

Combroke Parish Council

Consultation for Planning Application 16/00728/FUL

Proposed: 2 storey side extension

at Highfield, Combrook CV35 9HP

Representation

The Parish Council discussed this application at a meeting on 11 April. The Applicant was present. Following a brief presentation of the proposal, the Applicant was invited to add any further comments about the proposal and respond to further matters raised during the Council's discussion on the item.

Heritage

1. The site is within the Conservation Area of Combrook and Compton Verney. To the west the site abuts the grounds of the Church of St Mary and St Margaret and the rear of a cluster of listed cottages. A number of monuments within the grounds of the church are also listed.
2. Combroke Church is a Listed Building Grade II, it was rebuilt in 1866 to a design by John Gibson. Highfield is on higher ground and is therefore prominent above the church and its grounds, both when viewed from within the village; from views on several footpaths; and in particular from the lane on approach to the village from the Fosse Way. The site is therefore sensitive in relation to the setting of the Church which is central to the character of this part of the Conservation Area.
3. *For these reasons the Parish Council requests that the Planning Authority's Conservation Officer is consulted to provide an expert appraisal of these proposals in relation to impact on the setting of the Listed Buildings, Monuments and Conservation Area. (NPPF 129-135; SDC Core Strategy Policy CS 8; and Historic Environment Good Practice Advice Guidance in Planning 2015)*

Assessment of the Application

4. It was reported that a number of residents had approached councillors to indicate concern about the proposal, in particular it was felt to be too big given its prominent position. Equally it was reported that two residents, living in the vicinity of the site, have indicated they had no concerns about it.
5. A key element of the design is that the proposed extension will be faced in brickwork to match the existing chimney, this was specifically chosen to be a softer appearance to the current render. The Parish Council very much welcomes this choice of finish and agrees it will soften the appearance and be an improvement on the existing render.
6. In considering the size of the proposed extension, Policy CS19 states that extensions will be of an appropriate scale and subservient in relation to the existing building. It is noted that the proposal will increase the overall floor space by about one third, and footprint by about one quarter. In the context of the overall size of the site and distance to nearest neighbours, the Parish Council felt such an increase to be acceptable.
7. It is noted that the ridge of the proposed extension is not subservient to the existing building (CS 19). It was suggested that the proposed brickwork will in part define the extension as an additional element to the original building. It was agreed to leave clarification of this aspect of policy to be addressed by the Case Officer and it will also fall within an appraisal by the Conservation Officer.

8. Church Hill is one of the areas of the Village prone to surface water flooding in exceptionally heavy rains (refer Environment Agency mapping). It is suggested therefore, that for any additional development on this site calculation of the flow capacity be considered to ensure the proposed mechanism for discharge of storm water from roofs and impervious areas is adequate. It may be desirable to discharge to a watercourse/drain.
9. Given the particular topography, the judgement on the impact of the proposal on the setting of the Church and the character of the Conservation Area requires specialist expertise. The Parish Council would like to receive clear advice from an expert appraisal in the context of policy and the HE Guidance (see heritage section above).

For the above reasons, if the appraisal of the scheme by the Planning Authority's Conservation Officer gives unequivocal support for the proposals then the Parish Council will not object to this application.

14 April 2016