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1. **Introduction**

1.1 This application was considered by the Area Planning Committee West at its meeting on 24 April 2013, at which time it was deferred for a Committee site visit to assess the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and upon the residential amenities of neighbouring properties. The site visit was carried out on 10 June 2013.

1.2 The application has received six letters of support and is recommended for refusal.

2. **Description of the Proposals**

2.1 Planning permission is sought for the construction of a single storey extension at the rear of Lyncroft, Corbridge. The proposed extension would necessitate the demolition of an existing stone outbuilding and linking rear kitchen extension – for which an application for Conservation Area Consent has been submitted (application reference 12/03479/CON). The linking kitchen extension currently measures 3.3m by 3.8m single pitch roof link building, some 5 metres in height which is currently used as a kitchen; and a larger outbuilding 17.5 by 11.35 metres in size and some 5.1 metres in height which is attached to the former building. The larger outbuilding is currently used for storage. In replacement for these buildings a 7.05 metres in length, 5.5 metres in depth extension would be constructed across the rear of the house. It would have a pitched slate roof, 4.1 metres in height and with six rooflights. The south elevation of the extension would be glazed to the apex of the roof, with stone detailing to the sides. Attached to this, and within the south-east corner of the extension would be a stone, pitched roof offshoot 2.8 metres by 3 metres in size.

2.2 Lyncroft is a stone and slate terraced house, with an attached off-shot kitchen and attached outbuilding. Adjacent to the kitchen is a small rear yard. There is a timber garage to the rear, and to the east of this a garden area which extends to the rear of nos Hill Street. Vehicular access to the house is via a private lane which lies adjacent to 7 Hill Street and extends behind the rear of the terraced houses. The large outbuilding is attached to a further outbuilding in the neighbouring property, which is at the rear of the butchers shop, to the east of Lyncroft.

2.3 Lyncroft is located on Hill Street, in the centre of the village of Corbridge and within the Corbridge Conservation Area.

3. **Planning History**

**Reference Number:** 12/03479/CON  
**Description:** Conservation Consent: Demolition of the existing outbuilding  
**Status:** PENDING DECISION

**Reference Number:** T/20020952  
**Description:** Revised application - Loft conversion amendment to add balcony to previously approved dormers windows
Status: REFUSED

4. Consultee Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultee</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corbridge Parish Council</td>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong> No objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland Conservation</td>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong> No objection to removal of outbuilding subject to photographic survey of structure and that fabric is retained and utilised but recommend refusal to the extension. Based on the Structural Appraisal Report, consider that on balance substantial and intrusive works including dismantling, rebuilding and underpinning would be required in which to make the building structurally sound which would result in the significant loss of the outbuildings special vernacular character. The proposed addition will involve the loss of substantial historic fabric to the rear elevation. The design of the new addition is inappropriate in terms of scale and massing. The splayed roof extending to the party wall and extending the entire width of the rear yard creates a squat and ill-proportioned addition which requires revision. Need to ensure that the demolition of the outbuilding does not negatively impact on the structural integrity of and the passage of rainwater from the neighbouring boundary wall and outbuilding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Ecologist</td>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong> No objection subject to a condition relating to the mitigation and compensation scheme. The demolition of the outbuilding shall result in the loss of a roost and a Natural England Licence will be required before the demolition of the building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways</td>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong> No objection subject to conditions. Consider that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on highway safety in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Archaeologist</td>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong> No objection subject to a condition for building recording prior to demolition and a condition for a watching brief. The proposed extension is located within the medieval and later burgage plot and has the potential to impact on archaeological settlement remains. An archaeological watching brief will be required during the groundworks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Public Responses

   Neighbour Notification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Neighbours Notified</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Objections</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Support</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of General Comments</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notices

Site Notice- Affecting a Conservation Area expired 28 January 2013
Press Notice - Hexham Courant expired 1 February 2013

Summary of Responses:
Six letters of support have been received which in summary state that:
• the demolition of the outbuilding should be supported as it blocks sunlight, leads to damp in the adjoining building and does not contribute to the character and appearance of the area.
• There is support for the extension as it will not be seen from a wider area, it will give increased living space and the design is appropriate to the character of the site and its surroundings.

6. Planning Policy

6.1 National Planning Policy

6.2 Development Plan Policy
Tynedale Core Strategy
GD1 The general location of development
BE1 Principles for the built environment

Tynedale District Local Plan
GD2 Design criteria including extensions and alterations
GD4 Range of transport provision for all development
GD7 Car parking standards within the built-up areas of Hexham, Haltwhistle, Prudhoe and Corbridge
H33 Residential extensions
BE17 Demolition of buildings in Conservation Areas
BE27 Regionally and locally important archaeological sites and settings
NE27 Protection of protected species

7. Appraisal

7.1 The main issues in the consideration of this application are:

Principle of development
Design and impact on the Conservation Area
Impact on residential amenity
Impact on archaeological remains
Impact on protected species
Access and parking

Principle of development

7.2 The proposal site is within the village of Corbridge where Core Strategy Policy GD1 permits the scale of development proposed.

