

<b>Application Number</b>	14/0977/LBC	<b>Agenda Item</b>	
<b>Date Received</b>	17th June 2014	<b>Officer</b>	Miss Catherine Linford
<b>Target Date</b>	12th August 2014		
<b>Ward</b>	Petersfield		
<b>Site</b>	St Matthews Church And Church Hall St Matthews Street Cambridge		
<b>Proposal</b>	Single storey extension to form porch and prayer room		
<b>Applicant</b>	Mr John Anstead St. Matthews Church, St. Matthews Street Cambridge CB1 2LT		

SUMMARY	<p>The development does not accord with the Development Plan for the following reason:</p> <p>Whilst the access problems experienced by the Church are recognised, it is my opinion on balance, that they do not outweigh the concerns raised by the Urban Design and Conservation Team in relation to the impact the proposed extension would have on the special interest of the Listed Building</p>
RECOMMENDATION	REFUSAL

## 1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 St Matthews Church is a Grade II Listed Building situated on the eastern side of St Matthews Street. The surrounding area is predominantly residential. The site is within a Conservation Area.

## 2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 Listed building consent is sought for a single storey extension to the Church, to form a porch and prayer room.

### 3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
C/73/1185	The erection of entrances toilet accommodation and flat to existing Church Hall	REF
C/74/0507	Erection of extension to existing church hall	A/C
C/88/0083	Erection of new vicarage	A/C

### 4.0 PUBLICITY

4.1	Advertisement:	Yes
	Adjoining Owners:	Yes
	Site Notice Displayed:	Yes

### 5.0 POLICY

5.1 See Appendix 1 for full details of Central Government Guidance, Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN		POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Plan 2006	Local	3/1 3/4 3/7 3/14 4/10 4/11

5.3 Relevant Central Government Guidance, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework March 2012  National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014  Circular 11/95
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Material Considerations	<u>Area Guidelines</u>  Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal (2006)
-------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

#### 5.4 Status of Proposed Submission – Cambridge Local Plan

Planning applications should be determined in accordance with policies in the adopted Development Plan and advice set out in the NPPF. However, after consideration of adopted plans and the NPPF, policies in emerging plans can also be given some weight when determining applications. For Cambridge, therefore, the emerging revised Local Plan as published for consultation on 19 July 2013 can be taken into account, especially those policies where there are no or limited objections to it. However it is likely, in the vast majority of instances, that the adopted development plan and the NPPF will have considerably more weight than emerging policies in the revised Local Plan.

For the application considered in this report, there are no policies in the emerging Local Plan are of relevance.

## 6.0 CONSULTATIONS

### **Cambridgeshire County Council (Engineering)**

- 6.1 The proposal should have no significant impact on the public highway. Informatives are recommended relating to works to the public highway and public utilities.

### **Urban Design and Conservation team**

- 6.2 Object. The position and particularly the height of the proposed porch would compromise the characteristics of the existing form of the listed building. Though structural glass could produce a 'lightweight' addition, this is compromised by the projecting store. The interventions for the enlarged opening remove important existing window/brickwork features (and mean that this is not a reversible intervention). Therefore, the appearance of the building in the Conservation Area and the special interest of the Listed Building would be adversely affected and the

applications fail to conform to policies 4/10 and 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

### **Cambridge City Council Access Officer**

- 6.3 Support. The doors should have at least one minimum leaf width of 900mm, so may have to be asymmetrical.
- 6.4 The above responses are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the consultation responses can be inspected on the application file.

## **7.0 REPRESENTATIONS**

- 7.1 No representations have been received

## **8.0 ASSESSMENT**

- 8.1 From the consultation responses and representations received and from my inspection of the site and the surroundings, I consider that the main issues are:

1. Impact on the Conservation Area and special interest of the Listed Building

### **Impact on the Conservation Area and special interest of the Listed Building**

- 8.2 The proposed extension is required in order to improve accessibility into the Church. Due to the positioning of the entrance doors, tight corners are created which result in 'bottlenecks' when large groups of people are entering or leaving the Church. Whilst I understand the access difficulties that the applicant is attempting to solve, the Urban Design and Conservation Team have serious concerns about the proposals and the impact they may have on the special interest of the Listed Building.
- 8.3 The Church was built in 1866 and was designed by R.R Rowe as a Greek cross plan Church, with an octagonal central core and four radiating arms. The flank walls of the arms have paired lancet windows. There are currently at least three entrance doors to the church itself the two street entrances being under subsidiary timber-gabled, slate-covered roofs.

- 8.4 The proposed porch would be connected to one of the street entrances, on the south western radiating arm. This addition would affect the basic layout of the church and concerns the Urban Design and Conservation Team. Unlike the two existing main entrances, the proposed extension would have a tall roof, which would break the gutter line of the radiating arms and central core. In doing so, the variegated pattern of roofing slates as well as the guttering would be interrupted. The porch would cover the pair of lancet windows on this flank wall and one of the entrance doors, and the central pier of the lancet windows and the cills and characteristic brickwork below would have to be removed for the new entrance to be formed by lowering the opening. The tops of the window arches would be supported on a galvanised steel beam over relatively tall glass doors. Using the existing door would avoid this impact, but this would not be possible as it would not solve the existing access problems.
- 8.5 Though the left side of the porch would be transparent structural glass, the right side would be solid (to enclose a chair store/prayer room) and the apex of the gable created would contain a solid ceiling behind the full height glazed screen. Thus, a half transparent, half solid structure would be added and through the glazing, the ceiling and side interior wall to the store/prayer room would project out into the yard. The Urban Design and Conservation Team have expressed the opinion that this would be an awkward addition to the notable form of the Church, which would be emphasised when the porch LEDs lit the side wall of the store.
- 8.6 The existing palette of materials is circumscribed. Zinc, glass and steel is now proposed. This could be a workable contrast but for being compromised by the projecting solid of the store and proposed brick infill to the front of the store (with attendant difficulties of matching the detail of the existing brickwork of the church). The laying of new hard surfacing could be a welcome improvement to the setting of this listed building but concrete pavements are unlikely to be an appropriate material.

## **9.0 CONCLUSION**

- 9.1 Whilst the access problems experienced by the Church are recognised, it is my opinion on balance, that they do not

outweigh the concerns raised by the Urban Design and Conservation Team in relation to the impact the proposed extension would have on the special interest of the Listed Building. I therefore recommend that the application is refused.

## **10.0 RECOMMENDATION**

**REFUSE** for the following reasons:

1. The position, height, and inclusion of a projecting solid volume for a store within the proposed porch would compromise the characteristics and form of the listed building. Together with interventions for the enlarged opening removing important existing window/brickwork features, the proposals would significantly adversely affect the special interest of the listed building contrary to policy 4/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).