

Application Ref: 23/01736/FUL

Proposal: Demolition of existing house and reconstruction of front elevation, to match existing, with rear extension, detached garage and associated external works.

Site: 2 Welmore Road, Glinton, Peterborough, PE6 7LU
Applicant: Mr and Mrs Colin Gill

Agent: Mr Jon Richards
 Jon Richards Architectural Design

Referred by: Glinton Parish Council

Reason: Application to be determined by committee

Site visit: 13.03.2024

Case officer: Karen Ip
Telephone No. 01733 453405
E-Mail: karen.ip@peterborough.gov.uk

Recommendation: **REFUSE**

1 Description of the site and surroundings and Summary of the proposal

Site Description

The application site is a vacant dwelling located at 2 Welmore Road within the village envelope of Glinton, looking out to Welmore Road and Peakirk Road. The site is served by 2 driveways, one leading to an existing garage and one to the rear of the dwelling. The dwelling appears to have been vacant for a number of years.

No.2 Welmore Road was originally a thatched stone cottage (single storey with dormers) of unknown date (16th – 19th century) which was altered in the early 20th century through the addition of a full height first floor, tiled roof, rear and side extensions, new windows and porch.

The existing dwelling is considered to be a non designated heritage asset (NDHA) and has been proposed for the Peterborough List of Heritage Assets (Local List). The building is located within the Glinton Conservation Area with Grade II Listed Websters Farmhouse to the north, an associated substantially altered stone cottage to the South and further 20th century development surrounding.

The Proposal

The applicant is seeking planning permission for the total demolition of the existing house and erection of a new larger dwelling including reconstructed front elevation to match the existing, new detached garage and associated external works.

Amended plans have been received through the course of this application which have reduced the width and ridge heights of the rear extension, as well as width of the detached garage.

2 Planning History

No relevant planning history

3 Planning Policy

Decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan policies below, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Section 66 (1)

Section 72 (1)

National Planning Policy Framework (2023)

2 Achieving sustainable development

9 Promoting Sustainable Transport

12 Achieving well-designed places

16 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Peterborough Local Plan 2016 to 2036 (2019)

LP02 - The Settle Hierarchy and the Countryside

LP13 - Transport

LP16 - Urban Design and the Public Realm

LP17 - Amenity Provision

LP19 - The Historic Environment

LP29 - Trees and Woodland

LP32 - Flood and Water Management

Glington Neighbourhood Plan 2016-2036 (July 2021)

GPN3 - DDesign

GNP5 – The natural environment

GNP6 – Car parking

GNP8 – Drainage and flood risk

4 Consultations/Representations

Archaeological Officer

No objection in principle, subject to conditions for Archaeology Building Recording and Archaeological Monitoring and Recording as the building contains many of its original features, despite visible 20th century alterations.

PCC Conservation Officer

Objection

Confirms that the building has historic significance and is therefore a NDHA, contrary to the applicant's argument that it is not. Although extended and altered, the building retains a significant amount of the original single storey thatched cottage, the building has evolved and the early C20 alterations have significance in their own right.

States that LP19 sets out a presumption in favour of retention of NDHAs and despite the façade of the replacement dwelling largely replicating the original, the building does still incorporate other interest for which its loss would result in less than substantial harm to the setting of the listed building to the north and character of the Glington Conservation Area.

The submitted viability and structural appraisals do not adequately demonstrate that the building is beyond repair or that the costs would be so prohibitive as to make restoration unviable.

Considers that proposal is contrary to LP19 and the NPPF.

PCC Pollution Team

No objections to the development, recommend condition for unsuspected contamination due to the derelict nature of the site.

PCC Peterborough Highways Services

No Objections - Recommended a series of conditions which include access details, temp facilities, reinstatement of kerb, wheel wash and for gates to open inwards.

Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service

No comments received

Historic England

On the basis of this information, we do not wish to offer any comments. We suggest that you seek the views of your specialist conservation and archaeological advisers, as relevant.

