



© Crown copyright and database rights [2013]
Ordnance Survey [100018056]

Scale - 1:1250
Time of plot: 12:50
Date of plot: 11/10/2017



Rutland County Council

Catmose,
Oakham,
Rutland
LE15 6HP

Application:	2017/0756/FUL	ITEM 2	
Proposal:	Side & Rear Extension.		
Address:	24, Main Street, Preston, Oakham, LE15 9NJ		
Applicant:	Guy Gibbeson, Bloomsbury Planning and Design Limited	Parish	Preston
Agent:	As applicant	Ward	Braunston and Belton
Reason for presenting to Committee:	Chairman Request		
Date of Committee:	24 October 2017		

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The revised scheme in principle has addressed the reason for refusal of the original scheme reported to the Planning and Licensing Committee in June 2017. Alterations made to the design have addressed the potential impact for overlooking and loss of privacy to neighbouring residential properties, in particular no 2 Cross Lane. Changes made to the scale and form of the development have addressed issues concerning the impact of the development on the character and appearance of the Preston Conservation Area. The proposals now comply with the Development Plan and are acceptable.

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVAL, subject to the following conditions:

1. The development shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of the permission.

Reason – To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

2. Before any work is commenced drawings showing large scale details of all new windows and doors to a scale of 1:5, vertical and horizontal cross sections to show cill, lintels to a scale of 1:2 and 1:1 scale profiles of glazing bars shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall only be installed and carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason – To ensure that the detailing of the windows is acceptable and not harmful to the appearance of the Conservation Area

3. Before the relevant works begin details in respect of the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall only be carried out in full accordance with these details
 - a. Sample of external facing and roofing materials
 - b. Sample of rainwater goods (gutters, downpipes, hopperheads and soil pipes)

Reason -This is a publicly visible building where the correct materials are a visually essential requirement and insufficient details of materials have been provided with the application.

4. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans numbers

1607/3A/P/0101,1607/3A/P/0201,1607/3A/P/0501,1607/3A/P/0301,1607/3A/P/0302,and amended drawing numbered 1607/3A/0202/A, 1607/3A/0401/A and 1607/3A/0402/A received 19 September 2017

Reason For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Site & Surroundings

1. The application property is a 3 storey end of terrace house fronting Main Street. It is within the conservation area and there is a row of attached listed buildings immediately to the south (starting at no. 22 Main Street), and further listed buildings to the north (no. 3 Main Street and no. 2 Cross Lane).
2. To the north of the building is walled garden, and beyond this a triangular gravelled space outside of the application site that facilitates vehicular access to both the application site and no 2 Cross Lane.
3. There is evidence (both on site and through historic photos/maps) that shows that historically there was a linear building running along the western boundary of the site, hard up to the pavement, and extending to the north of the site. An ironstone boundary wall and evidence of a pitched roof remains of the previous development.
4. An application submitted under reference 2017/0238/Ful was considered by the Planning and Licensing Committee in June 2017. As part of that application a two storey side extension was proposed to be perpendicular to Main Street, in contrast to the rest of the attached row of buildings along this part Main Street. This was out of keeping with the established village character, which, combined with the design of the extension, would have had a detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of Preston Conservation Area, and the setting of adjacent listed buildings. The application was refused planning permission on the following grounds;
5. The orientation of the proposed two storey extension is perpendicular to Main Street and the row of buildings on this side of the road. The extension would not be in-keeping with the established linear street scene character. This would create a discordant relationship with the existing three storey property, with the gable of the two storey extension abutting the side of the three storey building. Combined with the design of the extension, this would have an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of Preston Conservation Area, and the setting of the row of attached listed buildings to the south(starting at no. 22 Main Street), as well as further listed buildings to the north (no. 3 Main Street and no. 2 Cross Lane). Although this harm is less than substantial, it is not outweighed by any wider public benefit. As such, the proposal is contrary to planning policies CS19 and CS22 of the adopted Core Strategy (2011), SP15 and SP20 of the adopted Site Allocations and Polices Development Plan Document (2014), and paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

Proposal

6. The revised proposal is for a three storey side extension (to increase the width of the existing dwelling by 2 metres) and a two storey rear extension, replacing the existing single storey rear extension and a two and single storey side extension. The single storey side extension would in part replace an existing flat roof side extension and extend along the full frontage of the existing side garden. External changes shown on the plans also include blocking up the existing front door, the replacement of windows and the creation of new window openings to front and the rear.

7. While the existing house is red brick, this is not the predominant material within the historic core of the village. The proposed materials for the two and single storey side extension fronting Main Street are ironstone and Welsh slate with the rear extension being red brick and Welsh slate.

Relevant Planning History

Application	Description	Decision
2017/0238	First floor side extension, two storey rear extension and replacement single storey lean-to at rear	Refused

Planning Guidance and Policy

National Planning Policy Framework

Section 12. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

The Rutland Core Strategy (2011)

Policies:

- CS1 Sustainable Development
- CS2 Spatial Strategy
- CS3 Settlement Hierarchy
- CS4 Location of Development
- CS19 Design
- CS22 The historic and cultural environment

Site Allocations and Policies DPD (2014)

Policies:

- SP1 Sustainable Development
- SP5 Built Development in Towns and Villages
- SP15 Design and Amenity
- SP20 The Historic Environment

Consultations

8. **Preston Parish Meeting** – have raised an objection to the application on the grounds
- The solid blank garage wall along the western boundary will be harmful to the character and appearance of the conservation area and result in the loss of greenery from the existing garden area.
 - Volume of 'new' build compared to size of the current property
 - Loss of privacy of adjacent properties from install of windows to the rear of the property.

