DELEGATED FILE NOTE

CASE OFFICER: ...Jo Cousins.....

APPLICATION REFERENCE	BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT	APPLICATION SITE
18/01260/FPH	Single storey front extensions (as amended by plans received 21 June 2018)	1 Church Close Reed Royston Hertfordshire SG8 8AN

Submitted Plan Nos

EX.001 PL.002A PL.003A CLS 18020001 Rev O

1.0 Policies

LP6	Rural Areas Beyond the Green Belt

LP30	Replace or Extension Dwellings Countrysi
SECT12	Conserving and enhancing historic enviro
SECT7	Requiring Good Design
LP55	Car Parking Standards
SPDDS	Design Supplementary Planning Document
XCGB1	Rural Areas Beyond the Green Belt
XHE4	Archaeology
XHE1	Designated Heritage Assets
XD1	Sustainable Design
XD2	Hse Extns,Replacement Dwells,Outbuilding
XD3	Protecting Living Conditions

2.0 **Site History**

2.1 None relevant.

3.0 Representations

3.1 **Reed Parish Council** – no objections.

3.2 **County Archaeology** – make the following comments and request that three consitions be imposed should permission be granted:-

The proposed development is located within an Area of Archaeological Significance, as identified in the Local Plan. This covers the historic core of Reed village and its environs, and contains within it one of the largest and most significant concentrations of medieval archaeology in Hertfordshire. Six to eight medieval moated sites are present within Reed village and its surroundings, and five of these sites are Scheduled Monuments.

The development sites lies in close proximity to four of them, two of which are Scheduled, Reed Hall (Historic Environment Record nos. 4026 & 15908), a 15th century hall house, circa 70m to the south, and Queenbury (HER no. 1919), the 13th century manorial centre, roughly 140m to the north east. The third, Carr's Pightle (HER no. 1920), survives as very ephemeral earthworks a short distance to the east of Reed Hall, and may in fact have been an extension of Reed Hall itself. The fourth (HER no. 9099) is visible only as cropmarks, and lies 130m to the east of the proposed development.

Of particular archaeological concern is the proximity of the development site to St Mary's Church (HER no. 4035), 48m to the east, which is of Late Saxon (early 11th century) origin. The potential for the presence of human remains associated with the Saxon and medieval church is comparatively high. Archaeological monitoring of drainage works (Heritage Network 2009) uncovered two human skeletons a short distance to the south east of the church. Both were female, with the traces of a coffin present in one of the graves, although their dating is unknown.

The structure to be extended first appears on the 3rd edition Ordnance Survey map (1921). It is a converted and extended timber framed and weatherboarded barn, likely associated with the adjacent Church Farm (HER no. 11037). Church Farm itself is a 19th century planned farm which, in common with many such farms in Hertfordshire, may have had earlier origins. Three structures are present at roughly this location on Dury and Andrews' Topographic Map of Hartfordshire (1766), one of which is probably Reed Hall, but the others could represent an earlier precursor to Church Farm.

The proposed extensions are of moderate size, with moderate potential ground disturbance. Given the archaeological potential of the location, however, the likelihood that significant archaeological remains may be disturbed is comparatively high.

4.0 Planning Considerations

4.1 Site & Surroundings

4.1.1 1 Church Close is a barn conversion located on the southern side of the road and to the west of St Mary's Church. To the rear is further small barn conversions set within a lose courtyard and further to the south lies Reed Hall.

The structure currently comprises a long barn range that runs parallel to the

highway with a lower height section containing a garage and bedrooms and a higher section, furthest from the access into Church Close containing the living space, kitchen and dining room.

4.2 **Proposal**

4.2.1 The application seeks planning permission for the following:-
Single storey rear extension to the bedrooms by bringing the wall forward to the level of the garage wall – thus 1.7m deep by 12.5m wide. The structure would have a flat lead roof and walls finished in a knapped brick with bee course brick detail.

Single storey extension to the taller barn section to increase the living area. This would be 4.3m wide, 4.2m deep and 4.2m high and would have a gable end containing a high level glazed section only to provide light. The materials would match the parent building and would include knapped flint work to the interior facing wall to match the other rear addition proposed. by that would infill the space between the existing garage and the dwelling.

