

19/07106/FUL

Consultations and Notification Responses

Ward Councillor Preliminary Comments

Cllr Whitehead

Comments: As this proposal has attracted much local controversy please could it be decided by the planning committee.

Parish/Town Council Comments/Internal and External Consultees

Hambleton Parish Council

Initial Comments: The Parish Council strongly object. The property is in the heart of the village and should remain as a modest sized property which are important to keep in the village. The scale of the proposed development is not in-keeping with the rest of the cottages in the nearby vicinity. It will alter the street scene completely, and appears to exceed the limits for permitted development. It will also impact on neighbouring properties, particularly with regards to light and will affect the amenities of the adjoining properties. It does not follow the guidance for properties in Hambleton which are protected under a restrictive Covenant with the National Trust. It neither preserves nor enhances the character of the Hambleton Conservation area and would harm the character of the neighbouring listed buildings.

Further comments following amendments: Please note background plans, amended entry 4.11.19, now dated 27.11.19, within the application history. Since submitting our objections to this application on 16th October last, Hambleton Parish Council has become aware of the amended plans lodged on your website on 4th November but dated April 2019, amended 28th August 2019, on the actual plans. In our opinion the proposed works are not in sympathy with neighbouring buildings and do not preserve or enhance the character of the Hambleton Conservation Area. The following objections are raised:-

1. The proposed single storey extension is to be built on garden land, the building footprint will extend to the boundary lines [north and east].
2. The elevation [north] includes an external door and two windows which open directly onto a private footpath. The brick built elevation will enclose an open boundary, which is uncharacteristic of the conservation area.
3. The brick built elevation [east] will create an unwelcome sense of enclosure to the private yard of No.65. The amenity of the occupants would be further harmed by a window in the elevation, intended to provide light and ventilation to an internal toilet, which directly faces onto the yard. An Environmental Health officer should be asked to comment on the latter.
4. The existing rear elevation [north] will be harmed by the removal of an existing dormer window, which forms part of a 19thc roofscape. The proposed replacement is a single fixed pane window and a glazed door. The arrangement of the window and door is wholly unsympathetic to the appearance of No's 65 and 66, which are heritage assets. The door leads out to the flat roof of the extension which suggests that it is intended to be used as a roof terrace and if so would be a loss of privacy for No 65.
5. The massing, modelling and form of the proposed extension would not protect or preserve the character of the conservation area, and would harm the setting of neighbouring listed buildings

Conservation Officer

Initial Comments: The proposed single storey extension does not comply with Policy DM31 of the WLP 2019 or advice in the NPPF. The conservation area character study notes that high standards of design are required in order to safeguard its special interest. As a building noted of significance within the conservation area, it is important that the extension is designed as an integrated part of

the building and the wider area. In order to comply with heritage policies and advice, the application should be amended:

- the height of the single storey extension should be reduced so that it does not project above the rear gully.
- windows should reflect existing openings and detailing

Further comments following amendments: On balance, the plans are now in accordance with Policy DM31 of the WLP 2019 subject to use of matching materials and joinery.

The amended plans illustrating the link extension detailing is an improvement over the original proposals. While the width of the extension extends over part of the existing gable, views towards the rear of the building are obscured by the outbuilding. It would be beneficial to alter the first floor glazing pattern to a more traditional casement to secure the satisfactory appearance of the building.

County Archaeology

Initial Comments: The nature of the proposed works is such that they are not likely to significantly harm the archaeological significance of any assets. We therefore have no objection to the proposed development and do not consider it necessary to apply a condition to safeguard archaeological interest.

Further comments following amendments: No change to original response

National Trust

Initial Comments: 66 Hambleden is subject to the terms of a restrictive covenant dated 29th September 1944 between The National Trust and Viscount Hambleden and known as the Greenlands Covenant.

The Greenlands Covenant imposes restrictions set out in the Third Schedule, on works of extensions and alterations without the express written consent of the Trust and no works can commence without formal consent in writing under the terms of the Greenlands covenant.

The National Trust has a formal application process for considering proposals for alterations. These proposals have not yet been presented to the National Trust for formal consideration therefore the Trust has not yet had the opportunity to consider the proposals under the terms of the restrictive covenant.

However, the National Trust note that, as the property is situated in a very prominent place in the historic heart of the village, is visible from all sides and forms part of a relatively unaltered row of cottages, it is highly unlikely that any proposal for extending this cottage would receive consent under the terms of the covenant.

Further comments following amendments: None received

Representations

In respect of original plans:

There are four objectors to the proposal, who have submitted multiple copies of their correspondence. Their comments have been summarised for this report:

- Does not protect the setting of surrounding listed buildings
- The proposal does not protect the environment
- Does not enhance the conservation area
- Out of keeping with the location
- Over development of the site
- There would be loss of privacy from overlooking
- Loss of light to neighbouring occupiers

- This not in accordance with policy
- Loss of rear window patter.

In order for the application to be valid the following information is not required

- No roof plan has been submitted
- No details on the boundary wall/ railings have been submitted

These are not planning matters

- Application did not contact neighbouring owner(s)
- There is a National Trust covenant
- There are no party wall details
- The old garden railing should be reinstated

Further comments in respect of amended plans:

Two further objections received:

- Previous objections still stand
- The proposal fails to preserve or enhance the Conservation Area