

ITEM NUMBER: 5

20/03779/LBC	Two storey side extension and associated landscaping works	
Site Address:	3-4 Una Way High Street Kings Langley Hertfordshire WD4 8BH	
Applicant/Agent:	Nayan Dhamdachia	
Case Officer:	Heather Edey	
Parish/Ward:	Kings Langley Parish Council	Kings Langley
Referral to Committee:	Contrary view of Parish Council	

1. RECOMMENDATION

That Listed Building Consent be GRANTED.

2. SUMMARY

2.1 The proposed works are considered to be sympathetic to the original design and character of the Grade II Listed Building 3-4 Una Way and the associated listed brick boundary wall, protecting and conserving the integrity, setting and distinctiveness of these designated heritage assets. Furthermore, it is also considered that sufficient information has been provided in support of the application to verify that the proposed works would be appropriate to the scale, proportion and internal/external appearance of the Listed Building. As such, the proposed works are acceptable in accordance with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019); Saved Policy 119 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (2004), Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and Policy CS27 of the Core Strategy (2013).

3. SITE DESCRIPTION

3.1 The application site comprises property 3-4 Una Way, a two storey Grade II Listed building that forms part of the listing for 6, 8 and 10 High Street, situated within the Large Village of Kings Langley. Forming the gabled rear wing of property 6 High Street, the dwelling is accessed via a small alley just off the High Street. The dwelling is constructed in masonry, with a timber framed pitched roof, and is externally finished in pebble dash walls and a clay tiled roof.

3.2 The site is within an Area of Archaeological Significance and falls within the Kings Langley Conservation Area.

4. PROPOSAL

4.1 Listed building consent is sought for the construction of a contemporary two storey side extension. Measuring approximately 4.1m wide, the new extension would project 4.5m from the side elevation of the building at ground floor level, to provide a larger kitchen/dining area. The proposed extension would be set in at first floor level, projecting 3m deep to provide an additional bedroom. The proposed extension would comprise a lower brick plinth, grey zinc metal cladding walls, a double glazed metal window, rooflight and bi-fold doors.

4.2 The application also proposes minor landscaping works, including the creation of a new patio area and the partial demolition of a 6.5m length of the listed brick boundary wall, extending between the application site and no. 8 High Street. Following the construction of the new extension, the

partially demolished section of the listed boundary wall would be rebuilt, predominantly using existing bricks.

PLANNING HISTORY

Planning Applications:

19/02617/FHA - Two Storey Rear Extension
WDN - 3rd December 2019

19/02800/LBC - Replacement of existing timber windows to the north elevation with hardwood double glazed casement windows.
WDN - 10th February 2020

19/02805/LBC - Two Storey Rear Extension
WDN - 3rd December 2019

20/00955/LBC - Replacement of existing timber windows, to North elevation, with double glazed hardwood casement windows.
GRA - 11th June 2020

20/03778/FHA - Two storey side extension and associated landscaping works
PDE -

4/01018/05/LBC - Replace existing windows
GRA - 27th June 2005

4/02624/04/LBC - Replacement windows
WDN - 30th December 2004

CONSTRAINTS

Area of Archaeological Significance: 42
CIL Zone: CIL2
Kings Langley Conservation Area
Former Land Use (Risk Zone):
Heathrow Safeguarding Zone: LHR Wind Turbine
Large Village: Kings Langley
Listed Building, Grade: II,
Parish: Kings Langley CP
RAF Halton and Chenies Zone: Yellow (45.7m)
Parking Standards: New Zone 3
EA Source Protection Zone: 2
EA Source Protection Zone: 3

REPRESENTATIONS

Consultation responses

These are reproduced in full at Appendix A.

Neighbour notification/site notice responses

These are reproduced in full at Appendix B.

8. PLANNING POLICIES

Main Documents:

National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)
Dacorum Borough Core Strategy 2006-2031 (adopted September 2013)
Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1999-2011 (adopted April 2004)

Relevant Policies:

Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 – Section 16(2) and 66(1)
National Planning Policy Framework 2019 – Section 16
Dacorum Borough Core Strategy 2013 – Policy CS27
Dacorum Borough Local Plan 2004 – Saved Policy 119

9. CONSIDERATIONS

9.1 The main issues of relevance to the consideration of this application relate to the impact of the proposed works on the character and appearance of the Grade II Listed Building and associated listed brick boundary wall.

