

**Development Control Committee
29 March 2011**

Additional Information

PWM2 – S10/2547

Proposal: Demolition of existing garage and erection of one and a half storey dwelling

Summary of information received:

County Highways Authority

The County Highways Authority has provided the following statement to justify why they have no objection to the proposal:

“There was a pre-application enquiry regarding development of the site for 1 to 2 dwellings to which this authority responded in January 2010 that a single unit may be acceptable (on the principle that a single small unit would generate only a modest increase in vehicular movements).

The subsequent submission for a 4 bedroomed unit did raise concern in that this could generate vehicular movements and ownership that would be comparable to the two units previously mooted.

There have been no injury accidents along High Road in the last 5 years, even with evidence of 'on-street' parking and poor visibility at various accesses along its route. The 'on-street' parking would appear to act as a form of traffic calming and the presence of such parked vehicles appear not to have created a hazard causing accidents. Speeds in the vicinity of the junction Chapel Lane are likely to be low due to the proximity of the junction/crossroads High Road/Main Street/Church Street.

The number of existing units served by Chapel Lane is above what would normally be considered for a private drive. However, this precedent has been set here and elsewhere in the county. The additional unit would generate a modest increase on current movements.

On the basis that the current proposal is for a 2 bed dwelling, with parking for two vehicles on the lines as this authority originally deemed would be acceptable in

principle, and for the reasons stated above it is considered that the proposal is acceptable in highway terms”

Amended plans submitted by applicant

In response to concerns raised by Members at the last committee meeting, the applicant has submitted amended plans with the dwelling significantly reduced in size and arranged so it cannot easily be reconfigured internally to a greater number of bedrooms. It has also been moved a further 3m away from 5 & 6 Chapel lane.

Officer comments: Taking the above into account it is considered that the concerns raised at the last committee have been satisfactorily addressed and that the proposal would not be detrimental to highway safety or traffic capacity.

Changes to recommendation:

That a further condition be added as shown below:

CONDITION 8: This permission relates solely to the application as amended by the drawings "Block Plan -MSP.609/002 REVA", "Proposed Elevations - CG-02" and "Proposed Floor Plans - CG-01" received 25 March 2011.

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt.

PWM3 – S11/0301

Proposal: Garage/garden store

Summary of information received:

Consultation Response from English Heritage

English Heritage Summary

Paddock Cottage lies within the Oasby Conservation Area and forms part of the setting of Oasby Manor (listed Grade II*) and Oasby House (Grade II). The proposed scheme is to erect a detached single storey garage with an attached garden store next to the western boundary of the garden of Paddock Cottage. In our view the revised proposals for a garage and garden store at Paddock Cottage do not cause harm to the significance of the listed Oasby Manor, Oasby House or Oasby Conservation Area. We advise that the application should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance, and on the basis of your detailed specialist conservation advice.

English Heritage Advice

Paddock Cottage lies within the Oasby Conservation Area and forms part of the setting of Oasby Manor (listed Grade II*). This part of Oasby - Oasby Manor, Folly Cottage, Oasby Manor Farmhouse, Oasby House (listed Grade II) and Paddock Cottage - represents a significant part of the historic core of the village. The garden to the south of Paddock Cottage has been open space since the 19th century or earlier, as is evident from the 1st edition OS map of 1889. The current proposed scheme is to erect a detached single-storey double garage with an attached garden store adjacent to the boundary with Oasby Lodge. The proposed garage is built of stone with a clay pantile roof and two sets of timber double doors. The garden store will be clad in stained timber boarding and have a hipped pantile roof. An oil tank will be sited to the south of the shed and screened with fencing. In a letter of 23 June 2009 we recommended refusal of a previous application to build a garage/office located to the south of the garden of Paddock Cottage and approximately midway between the east and west boundaries. We considered that the garage/office was of an inappropriate scale and its design and location would interfere with important views and the open character of the area as a whole. We advised that it would not preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area and it would harm the setting of the listed buildings.

