the planning authority have received and approved archaeological reports for all the required archaeological works

Reason: To safeguard the archaeological record.

Reason for Decision

The extensions, hereby permitted, would have no adverse effect on the amenities of the neighbouring residential properties, the visual amenity of the locality or the appearance, setting and character of the listed building and, as such, complies with the relevant provisions of the development plan, as summarised below.

Summary of Development Plan Policies and Proposals relevant to the Decision:-

North Hertfordshire District Local Plan No 2 with Alterations

Policy 7 - Selected Villages beyond the Green Belt

Policy 16 - Areas of Archaeological Significance and other Archaeological Areas

Policy 28 - House Extensions