Open Space Officer

No objections - The application falls below the threshold for requirement of offsite POS contributions.

Glinton Parish Council

Glinton Parish Council referred this application to Committee. They support the application on the grounds that the site is current an eyesore and restoration would be uneconomical. Glinton PC consider the local list of heritage assets to be to inform planning policy rather than definitive. Consider that some parts of the property have no architectural merit and do not agree that the whole footprint should be retained. This would be an opportunity to establish a family home that enhances the conservation area and streetscene.

PCC Tree Officer (10.04.24)

Objection, on the grounds that removal of the yew tree is unjustified and would be contrary to LP19. The tree protection measures need amending

Waste Management

No comments received

Welland & Deeping Internal Drainage Board

No comments received

Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service

No comments received

Local Residents/Interested Parties

Initial consultations: 4

Total number of responses: 8

Total number of objections: 6

Total number in support: 2

The issues raise are summarised below;.

- The large detached garage/workshop location intrusive/overbearing.
- Light and noise pollution from vehicles using drive to access garage
- Would set a precedent for further development
- Insufficient gap between proposal and no4
- Additional separation needed for rear extension or reduction to single storey
- Removal of Yew Tree T003 would be detrimental to the site
- Overlooking from rooflight
- Renovation preferable to demolition
- Keeps it current look, garage is better at the back than side

5 Assessment of the planning issues

The main considerations are:

- a) Principle of Development
- b) Design, Materials and Context
- c) Amenity of neighbour and future occupiers
- d) Heritage
- e) Archaeology
- f) Trees
- g) Flood Risk and drainage
- h) Contamination
- i) Highways Safety

a) Principle of development

The application site is located within the settlement boundary of Glinton, which is an acceptable location for residential development in principle. The proposal satisfactorily accords with Policy LP2 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) in this respect, but remains subject to all other relevant policies and material considerations as discussed below.

b) Design, Materials and Character of the Area

The proposal seeks to completely demolish the existing dwelling and build a new replacement dwelling. The front elevation of the new dwelling would replicate the original, being built in the same position and with the same materials and appearance as the existing. The footprint and massing of the replacement dwelling would be significantly larger, extending significantly further to the rear. In addition, a new single storey garage/workshop would be erected to the rear of the site.

In terms of design, the front part of the dwelling, including the pitched roof would be near identical to the existing, except the garage door which would be replaced with a window to serve the ground floor snug as well as the roof material which would be blue natural slate rather than the original asbestos tiles. The proposed rear sections of the building including the orangery would be subservient and of good quality design and materials and would be in proportion to the main house and the size of the plot and its wider context.

The proposed garage/workshop would be of appropriate design, scale materials and massing and would relate well to the dwelling and surrounding context. Whilst relatively large when compared to other double garages in the surrounding area, it remains subservient and is considered acceptable.

The impact on the streetscene would be minimal by virtue of the replication of the original front elevation. The increased scale and massing of the new dwelling, together with the new garage would be evident when viewed from the rear gardens to the west and to some extent the north and south, although not so noticeable in the streetscene. However, overall the design/scale is appropriate to the character of the area.

Notwithstanding the above, Policy LP16 clearly advises development should

“respect the context of the site, surrounding area and respond appropriately to..... the existing natural, historic, built assets and features that contribute positively to the local character and distinctiveness.”

Whilst the proposed design seeks to replicate existing design features, the demolition would still result in the total loss of an NDHA which positively contributes to the local character and distinctiveness of the area. This is discussed further in the following section

Furthermore Glinton NP Policy GNP3 – Design states:

“Development must deliver high quality design through3.2 Responding positively to

key features on the site such as trees and other natural environmental features, topography, and buildings and retaining them as part of the scheme wherever possible”

In this respect, whilst the design of the proposal is generally in keeping with the character of the area the proposal is contrary to Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2019,(particularly when read together with Policy LP19), Policy GNP 3 of the Glinton NP, as well as the NPPF.

d) Heritage

The Council is currently in the process of updating the local list of NDHAs, of which no.2 Welmore Road is one of the nominations. Although the building is yet to be formally adopted on the Local List, this does not in any way mean that it is not an NDHA or that it is of lesser historic significance than those already on the local list.

