

<b>Parish:</b>	<b>Grimston</b>	
<b>Proposal:</b>	<b>Replacement garden room</b>	
<b>Location:</b>	<b>Ivy Farm House 37 Congham Road Grimston King's Lynn</b>	
<b>Applicant:</b>	<b>Client of Holt Architectural Ltd</b>	
<b>Case No:</b>	<b>23/00853/F (Full Application)</b>	
<b>Case Officer:</b>	<b>Mrs Rebecca Bush</b>	<b>Date for Determination:</b> <b>11 July 2023</b>  <b>Extension of Time Expiry Date:</b> <b>8 September 2023</b>

**Reason for Referral to Planning Committee** – Called in by Cllr De Whalley due to the replacement garden room being of a substantially different design to the listed farmhouse and is more conspicuous because of the amendments.

**Neighbourhood Plan:** No

### **Case Summary**

The application is for a replacement single storey garden room to the rear (west) of the existing dwelling. This dwelling is a Grade II listed building.

The site is located to the east of the village close to the junction of Lynn Road and the B1153 within the village of Grimston. Grimston is a Key Rural Service Centre as defined by Policy CS02 of the Core Strategy 2011.

An associated Listed Building application has also been submitted (reference 23/00855/LB).

### **Key Issues**

Principle of Development  
Design  
Impact on Neighbour Amenity  
Any other material considerations

### **Recommendation**

**APPROVE**

### **THE APPLICATION**

This is a two-storey dwelling situated within the development boundary of Grimston. The application is for a replacement garden room to the rear (west) of the dwelling.

This is a Grade II listed building called Ivy Farm House. The listing description details are: Grade II, Reference 2/29. This is a 17th Century with extension dated 1733. It is constructed in coursed galletted carstone with brick dressings and eaves course; pantiles, gable, parapets. 3 bays, 2 storeys, plus 2-bay 2-storey extension to right with lean-to, added range to rear. A principal facade to east: large 4-light casements under flat arches to bays 1 and 3, doorway to bay 2 renewed with 2-light casement above to first floor, small, inserted window to chimney bay to right. 2-bay 2-storey extension to right with cast iron plaque having monogram YP and date May 28 1733; ground floor with 2 casements. Left return to south of 17th Century carstone rubble with brick quoins, external stack of galletted carstone blocks; gable raised from 1 1/2 to 2 storeys, inserted doorway to left with blocked first floor window above. Rear: 1-bay 2-storey 19th Century range to rear of bay 2 having facing of small carstone with brick dressings; 2 large openings to south and west, those to ground floor under flat arches. Rear facade of varied materials, 17th and 18th Century brick, galletted and ungalletted carstone rubble, upper courses in brick, vertical join; varied scattered and inserted fenestration including semi-circular headed fixed stair light with glazing bars.

The initial scheme proposed the joining of the farmhouse to the outbuilding through an orangery style extension. As a previous application for a similar scheme had been refused on harm to the character and significance of the building (see reference 22/01354/LB), the agent was asked to submit amended plans for an extension that did not link the buildings. The amended plans are now the subject of this application.

The proposal is now for a day room which is not attached to the outbuilding in the rear garden area. It would have a flat roof and frameless sliding glazed screen facing the rear with reclaimed facing brickwork to the conservation officer's approval.

## **SUPPORTING CASE**

No supporting case to date, however, we have received a design and access statement on 28.07.23 which incorporates a heritage statement. The report details the listed building and describes the site and proposal.

It states that given the small nature and style of the proposed the impact on the listed building would have minimal impact on the arm of the historic fabric and appearance. All external materials and colours would be carefully selected in conjunction with the conversation officer to deliver a space that helps retain the period feel to the main dwelling and the listed building and its setting whilst removing the existing UPVC conservatory.

## **PLANNING HISTORY**

22/01354/LB: Listed building application for removal of existing rear lean-too conservatory and construction of new orangery style rear single storey extension. Refused. 20.04.23.

22/01353/F: Removal of existing rear lean-too conservatory and construction of new orangery style rear single storey extension. Withdrawn 15.05.23.

20/01495/F: Proposed triple cart shed to rear of main house. Permitted 16/12/20.