Design and impact on the Conservation Area

7.3 The NPPF sets out as one of its core planning principles that planning should always seek to secure high quality design and that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area. It also states that there has to be substantial public benefit to outweigh the loss of a heritage asset.
7.4 The stone and slate outbuilding to the rear of the house would be considered to be a heritage asset and is described as a former farm building or workshop within the Heritage Statement. A structural appraisal report of the outbuilding was submitted with the application. Whilst it is considered that some of the issues outlined in that report could be remedied and repaired, on balance substantial and intrusive works, including dismantling, rebuilding and underpinning would be required to make the building structurally sound. This in turn would result in the significant loss of the outbuilding’s vernacular character. Although it is acknowledged that the building contributes to the character of the Conservation Area, the condition of the building is such that it is considered that it could be acceptable for removal, in accordance with Local Plan Policy BE17, subject to a suitable replacement structure being agreed upon.

7.5 Having accepted in principle the loss of a heritage asset, there is a need to address the principle outlined in the NPPF that new development should make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. The Corbridge Conservation Area Character Appraisal states that Hill Street, through its different building styles, heights and detailing, creates a rich and interesting townscape where individuality is a key characteristic. The proposed extension would be built across the entire width of the building, which is considered to create a squat and ill-proportioned addition. Concern has also been raised by the Conservation Officer about the removal of original fabric on the south elevation of the building. The plans have subsequently been amended to try to address this issue and to retain the existing door and window opening, although no details have been provided as to the means of achieving this.

7.6 The proposed extension would result in the apex of the roof reaching the level of the first floor window sills and the roof would have six regularly spaced rooflights. Compared with traditional development found on the rears of period houses where extensions respect and are in scale with the original dwelling, the proposal would create an overlarge addition. The large area of non-traditional glazing is not sympathetic to the local vernacular style or the original dwelling and does not create a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. It is not considered to be high quality design that would enhance the Conservation Area. The proposal would not accord with the design and heritage principles of the NPPF, Core Strategy Policy BE1 or Local Plan Policies GD2 and H33.

Impact on residential amenity

7.7 The outbuilding to be demolished is attached to a neighbouring outbuilding. The agent has stated that the neighbours building would be protected during the course of the demolition and would be subject to the Party Wall Act etc 1996. Subject to these measures it is considered that the removal of this building would not impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring property.

7.8 The construction of the proposed extension would extend across the entire width of the rear elevation and yard of Lyncroft, thereby extending from both the west and east boundary walls. It is considered that this would not impact on the amenity of the neighbouring property to the east, which is in
commercial use, as there is already an existing wall 5 metres in height between the two properties. In relation to the property immediately to the west (Brynmor) this has only a small enclosed yard area as outdoor amenity space to the rear containing outbuildings. The dwelling has two ground floor windows (one facing rearwards, the other sideways towards the proposed extension). This small yard is the only amenity space afforded to this property. Whilst the existing outbuilding at the application site is of a significant height and scale, it is at least located someway down the rear yard. With the lower “linking” extension, the scale of the outbuilding is minimised to an extent and there is therefore a “gap” which allows an adequate level of daylight to the rear yard and windows of Brynmor. The proposed extension, whilst necessitating the removal of the existing outbuilding, would result in an extension of a similar height being attached to the rear of Lyncroft, immediately adjacent to the rear of Brynmor. At the present time, as there is a ‘gap’ between the rear of Lyncroft and the existing outbuilding, there is some outlook from the rear yard area. If the extension was added to the rear, a 5.7 metre long extension would be constructed along the boundary wall. Appendix 12 of the Local Plan states that single storey extensions to the rear of properties should normally be restricted to a depth of 3.6 metres when sited on the party boundary. The proposal would exceed this by 2.1 metres and although the roof would be pitched, this would create an overbearing structure, overshadowing the yard and bay window and impacting on light levels to this area, to the detriment of residential amenity.

7.9 The applicant’s agent notes that as the neighbouring property is within the applicant’s ownership the impact of the proposal is not therefore so significant and that given the pitched roof the highest part of the proposed extension would not be on the party boundary, but some 3 metres away from the boundary line. Whilst it may be possible to retaining the existing yard wall at its current height, the additional height of the pitched roof immediately adjacent to the limited private area would adversely impact upon residential amenity of occupants of Brynmor. The NPPF, in seeking high quality design, also seeks to ensure a “good standard of amenity for existing and future occupants of land and buildings”. The provisions of Core Strategy Policy BE1 and Local Plan Policies GD2 and H33 align closely with this aim in seeking to protect residential amenity. It is considered that this would not be achieved, would adversely impact upon residential amenity through an overbearing and overpowering impact and would therefore fail to satisfy the NPPF in this respect, and be contrary to Core Strategy Policy BE1 and Local Plan Policies GD2 and H33.