This stance has been confirmed within appeal decisions such as The Old Kennels, Easton, APP/J3530/W/15/3004542. In paragraph 7 the Inspector concludes that:

“although the appeal property is not identified in a local list, this does not operate as a bar to its identification as a non-designated heritage asset. That is instead a matter for the decision maker on the basis of the evidence presented to them. As such whilst the property is a nomination for the LPA’s current review of the Local List the weight applied to the nomination is irrelevant given that evidence presented can warrant the building being identified as a non-designated heritage asset.”

Throughout the application process, the applicant has acknowledged the heritage significance of the existing building but has disputed its merits as an NDHA due to the fact that it is not wholly a C19 cottage as originally assumed but has been significantly reconfigured through early C20th alterations and additions.

As a result, the Conservation Officer has conducted a re-evaluation and has reiterated that the building still meets the criteria as an NDHA. For the avoidance of doubt, officers consider that the building is an NDHA.

The applicant has submitted a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) which clearly demonstrates through old maps and photographic evidence that the building was originally a thatched stone cottage (single storey with dormers) of unknown date (probably 16th – 19th century) which was altered in the early 20th century through the addition of a full height first floor, tiled roof, rear and side extensions, new windows and porch. This is also evident from the submitted existing ground floor plan which shows a slightly asymmetrical plan and much thicker external walls, than would be expected in a C19 or C20 dwelling

Despite the clear evidence in the HIA, it is also asserted in the addendum to that document that very little of the structure of the original cottage remains, that it was largely demolished and that the building is largely C20. Officers consider that the historic significance of the building has been understated in the HIA. The external walls of the original thatched cottage, including the gable ends, still exist almost entirely intact, contributing greatly to the building’s historic interest and significance. The early C20 extensions and alterations can be viewed as a second phase of the building’s evolution which are also integral to the significance of the building, demonstrating how the rural character of Glinton has evolved over the years. Despite the alterations, it is still considered to be of sufficient age and rarity to be an NDHA and to contribute positively to the historic character of the conservation area and setting of the adjacent listed building, by virtue of its age and historic significance as well as its design scale, materials and appearance.

It is acknowledged that NDHAs do not carry the same degree of protection as designated heritage assets (listed buildings, conservation areas etc). However, they do still benefit from a degree of protection, not only at a national level but also within Policy LP19 of the Local Plan, which states:

"Where a non-designated heritage asset is affected by development proposals, there will be a presumption in favour of its retention, though regard will be had to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. Any special features which contribute to an asset's significance should be retained and reinstated, where possible."

Para. 206 of the NPPF states:

"The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset."

Para. 205 of the NPPF also requires developers to:

"record and advance understanding of the significance of heritage assets to be lost". This however is a mitigation subsequent to the planning balance and "should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted".

In this case, not only would the proposal result in the total loss of the NDHA, it would also result in a degree of less than substantial harm to the historic character of the conservation area and the setting of the adjacent grade II listed building. Whilst the replacement dwelling would look superficially the same as the existing in the streetscene, it would inevitably look "new" which would erode the historic character of the conservation area and the setting of the listed building, taking away the various layers of history which can still be perceived in the building.

Whilst the starting point of LP19 is a "presumption in favour of retention", there may be cases where loss can be justified, including where it can be demonstrated that the NDHA is beyond repair, or unviable to restore, or where there would be a much greater benefit through redevelopment of a site.

Furthermore, Glinton NP Policy GNP3-Design states:

"Plans and supporting statements submitted with planning applications should make clear how decisions on the design of the proposal were arrived at and why they are appropriate for the context of the site."

In this case the applicant has sought to argue that due to the poor structural integrity of the existing building, and costs involved to bring the building up to modern standards, it would not be viable to retain the existing building and that the only viable option would be to demolish and re-build.