09/01589/F: Construction of open fronted 3 bay car port. Permitted 28.10.2009.

2/00/0472/F: extension of conservatory extension to dwelling. Permitted 20.06.2000.

2/00/00251/LB: Retention of conservatory extension to dwelling. Permitted 20.06.2000.

23/00853/F

## RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION

### Parish Council: OBJECT

The Parish Council recommends refusal of what constitutes a substantial extension, which will change the essence of the historical and architecturally important local building. Although to the rear, the style and design will dominate this part of the building in a way that is not in keeping with its listing.

Amended Design

No Parish Council comments received.

### Public Rights of Way: NO OBJECTION

We have no objections on Public Rights of Way grounds as although Congham Restricted Byway 12 is in the vicinity, it does not appear to be affected by the proposals.

### Historic Environment Service: NO OBJECTION

No known archaeological implications.

### Historic England: NO OBJECTION

Historic England provides advice when the engagement can add most value. In this case they are not offering advice. This should not be interpreted as comment on the merits of the application. Suggests seeking specialist conservation and archaeological advisers.

### Conservation Area: NO OBJECTION

The first design linked the outbuilding to the main house, which was considered unacceptable as it would harm the significance and historic status of both buildings. New plans were requested.

Amended Design

This is now a neat, modern extension which does not dominate the listed building or overpower any of the historic features. It replaces an inappropriate, late C20 lean-to conservatory which actually causes some harm to the rear elevation of the building because of its style and materials.

### Arboricultural Officer: NO OBJECTION

No objection to the application. No threat to existing trees.

## REPRESENTATIONS

**ONE** letter of **OBJECTION** from **ONE** public comments (original scheme) regarding as follows:

- How does the amendments, with a significance increase in the size of the glass doors on two aspects of the proposal, is any more in keeping with the heritage of the listed building.

- Create potential noise and anti-social behaviour by some holidaymakers and disrupted the neighbourhood in a quiet residential area.
- Extra occupancy will mean increased pressure on an already overloaded antiquated and failing drainage/sewage system.

**TWO** letters of **OBJECTION** from TWO public comments (amended scheme) regarding the following:

- How is the application more in keeping with the nature of the listed building as opposed to the last application.
- Create potential noise and anti-social behaviour by some holidaymakers and disrupted the neighbourhood in a quiet residential area.
- Extra occupancy will mean increased pressure on an already overloaded antiquated and failing drainage/sewage system.
- How does the amendments, with a significance increase in the size of the glass doors on two aspects of the proposal, is any more in keeping with the heritage of the listed building.
- Lorries/skips an eyesore.
- Unhappy regards more holidaymakers to the area.

## **LDF CORE STRATEGY POLICIES**

**CS02** - The Settlement Hierarchy

**CS06** - Development in Rural Areas

**CS12** - Environmental Assets

**CS08** - Sustainable Development

## **SITE ALLOCATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES PLAN 2016**

**DM2** – Development Boundaries

**DM15** – Environment, Design and Amenity

## **NATIONAL GUIDANCE**

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

National Design Guide 2021

## **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

**The main considerations are:**

- Principle of Development
- Design
- Impact on Neighbour Amenity
- Any Other Material Considerations

## **Principle of Development**

The proposal is located within the development boundary of Grimston, a Key Rural Service Centre as defined by Policy CS02 of the Core Strategy 2011.

Ivy Farm House is a two storey, detached, Grade II listed building located within the village of Grimston. The dwelling is constructed in Carstone and brick, with Norfolk pantiles. The property is set back from the road with a large shingle frontage and driveway.

The proposed garden room would be located within the curtilage of the plot of the existing residential unit, and as such, the principle of development is acceptable subject to compliance with neighbourhood, local and national policy.

## **Design**

A planning application and listed building application were submitted last year (22/01353/F and 22/01354/LB) for the removal of existing rear lean-to conservatory and construction of new orangery style rear single storey extension. The listed building application was refused, and the planning application was withdrawn. The listed building was refused due to the larger footprint of extension. The extension covered the majority of the rear elevation and was of an inappropriate design which would have resulted in the loss of significant amount of historic fabric and would harm the appearance and setting of the historic asset.

