

Delegation meeting - Minutes

- **Date:** 27th February 2024
- **Time:** 11:00 – 12:30
- **Meeting held:** via Teams

Attendees: Cllr Peter Fane (Vice Chair of Planning Committee), Rebecca Smith (Delivery Manager (DM West & Compliance)), Karen Pell – Coggins (Senior Planner)

Apologies: Cllr Martin Cahn (Chair of Planning Committee)

Minutes approved by: Cllr Peter Fane (Vice Chair of Planning Committee) 27.03.2024

24000233/FUL – 12 Church Street Ickleton

Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of replacement one and a half storey dwelling on similar footprint

Reason for Call-in Request:

Parish requested

Ickleton Parish Council Response OBJECTION

The Parish Council is extremely disappointed to see that this, the third version of the recent proposals for the site, once again fails to respond in any meaningful way to the concerns the Council has. Moreover, it is evident that Planning Officers have not been taking the Council's concerns on board. Or, if they have been conveying those concerns to the applicant, that they are being ignored in revising the proposals. Inappropriate scale for location: It is acknowledged that small adjustments have been made compared with the previous iteration, mainly it seems to address the impact of the proposals on 10 Church Street. How successful these changes are may be judged by proper consideration of the fulsome response made by the occupants of 10 Church Street.

The Parish Council considers that the intended height of the proposed dwelling is the principal problem giving rise to objections from neighbours and the Parish Council, and that these objections cannot be overcome without a significant and meaningful reduction in height. It is simply perverse to keep describing the proposals as being for a one and a half storey dwelling when it is clearly a two-storey dwelling. This building is not of appropriate scale and massing for this location.

As far as the impact on 10 Church Street is concerned, the Parish Council's view is that the proposals breach Policy HQ/1 Design Principles of the Adopted Local Plan. In particular 1n, which aims to protect the amenity of occupiers and surrounding uses from development that is overlooking, overbearing or results in a loss of daylight.

Adverse impact on heritage assets:

The Parish Council objects on the grounds of the harm the proposals, if approved, would cause to the Church (Grade I listed), the Church's setting, Norman Hall opposite (Grade II listed), and the conservation area. Councillors are concerned about the proposed height of this two-storey building. Reference is made in the application to the permission recently granted relating to an extension to 10 Church Street, the height of which is deliberately subservient to preserve views of the Church within the locality of this part of the conservation area (the length was also adjusted in the light of concerns about views of the Church and the impact on the conservation area). It seems that the plan for 10 Church Street has been amended so that no upper storey will be built. In the circumstances it seems even more important that development of this site should be restricted as regards height. It is undoubtedly the case that when permission was granted for a single storey building on the

site, and subsequently for a garage of modest height, it was intended that impact on the conservation area and adjacent listed buildings would be contained by the limitations placed on the sites development. Permitting a building with the main ridge height equal to that of the main ridge of no.10 would abandon any such attempt at limitation, and fail to preserve the character of the conservation area and the relationships with the listed buildings.

The size and massing of the proposed dwelling make it inappropriate for this location. The drawing described as Perspective View 1 understates the potential impact of the intended dwelling because it is not the view as it would be seen by a person of average height. It is drawn from the perspective of someone in an elevated position. In reality, a person standing on the spot would see much less of the church tower etc. than the drawing suggests. Even so, the drawing shows a loss of part of the tower and of the roof ridge of the nave of the church, which can be seen in photographs of the current street scene from opposite 10 Church Street. Residents to the south currently enjoy unimpeded open views of the Church, which are a characteristic of this part of the conservation area. This would not be the case if these proposals were to be approved. It is strongly felt that the Conservation Officer and Planning Officer to date have not paid sufficient attention to the rear aspect of the proposed dwelling and its potential impact on the Grade I listed Church and its setting, and the conservation area. The proposals prompt great cause for concern with regard to the rear of the intended dwelling.

There is a photograph of the site as seen from within the Churchyard. This is potentially misleading as the camera appears to be placed below knee height in order to demonstrate that a conifer hedge obscures a view of the present bungalow. It does not, as the north end of the roof ridge can clearly be seen, as can the chimney stack and pots and the television aerial. It is quite easy to imagine what impact the upper storey of the proposed dwelling would have as seen from the Churchyard, particularly from the point of view of a standing person. Too much reliance is placed on the conifer hedge, which would by no means conceal the upper storey. The new house would clearly compete with the aspect of Norman Hall as seen from the Churchyard at the northern side of the Church. This damages the setting of both the Church and of Norman Hall.

The Council recognises the applicants attempts to use materials found on surrounding buildings and to adopt a design in keeping with local historic vernacular style but only on the front facade. To the rear no attempt is made to reflect local vernacular style or adopt locally used materials. The proposed timber cladding does not respond to the local distinctive character, and the proposed roof terrace with its intrusive glass balustrade overlooking the Churchyard is utterly out of place. What is more, the corner of the Churchyard overlooked by the intended terrace is still in use to inter cremated ashes. The balcony is unacceptable. Considerable damage would be caused to the setting of the Grade I listed Church, to the aspect of Norman Hall from that side of the Churchyard, and to the conservation area. We observe that, in the course of a recent planning application involving 10 Church Street, the Applicant was required to remove a proposed roof terrace before permission was granted, and it would seem unfair and unjust to permit one in this application it would introduce a far more visible and incongruous element to the conservation area and the setting of two important buildings.

A two-storey building on the site would fail to enhance the conservation area. It would entail harm to heritage assets, especially the setting of the Church and the setting of Norman Hall, and to the conservation area. The harm would not be outweighed by the public benefits of the proposals. The Parish Council is of the view that the proposals fail to meet the requirements of Local Plan Policy NH/14 by adversely affecting the setting of the Villages only Grade I Listed Building, the Church, and arguably the setting of Grade II Listed Norman Hall. The proposals do not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area as they would introduce a building that is too large for its intended

location, with intrusive modern design elements at the rear that fail to reflect local vernacular style. The requirements of Local Plan Policy NH/14 are not met. We urge refusal.

Key Considerations:

The Case Officer (KPC) introduced the application outlining the details of the planning application, as well as the existing context of the site and surrounding area, together details of the site designations. The planning application relates to the demolition of existing the bungalow on site and erection of replacement dwelling adjacent to a grade I listed building, with grade 2 and 2* listed buildings within the vicinity of the site. The site is located within the development framework and the conservation area.

The case officer advised that the Parish Council are in objection to the proposal on the grounds of the impact on the listed buildings, the wider conservation area and also by reason of the amenity impacts on neighbour residents at number 10 Church Street.

Historic England have been consulted as part of the application and do not wish to offer comments however have suggested we seek the views of own conservation specialists. The Council's Conservation Officer has been consulted and has not raised any objections, they considered the proposed development to be appropriate scale and massing that doesn't affect the important views of the church spire and tower from church street, they also do not feel the proposal directly impacts on Normal Hall opposite the site.

3 objections have been received from neighbouring residents, raising similar concerns relating to the overbearing nature of the proposal, loss of light and impact on amenity.

It was acknowledged that the nature, scale and complexity of the proposed development is not significant in context. There is limited public interest in the scheme, and it was not considered there were any policy implications. Consequently, in consultation with the Vice Chair of the Planning Committee, the Delivery Manager considered, on balance, the proposal should not be referred to the planning committee.

Decision

Do not refer to Planning Committee