Officers advised the applicant to provide a detailed structural report and a viability report to support the proposal and justify demolition and rebuild. However, the applicant has only provided evidence in the form of a brief structural appraisal, which does not provide robust detailed evidence or assessment.

In addition, the methodology used in the submitted viability assessment is flawed and it does not provide a robust assessment. It also does not appear to have been carried out by a RICS accredited professional in line with the "Red Book". In the absence of a detailed structural report, the extent of any necessary remedial works is unclear, which throws significant doubt on the figures stated in the viability assessment. Furthermore, it is unclear on what basis the purchase cost has been reached. £325,000 appears excessive for a plot with a dwelling which is allegedly beyond economic repair. Equally the viability assessment does not show how the build costs or estimated sales value have been reached.

Taking the above into account, it is considered that insufficient evidence has been presented to demonstrate that the structural and other problems are so serious as to be incapable of repair or

that any necessary works would be impractical or financially unviable. Despite requests, the applicant has declined to provide any further structural or viability information.

In this respect, the proposal is contrary to Policy LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2019, Policy GNP 3 of the Glinton NP, as well as the NPPF.

d) Neighbour and Occupier amenity

The application site shares boundaries with no.4 Welmore Road to the south, Grade II Listed, Websters Farmhouse to the north, no.7 Websters Close to the west and No.1 Welmore Road to the east.

Neighbouring amenity

The proposed dwelling located on the footprint of the existing dwelling with a 2-storey rear extension to the west. Although the ground floor aspect would be adjacent to no.4, the first-floor aspect of the rear extension would be stepped slightly away from no.4 Welmore Road by 1m. Given the size of the no.4's amenity space, although it would be noticeable, the design and orientation of the site means that there is some relief and the extension is unlikely to result in adverse harm to this neighbour by means of overbearing and overshadowing. There are no new windows on the elevation facing south to result in overlooking for this neighbour.

With regards to Websters Farmhouse to the north and no.7 Websters Close to the west, there is sufficient separation distance to ensure no unacceptable residential amenity impacts to these neighbouring occupiers, in particular overbearing, overshadowing or overlooking.

In respect of the garage/workshop, it is single storey with a ridge height of 5.22m from ground level and no windows facing towards to the rear or side and sited to the rear of the neighbouring boundaries. The rear of the garage/workshop would be between 1.75m and 0.63m from the shared rear boundary. Although it would be noticeable, especially for no.7 Websters Close to the rear, it is considered that the structure would not adversely affect the main usable amenity spaces of the neighbouring gardens and would not result in harm by means of adverse overbearing or overshadowing. A condition could be appended to ensure that the garage/workshop remains incidental only, with no additional windows permitted and that the building shall remain non-habitable in perpetuity.

In terms of the proposed vehicle access to the rear, due to the plot being fairly spacious and the vehicle movements unlikely to be an intensification given the residential nature of the proposal, it is not considered that the movement of vehicles would result in adverse amenity harm to neighbours at no.4 Welmore Road to the south and Websters Farmhouse to the north.

No.1 Welmore Road is on the opposite side of the road and amenity would not be adversely impacted by the proposal.

Occupier amenity

The proposed design would ensure that the amenity of future occupiers is met with regards to natural light, privacy, living and storage needs and private amenity space. There is also sufficient space for bin storage and the parking and turning of vehicles.

On the basis of the above, in this respect, the proposal is considered to satisfactorily comply with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and Policy GNP 3 of the Glinton NP.

e) Archaeology

The Council's Archaeologist has noted that despite the visible 20th century alterations described in the Heritage Statement and Impact Assessment document submitted with this application, the building on site, which is currently undated, retains many original features.