Our view was supported by the Planning Inspector on Appeal on 3 June 2010. The Inspector found that the scale and siting of the proposed

garage/office would “*dominate this currently open green area at the heart of the village, block some views of Paddock Cottage and disturb the harmony of the existing open space and grouping of historic buildings*”. The Inspector also found that the insertion of a garage block “*at this point would fundamentally alter and effectively sandwich the main approach to [Oasby House] between the proposed building and the existing stone storage-type building close to Oasby House, at the roadside. Thus it would constrain and harm the setting of this listed building.*” The Inspector found that “*it would have a less direct effect on the immediate setting of Oasby Manor, across the road, which is well screened by its own boundary walls and planting. Nevertheless ... the proposed building would intrude into the open space at the centre of the conservation area and the harm to the conservation area ... would cause inherent harm to the setting of the Manor.*” We advised in our letter of 23 June 2009 that while we were unable to support the submitted scheme, it might be possible to erect some form of ancillary building and that the most appropriate site would be close to the western boundary of the garden. We also advised that the structure should be no higher than a single storey and no wider than the width of two normal garage doors. We advised that consideration should be given to the use of a hipped roof and the whole structure could have the appearance of a two bay ‘cart shed’ constructed of appropriate materials - stone, brick and weatherboarding under a clay tile roof. The current proposals are for a garage and garden store sited 1m from the western boundary of the garden. The proposed garage is single storey and has two bays and is just wider than two garage doors. The garden store is attached to the south side of the garage. It is significantly lower and narrower with a hipped roof and clad in timber boarding and is clearly ancillary to the garage. In our view this significantly reduces the real and apparent mass and scale of the proposed scheme in relation to the previously-refused scheme. In the current proposals, the garage block has a ridge height of 5.925m. While this is some 30cm lower than the height in the previously-refused scheme, it is nonetheless higher than the 5.7m proposed in a draft scheme which we commented on in our pre-application letter of 3 November 2010. We advise that reducing the height of the roof ridge to 5.7m will further lessen any impact of the proposed garage building on the setting of the surrounding historic buildings and the conservation area. We support the use of stone and clay pantiles, as we advised in our letter of 23 June 2009, and the simple detailing which gives the proposed scheme a vernacular appearance. We understand that the existing oil tank will be retained and will be separate from the garage and garden store

In our view the revised proposals for a garage and garden store at Paddock Cottage do not cause harm to the significance of the listed Oasby Manor, Oasby House or Oasby Conservation Area. The nature of the historic open space to the south of Paddock Cottage is largely retained

and the garage and garden store would not intrude into or dominate that space. Views from the road of Paddock Cottage and the listed buildings would not be blocked. The scale and particularly the revised location of the proposed garage and garden store would not alter or sandwich the approach to Oasby House. We consider that the proposed garage and garden store would not cause harm to the setting of Oasby Manor, particularly as it would not intrude into the open space. Our advice reflects policy and guidance provided in Planning Policy Statement 5 (PPS5), particularly policies HE9.1, HE9.4 and HE10, and the PPS5 Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide (HEPPG).

English Heritage Recommendation

We advise that the application should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance, and on the basis of your detailed specialist conservation advice.

SKDC Conservation Officer

The Conservation area has stated that a garage/store to the scale, design and materials proposed and located in the south-west corner of the garden would have a neutral effect on the setting of the listed buildings in the vicinity and the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area. A number of further conditions have also been recommended. See below.

Further Neighbour Representations

One further letter of objection received – the points raised have already been discussed in the main report

Seventeen letters of support received from residents of Oasby as well as other local villages and further afield – the general thrust being that the proposal is in keeping with the conservation area and the existing cottage.