Policy

9.2 The NPPF (2019), Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, and Policy CS27 of the Core Strategy (2013) all seek to ensure that the integrity, setting and distinctiveness of designated and undesignated heritage assets will be protected, conserved and enhanced.

9.3 Furthermore, Saved Policy 119 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004) states that consent to alter a Listed Building will only be granted where it can be satisfactorily demonstrated that the proposed works would be carried out in a manner appropriate to the scale, proportion and external and internal appearance of the building.

Assessment

9.4 The current application seeks listed building consent to alter Grade II Listed Building 3-4 Una Way from a one to two bed dwelling, with works involving alterations to the existing 19th century gable end wall and the construction of a contemporary two storey side extension.

Alterations to Gable End Wall

9.5 In order to connect the new extension to the existing Listed Building and alter the internal layout of the dwelling, the application proposes alterations to the existing 19th century gable end wall. Whilst this wall would be completely demolished at ground floor level, this wall would be largely retained at first floor level, with the application proposing the insertion of a new doorway opening.

9.6 Whilst no concerns have been raised to the demolition of the gable end wall at ground floor level, the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB) have raised objection to the proposed first floor level works. In particular, they have raised concerns that no evidence has been submitted to evidence that preliminary investigations have been undertaken to confirm that the new doorway would be positioned in the least sensitive section of this wall.

9.7 Following two site visits to the property, the Conservation and Design Officer has confirmed that preliminary investigations of the 19th century gable end wall have been undertaken. In light of these

findings, they have raised no objection to the positioning of the new opening at first floor level, considering these works to be acceptable.

9.8 In light of the above, no concerns are raised in relation to the proposed works to the 19th century gable end wall.

Proposed Extension

9.9 The application proposes the construction of a contemporary two storey side extension. Measuring approximately 4.1m wide, the new extension would project 4.5m from the side elevation of the building at ground floor level, to provide a larger kitchen/dining area. The proposed extension would be set in at first floor level, projecting 3m deep to provide an additional bedroom. The proposed extension would comprise a lower brick plinth, grey zinc metal cladding walls, a double glazed metal window, rooflight and bi-fold doors.

9.10 SPAB were consulted in relation to these works and raised objection to these works. Whilst no objections were raised in principle to the construction of an extension of contemporary design, they have recommended that additional alterations be made to the current extension, in particular, further reducing its height and altering the material finish of external walls from zinc cladding to weatherboarding.

9.11 The proposed two storey side extension has undergone a number of design alterations in response to concerns raised by SPAB and the Conservation and Design Officer during pre-application and formal application stage.

9.12 Whilst the Conservation and Design Officer has considered the comments put forward by SPAB, they have challenged their assessment of the proposal and their recommendations.

9.13 With regards to the proposals' height, the Conservation and Design Officer has noted that the proposed extension has already been significantly altered in order to reduce its visual bulk/mass, (i.e. with the new extension being set in at first floor level). Given that further reductions to the proposals height would cause issues with head height at first floor level, they have challenged the requirement for further alterations to be made in this regard.

9.14 With regards to material finishes, the Conservation and Design Officer has also raised no concerns. Whilst they have noted the use of timber cladding to be preferable, the use of zinc cladding is not considered to be harmful to the existing Listed Building, given that the silver/grey finish of the zinc would sufficiently soften the appearance of the extension and provide less of a contrast with the 20th century painted pebbledash render of the existing rear wing.

9.15 In light of the assessment made by the Conservation and Design Officer, the proposed two storey side extension is considered to be acceptable, conserving the integrity, setting and distinctiveness of the existing Grade II Listed Building

Works to Listed Boundary Wall

9.16 In order to facilitate the construction of the proposed extension, a 6.5m length of the listed brick boundary wall extending between the existing dwelling and no. 8 High Street would need to be demolished.

9.17 Information submitted in support of the application has confirmed that the existing listed brick wall is in poor structural condition. In light of this, the agent has confirmed that repairs would be made to the existing wall, (with the existing wall being stabilised as part of the proposed construction works), and the demolished section of the wall being rebuilt using existing bricks.

9.18 In accordance with the comments provided by the Conservation and Design Officer, no concerns are raised in relation to these works. This is however subject to a condition being attached to the formal listed building consent ensuring that these demolition works are undertaken by hand, and that the demolished bricks are carefully handled so that they can be reused.