Neighbour Representations

9. 6 letters of objection have been received from 5 households (2 from the same address). The issues relate to:
- Loss of a view from properties on the opposite side of the road;
 - Alter the view along this part of Main Street;

- Loss of privacy to the garden and ground floor bedroom at no 2 Cross Lane;
 - Felling of a tree (T7- Norway Spruce);
 - Harmful impact on the character and appearance of the Preston Conservation Area;
 - Widening of the main house;
 - Loss of the orchard;
 - Cumulative size of the extensions are too large and if approved would dominate this part of the village;
 - No objections received to the original scheme as this was seen as an improvement. The current scheme is not; and
 - The long garden room and garage (unbroken by windows) would have a detrimental impact on the conservation area.
10. In addition to objections to privacy and loss of a tree, the occupier of no 2 Cross Lane also stated they are happy with the overall development plan and support the transfer of the vehicle access to the other side of the drive as it will improve the current situation where there is a conflict of access in the corner of the gravel drive.
11. In addition to objecting over the size of the single storey side extension the email from Paul Waterworth dated 5 September stated that the proposed development of the original building and small side extension should represent an improvement of the appearance of the house and the entrance to the front of the house from Main Street is in keeping with other houses in the neighbourhood.

Planning Assessment

12. The main issues are the same as with the original submission and are impact upon heritage assets (Conservation area/setting of listed buildings), scale and design, and residential amenity.

Impact upon heritage assets, scale and design

13. The character of this part of Main Street is linear housing running parallel to the road, directly adjacent to the footpath. Historical evidence shows that a group of buildings once continued northwards to the junction with Cross Lane and whilst conservation is not about recreating the past, in this instance it serves to confirm that the plan form of the proposed development would follow historic precedent.
14. Some physical evidence of the building that formerly adjoined no.24 survives in the form of the ironstone walling of the, now flat-roofed, single storey element on the northern side of the three storey main house and also in the form of the outline of southern gable wall of the former building on the same wall of that house.
15. During the lifetime of the application, changes have been made to the application to address concerns raised about the design and scale issues related to the proposed development.
16. As a result the ridge and eaves height of the proposed garage and garden store room has been reduced by 1.5 metres and the roof pitch adjusted to match the roof pitch of the main house. In order to break up the lengthy single storey elevation to the road 2 arrow slit windows have been introduced to provide some relief.
17. There is no objection to the demolition of the existing single storey rear lean-to and side extensions or the increase frontage of the existing dwelling from a conservation point of view. Due to the first floor windows in the eastern elevation of the existing and proposed two storey side extension being omitted in lieu of rooflights, for amenity reasons 'blind'

windows have be substituted.

18. The intention to replace the uPVC windows in the existing house with ones manufactured of timber will constitute an enhancement to the character and appearance of the conservation area.
19. Conservation advice received has stated that the success of the scheme will largely be dependent on good detailing, which drawings of the scale so far submitted do not give any assurance. In a letter dated 19 September 2017, the applicant has agreed to a condition requesting samples of materials, rainwater goods, windows and doors details, sections and profiles.
20. Notwithstanding the impacts of the two storey development, there is no concern with the replacement of the rear lean-to with a two storey rear extension. It would not be prominent from public viewpoints or neighbouring properties. It would also not result in overlooking of neighbouring properties due to no windows being present at first floor in the eastern and southern elevations.
21. It is also proposed to fell 7 trees. The majority being fruit trees (mainly apple). The others trees being a Norway spruce and a common hazel located along the eastern boundary walled garden. It is proposed to replace 3 of the native fruit trees, planting replacements along the eastern and northern garden boundary. The felling of the trees is required in order to accommodate the proposed extensions. It is not considered that the loss of the fruit trees (mainly apple trees or the other species would warrant protection by a tree preservation order or justify recommending refusal of the current scheme.

Residential amenity

22. Other changes made during the lifetime of the application, have been made to address amenity issues. This includes the deletion of 4 windows in the second and first floor rear elevations of the existing and proposed 2 storey side extensions. Two roof lights have been added to provide an additional light source to bedroom 1 and 4 .This change has been undertaken to address concerns raised about loss of privacy and overlooking.
23. Following private discussions with the occupier of no 2 Cross Lane the agent is proposing to relocate the existing vehicular gated access further away from the neighbouring property. This would involve a new opening in the stone boundary wall, with the existing access to be blocked up. It is understood that there is an ongoing ownership/right of access dispute regarding the triangular gravel area adjacent to the north of the site. While noted, this is not a material planning consideration for the current application. There are no concerns over the location of the existing access, and the Council has not sought the revisions. Notwithstanding this, while it would make the driveway more prominent within the street scene, provided that the wall was infilled the impact upon the surrounding heritage assets would not be significant. For the avoidance of doubt this infilling of the wall would be in the interests of preserving the character of the conservation area, rather than due to any impact upon residential amenity.