Impact on archaeological remains

7.10 A Heritage Statement was submitted with the application which only addressed the building to be demolished and did not include any assessment of below ground archaeology. The site is, however, located within the medieval settlement of Corbridge and is likely to have covered an area of medieval burgage plots, thereby being within an area of archaeological potential. The County Archaeologist has accepted that, based on the Structural Report and Heritage Statement, that the demolition of the building, following historic building recording would be acceptable. They consider that the construction of the extension would require an archaeological watching brief during the groundworks of the development, which would be subject to a
condition. Subject to relevant conditions, the proposal would accord with the provisions of the NPPF, Core Strategy Policy BE1 and Local Plan Policy BE27.

Impact on protected species

7.11 A Bat and Barn Owl report has been submitted with the application. This identified a bat roost within the outbuilding to be demolished which would require a Natural England Licence. The County ecologist has been consulted on the proposal and has no objection subject to a condition relating to the compensation and mitigation scheme. The proposal would accord with Local Plan Policy NE27.

Access and parking

7.12 The existing access would be utilised and there would be no change to the parking arrangement on the site. The proposal would accord with Local Plan Policies GD4 and GD7.

8. Conclusion

8.1 The proposal site is within the village of Corbridge where Core Strategy Policy GD1 permits the scale of development proposed.

8.2 Although it is acknowledged that the outbuilding contributes to the character of the Conservation Area, the condition of the building is such that we consider that it is acceptable for its removal, in accordance with Local Plan Policy BE17, subject to a suitable replacement building.

8.3 The NPPF, in seeking high quality design, also seeks to ensure a “good standard of amenity for existing and future occupants of land and buildings”. The provisions of Core Strategy Policy BE1 and Local Plan Policies GD2 and H33 align closely with this aim in seeking to protect residential amenity. It is considered that this would not be achieved, would adversely impact upon residential amenity through an overbearing and overpowering impact and would therefore fail to satisfy the NPPF in this respect, and be contrary to Core Strategy Policy BE1 and Local Plan Policies GD2 and H33.

8.4 The site is within the medieval settlement of Corbridge. The demolition of the building would be acceptable subject to historic building recording prior to its demolition. The construction of the extension would require an archaeological watching brief. Subject to relevant conditions, the proposal would accord with the provisions of the NPPF, Core Strategy Policy BE1 and Local Plan Policy BE27.

8.5 A bat roost is in the outbuilding, but subject to a Natural England Licence and a condition relating to the compensation and mitigation scheme, the proposal would accord with Local Plan Policy NE27.

8.6 The access and parking would be as existing and the proposal would accod with Local Plan Policies GD4 and GD7.

9. Recommendation
That this application be REFUSED permission subject to the following:

Reason for Decision

01. The extension would create an overlarge addition which would not be sympathetic to the local vernacular style or the original dwelling and does not create a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. It is not considered to be a high quality design that would enhance the Conservation Area. The proposal would not accord with the design and heritage principles of the NPPF, Core Strategy Policy BE1 and Local Plan Policies GD2 and H33.

02. The proposal would extend 5.7 metres along the boundary wall with Brynmor to the west and would create an overbearing structure, overshadowing the yard and bay window and impacting on light levels. It is considered that the extension would have a detrimental impact on the adjoining neighbouring property and would not accord with Local Plan Policies GD2 and H33.

Date of Report: 11.04.2013
Background Papers : Planning application file(s) 12/03478/FUL

List and Comments of representations received:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Summary of Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joan Joyce</td>
<td>Brynmor Hill Street</td>
<td>See attached letter received 20th December 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corbridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NE45 5AA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr George Hall</td>
<td>Lumley Cottage Main Street</td>
<td>See attached letter dated 5th October 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corbridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NE45 5LA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Farnworth</td>
<td>21 Chains Drive</td>
<td>See attached letter dated 9th January 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corbridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NE45 5BP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs J Thompson</td>
<td>Four Jays Fellside</td>
<td>See attached letter dated 24/01/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hexham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NE46 1RB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Joyce</td>
<td>7 Hill Street</td>
<td>See attached letter dated 9th January 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corbridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NE45 5AA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Hampton</td>
<td>Woodburn House</td>
<td>See attached letter dated 11/01/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graves</td>
<td>Corbridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NE45 5AY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>