The LPA then received this application that was previously not acceptable. The first design linked the proposal to the main house and outbuilding. This would harm the significance and historic status of both buildings. The second design showed the link element removed. However, it left a very awkward rear extension which was half modern flat roofed and half traditional gabled roof.

The final design (received 29.06.23) proposes a day room which has a modern and lightweight design that would be joined onto the kitchen area off the rear elevation, which contrasts with the historic fabric of the listed building. It would measure 9.7m x 4.6m and 2.8m in height with a flat roof. The extension would be glazed to the west with 2 roof lights. Although a lot of glazing, the site is not situated within a Conservation Area or an AONB and within a residential area. The proposal would not dominate the listed building or overpower the historic features to this designated heritage asset. Using a modern design or materials to contrast against historic fabric is an accepted conservation approach first developed by the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB) in the 19th century. It is a way of differentiating between each generations alterations without creating a pastiche of what might have been there.

This extension would replace a conservatory which itself causes more harm with the style and materials used. There is evidence in the rear wall of former openings and rebuilt upper sections which indicate that some of the fabric in this wall may not be as historic as might be expected.

The orangery style extension from last year would have had more traditional glazing panels, would dominate the rear elevation and would not be able to sit under the semi-circular window successfully. The proposed design, with its flat roof and large amounts of glazing avoids the dominance of a more traditional scheme while maintaining visibility of historic features.

The proposal would be constructed in facing brickwork to match the existing and Norfolk pantiles to also match the roof and would therefore be acceptable. It would sit under the existing windows of the existing rear elevation which are able to be retained without

alteration. Given the mix of dwellings in the locality combined with the position of the extension to the rear, the impact on the street scene would be limited. This scheme is smaller in mass and scale than that proposed in the refused/withdrawn applications (22/01353/F and 22/01354/LB) with less detrimental impact on the building. As such, this application would comply with Policy DM15 of the SADPP, Policies CS08 of CS12 of the Core Strategy and Para 126 and 199 of the NPPF.

### **Impact on Neighbour Amenity**

The proposal would be single storey with a flat roof and located centrally off the rear elevation. The plot has a long rear garden with a boundary fence of an approx. 1.8m. The fence and the existing outbuilding would screen the proposal from the west.

To the south of the site the existing drawing room would screen the day room from any neighbours.

The properties to the north are a good distance away from Ivy Farm House at approx. 24m. As the extension is surrounded by garden land and the Farmhouse there would be no overshadowing and therefore no adverse impacts on the neighbours.

This application accords with Policy CS08 of the Core Strategy and DM15 of the SADMPP.

### **Any Other Material Considerations**

The final amendment shows a modern extension which does not dominate the listed building or any of the historic features and does not lead to overdevelopment of the site.

This is not a change of use application, and the site is residential. Whether the day room is constructed or not noise would be created within the garden space by owners/holidaymakers.

As this is a small-scale extension - drainage and construction noise would only have minimal impacts.

The application is within the grounds of a residential dwelling to the rear of the property causing no highway issues.

### **CONCLUSION**

The above development is considered to represent sustainable development in accordance with the NPPF.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

**APPROVE** subject to the imposition of the following condition(s):

- 1 Condition: The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
  
- 1 Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, 2004.

2 Condition: The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

- Location Plan - HAL23-IF-900 received 20.04.23.
- Geomatics Survey RS-1841-01-GEO received 20.04.23.
- Ground Floor Plan RS-1841-02-MSB received 20.04.23.
- First Floor Plan RS-1841-03-MBS received 20.04.23.
- Elevations and Section RS-1841-04-MBS received 20.04.23.
- Elevations Sheet RS-1841.05.MSP received 20.04.23.
- Sections Sheet RS-1841-06-MBS received 20.04.23.
- Proposed elevations and section (link to pool house removed) HAL23-IF-400 Rev C received 28.07.23.
- Proposed site plan (link to pool house removed) HAL23-IF-700 Rev B received 28.06.23.
- Proposed elevations (pool house link removed) HAL23-IF-300 Rev B received 28.06.23.
- Proposed floor plan HAL23-IF-200 Rev B received 28.06.23.

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