Internally two small mezzanine areas are proposed with roof lights above and served by two new internal staircases. The garage is shown to be converted to a studio and again roof lights are introduced. At my request the plans have been amended to remove high level glazing in the gable ends to maintain the weatherboarding and thus the external appearance of the barns in public views.

4.3 **Key Issues**

4.3.1 The main issues associated with the application relate to the objectives of Policy 30 of the current local plan and the impact of the development upon the amenities of local residents and the visual amenity of the area and impact upon heritage assets.

4.3.2 <u>Policy</u>
The site is in the rural area beyond the green belt and Reed currently does not have a defined settlement boundary. While a boundary is identified in the emerging plan this site will remain in the rural area. That said both the emerging and existing policy allow for additions such as that proposed and in principle I do not find that the scheme would conflict with current or emerging policy requirements.

4.3.3 <u>Visual amenity</u>
I can see no material objections to the proposed extensions which are at the rear of the property and of a modest scale, designed to compliment the parent building. The additions would not be detrimental to the street scene or the visual amenity of the area. Materials for construction and the design would match and compliment the parent building and would cause no detriment to visual amenity in my view.

<u>Residential amenity</u>
The extensions would be set away from the boundary with the neighbours to the rear and the larger addition contains no window at ground level. The extensions
4.3.4 are single storey only and would have no impact on daylight/sunlight. Consequently I do not consider that development would have any adverse impact upon any neighbouring amenity due to the single storey design and location to the side. The introduction of roof lights to serve the small mezzanine areas would not in my view be detrimental to any neighbouring amenity. I am satisfied that the additions would comply with the provisions of the current development plan.

Heritage assets

The agent has discussed the archaeological implications with the county historic environment advisor and there was an attempt to see if any evidence could be produced to avoid the need to impose conditions. Unfortunately no records were kept of previous drainage works so the agent agrees that the conditions still stand and I have added them below accordingly. In my view the imposition of such conditions would safeguard designated heritage assets and accord with the requirements of the NPPF.

The site lies within the Reed Conservation Area and the impact upon this designated heritage asset is also an important consideration. The development would not be publically visible and is of a small scale within this group of barn

4.3.5 conversions. It is noted that other barns have additions and some of those within the courtyard have conservatories ad a variety of replacement upvc windows. Consequently I feel that the overall form and nature of these current proposals would do little to harm the character or appearance of the area and satisfy Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and as supported by the aims of Section 12 of the NPPF.

Other matters

It is noted that the scheme results in the loss of the garage. However the site has adequate off street parking to serve the needs of the site and as no additional bedrooms are proposed I am satisfied that the requirements of the Councils SPD are satisfactorily met.

4.4 **Conclusion**

4.4.1 In the absence of any material or sustainable planning objections I have framed a favourable recommendation accordingly.

5.0 **Recommendation**

5.1 That planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.

   Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out wholly in accordance with the details specified in the application and supporting approved documents and plans listed above.

   Reason:To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with details which form the basis of this grant of permission.

3. No demolition/development shall take place/commence until an Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The scheme shall include an assessment of

archaeological significance and research questions; and:
1. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording
2. The programme for post investigation assessment
3. Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording
4. Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation
5. Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation
www.hertfordshire.gov.uk
6. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation.

Reason:The site lies within an area where there is significant potential for archaeological remains and any finds should be retrieved and/or recorded before they are damaged or destroyed as a result of the development hereby permitted.

4. The demolition/development shall take place/commence in accordance with the programme of archaeological works set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (3).

Reason:The site lies within an area where there is significant potential for archaeological remains and any finds should be retrieved and/or recorded before they are damaged or destroyed as a result of the development hereby permitted.

5. The development shall not be occupied/used until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (3) and the provision made for analysis and publication where appropriate.

Reason:The site lies within an area where there is significant potential for archaeological remains and any finds should be retrieved and/or recorded before they are damaged or destroyed as a result of the development hereby permitted.

Proactive Statement:

Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. The Council acted proactively through positive engagement with the applicant during the determination process which led to improvements to the scheme. The Council has therefore acted proactively in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraphs 186 and 187) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

Signed  Simon Ellis	Development Management North Hertfordshire District Council Council Offices Gernon Road Letchworth

Determining Officer	Herts SG6 3JF
Date: 4 July 2018	