Conditions are therefore recommended for Archaeology Building Recording and Archaeological Monitoring and Recording. An archaeological building recording to Historic England's Level 3 standards is therefore recommended. The aim is to characterise the building and provide satisfactory evidence to inform decisions and mitigate risk in the appropriate context of the proposed development. Monitoring of all groundwork is also recommended as the site is located within an historic nucleus of the village which has produced pottery dating to the Early Medieval period. Finds of Roman and Iron Age date have also been reported.

f) Trees

GNP5 of the Glinton Neighbourhood Plan seeks to protect trees in the Conservation area, in line with LP29 of the Peterborough Local Plan.

Although the trees are not protected by TPO, they are within the Conservation area, so therefore already benefit from a level of protection. All trees have amenity value and are a material consideration when it comes to development, regardless if they are protected by TPO or not.

As per email from agent dated 5th June 2024, tree T003 within the rear garden marked for removal has been agreed to be retained along with T001, T002 and T005. As such, the only tree which would be removed would be T004 to the front of the site.

If the proposal was to be approved, conditions could be appended to ensure that the recommended tree protection measures are in place prior to any works commencing on site and monitor the site during the development period to ensure the same and the installation of the proposed areas of no-dig driveway.

In light of the above it is considered that in this respect, the proposal is in accordance with Policy LP29 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and GNP5 of the Glinton NP.

g) Flood Risk and drainage

The application site does not fall within flood zones 2 and 3.

However, as required by LP32 and GNP8, Adequate information must be provided to clearly demonstrate that there is an adequate supply of potable water; and foul water and drainage water will not have negative consequences to existing systems servicing the village of Glinton.

The details of the surface and foul water drainage have not been specified on the application form or within the supporting drawings. If the application was to be acceptable in all other respects, a condition could be applied to secure the details and ensure the site adequately drains, in accordance with the drainage hierarchy in accordance with Policy LP32 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and GNP8 of the Glinton NP.

h) Contamination

Demolition should be carried out in accordance with best practice to control dust and noise.

As per advice from Environmental health, due to the derelict nature of the site, it would be prudent to apply the unsuspected contamination condition if this application is approved.

i) Highways Safety

The proposal would provide ample off street parking, above requirements as stated in the council's parking standards for a 4-bed dwelling. Secure cycle storage has also been designed to be located within the garage and bin storage located towards the front which is acceptable.

The LHA has advised no objections to the proposal subject to a number of conditions relating to access details, temp facilities, reinstatement of kerb, wheel wash and for gates to open inwards.

Details of electric charging points have not been included in the proposal, so if the application is approved, a condition shall be appended for the submission and installation of these as required by both LP13 of the local plan and GNP6 of the Glinton Neighbourhood plan.

In light of the above it is considered that in this respect, the proposal is in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and GNP6 of the Glinton NP.

6 Conclusions

Replacement dwellings, within the village envelope, that are in keeping with the character of the village, are acceptable in principle. However, in this case the proposed replacement dwelling, whilst in itself of an appropriate design and scale, would result in harm through the total loss of a NDHA and less than substantial harm to the character of the conservation area and the setting of the adjacent grade II listed building. The applicant has failed to demonstrate through robust evidence that replacement of the NDHA is the only viable option, or that the public benefits of bringing the site back into use through redevelopment, outweigh the harm.

The proposal is therefore unacceptable having been assessed in light of all material considerations, including weighing against relevant policies of the development plan and for the specific reasons given below.

7 Recommendation

The Executive Director of Place and Economy recommends that Planning Permission is **REFUSED**

- R 1 The application fails to provide sufficient assessment and justification for the demolition of the existing non-designated heritage asset (NDHA). Although the proposed replacement, will to a large extent, match the design of the building proposed to be demolished, there is a shortfall of information to surpass the test of Policy LP19 and the presumption in favour of retention. Based on the limited information submitted, there is no robust justification for the total loss of the NDHA and less than substantial harm to the conservation area and setting of the adjacent listed building contrary to Policy LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2019, Policy GNP3 of the Glinton NP, as well as the NPPF.

Copies to Councillor- Councillor Neil Boyce
Councillor Peter Hiller

This page is intentionally left blank