Cllr Peter Stephens - (Lincrest Ward)

Cllr Stephens has objected in his capacity as ward member following receipt of a number of objections from villagers in Oasby. (main points of his objection summarised below):

- Concerns raised about the height of the building – that it is higher than a “normal” garage.
- It is a “Trojan Horse” with a view to applying for extra accommodation
- It could be used as a dwelling after many years of uncontested use
- Overbearing impact on Oasby Lodge
- Should be closer to Paddock Cottage

- Ignores suggestions of English Heritage
- Oil tank should be near house
- Will fundamentally change open nature of conservation area
- Fails to preserve or enhance conservation area or setting of listed buildings
- Parish council object

Cllr Stephens has stated in further correspondence that he has now been made aware that English Heritage do not object to the proposal and that he is surprised by their position. In respect of the height, there is no “standard” height of domestic garages as such. The individual circumstances of each case will dictate an appropriate height, particularly in a village context where there is a mix of building types where the majority of buildings can be considered “non standard”. All the other issues raised above have been already addressed in the main report.

Amended plans submitted by applicant

Although English Heritage do not object to the scheme as submitted, in response to their comments about the height – that it had been increased by 0.225m from drawings that they had seen previously, the applicant has submitted revised drawings with the height of the garage reduced to 5.7m.

Officer comments on information:

As already stated in the main report, this proposal has come about after extensive pre-application discussions between the applicant, Council Officers and English Heritage. Taking into account the comments of English Heritage and the Conservation Officer above, as well as the issues discussed in the main report, it is considered that the issues which led to the refusal and dismissal at appeal of the previous scheme have now been fully resolved. The development therefore is considered to preserve the character of the conservation area and setting of the listed buildings. Furthermore, the applicant has reduced the ridge height by 0.225m to 5.7m in accordance with EH advice which further reduces the impact. A number of further conditions suggested by the Conservation Officer have also been recommended

Changes to recommendation:

That a further 3 conditions be added as shown below:

CONDITION 6: The garage doors shall be a matching timber pair as shown on the plan and retained as such thereafter unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority.

REASON: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and preserve the character of the conservation area and the setting of the adjacent listed buildings in accordance with PPS5 and Policy EN1 of the adopted South Kesteven Core Strategy (July 2010).

CONDITION 7: The external stonework shall be laid in courses to match the stonework of the main dwelling.

REASON: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and in accordance with Policy EN1 of the adopted South Kesteven Core Strategy (July 2010).

CONDITION 8: This permission relates solely to the application as amended by the drawing "04 Rev A" received 24 March 2011

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt.

PJM1 - 2667

Proposal: Erection of four dwellings

Information Received

Additional correspondence has been received from Anglian Water as follows:

“The foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Long Bennington that at present has available capacity for these flows.

Development will lead to an unacceptable risk of flooding downstream. A drainage strategy will need to be prepared in consultation with Anglian Water to determine mitigation measures.

We request a condition requiring the drainage strategy covering the issues to be agreed.

The preferred method of surface water disposal would be a sustainable drainage system (SUDS) with connection to sewer seen as the last option.

We request a condition requiring the drainage strategy covering the issues to be agreed.”

Alterations to Conditions

Condition No. 3 states that No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a scheme for the provision of surface and foul water drainage has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage works shall be completed in accordance with the details and timetable agreed to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Condition No. 3 has been replaced by two new conditions as a result of the additional information that has been received. These are as follows:

3. No development shall commence until a foul water strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No dwellings shall be occupied until the works have been carried out in accordance with the foul water strategy so approved unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To prevent environmental and amenity problems arising from flooding.

15. No development shall commence until a surface water strategy / flood risk assessment has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No dwellings shall be occupied until the works have been carried out in accordance with the surface water strategy so approved unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To prevent environmental and amenity problems arising from flooding.

Changes to Recommendation:

No change to the recommendation. Approve Planning Permission for the reason stated in the main committee report.

CM1 – S10/2811

Proposal: Extensions and alterations to dwelling

Two letters of support for the proposal on the grounds that it is an improvement and its impact minimal.