9.19 Where additional materials are required, it has been agreed that the materials used would be selected to match the existing wall, (i.e. matching bricks, brick bond and mortar finish). It is recommended that these arrangements be secured by condition.

10. CONCLUSION

10.1 It is recommended that the application be granted.

10.2 The proposed works are considered to be sympathetic to the original design and character of the Grade II Listed Building 3-4 Una Way and the associated listed brick boundary wall, protecting and conserving the integrity, setting and distinctiveness of these designated heritage assets. Furthermore, it is also considered that sufficient information has been provided in support of the application to verify that the proposed works would be appropriate to the scale, proportion and internal/external appearance of the Listed Building. As such, the proposed works are acceptable in accordance with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019); Saved Policy 119 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (2004), Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and Policy CS27 of the Core Strategy (2013).

11. RECOMMENDATION

That listed building consent be GRANTED subject to the following conditions:

Condition(s) and Reason(s):

- 1. The works hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of three years from the date of this consent.**

Reason: To comply with Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 (4) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- 2. No works (excluding demolition/ground investigations) shall take place until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Please do not send materials to the Council offices. Materials should be kept on site and arrangements made with the Planning Officer for inspection.**

Reason: To preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the designated heritage asset in accordance with the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and Policy CS27 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013).

- 3. The listed brick boundary wall shall be stabilised for the duration of construction works.**

Reason: To ensure that the character or appearance of the designated heritage asset is preserved or enhanced as required per Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Policy CS27 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013) and Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

4. **The demolition of the listed brick boundary wall shall be carried out by hand [or by tools held in the hand other than power-driven tools] and the materials stored for re-use.**

Reason: To ensure that the character or appearance of the designated heritage asset is preserved or enhanced as required per Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Policy CS27 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013) and Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

5. **The 6.5m length of the demolished brick boundary wall shall be rebuilt using existing bricks and shall be constructed to match the existing wall in terms of height, brick bond and mortar finish. The rebuilt wall shall be tied to existing walls. Where new bricks are required to complete these works, these bricks shall be selected to match existing bricks.**

Reason: To ensure that the character or appearance of the designated heritage asset is preserved or enhanced as required per Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Policy CS27 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013) and Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

6. **The works hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans/documents:**

20002-00-100
 20002-00-101
 20002-00-102
 20002-00-103
 20002-00-104
 20002-00-105
 20002-00-201 Rev A
 20002-00-202 Rev A
 20002-00-203 Rev A
 20002-00-204 Rev A
 20002-00-205 Rev A
 20002-00-206 Rev A
 Design and Access Statement (Rev A)
 Heritage Statement (dated 8th Sept 2020)
 Structural Engineering Advice Letter (dated 20th Nov 2020)

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

APPENDIX A: CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Consultee	Comments
Parish/Town Council	The Council objects on the grounds that the design proposed would be wholly out of keeping and materially harm both the existing building and the surrounding conservation area.

<p>National Amenity Societies</p>	<p>SPAB:</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the SPAB regarding the proposed two storey extension to the rear of the Grade II listed 3-4 Una Way, and our apologies for the slightly late reply. This property was created from the rear section of the Grade II listed 6 Una Way. The dating and construction of this part of the building is somewhat confusing, but we generally agree that it is likely to be partly early 17th century, extended in the 19th century. The Heritage Statement is useful for assessing the building, but does not provide much in the way of justification for the proposed works, or an explanation of how the scheme came to be (we understand there was a pre-application previously but we do not know what that was for).</p> <p>The majority of the earlier part of the building appears to be a timber frame with brick infill, externally rendered in some areas. However, it is not entirely clear whether there are any historic timbers (reused or otherwise) in the existing west elevation, and this will not be known until the pebbledash and weather boarding are removed. Therefore, it might be sensible to agree to some preliminary investigations by either carefully removing all of the internal plaster on this wall, or removing the pebbledash and weatherboarding externally to ascertain its construction. This will be necessary so that the doorway into the new room at first floor level can be opened through the least sensitive section of wall.</p> <p>The principle of a small extension to this property is generally acceptable, but we question the proposed design. Given the close proximity of neighbouring properties here, are patio doors and a Juliet balcony coming off a bedroom considered to be acceptable in terms of privacy / overlooking? Is the roof light necessary given that the proposed new kitchen will also have folding doors and a side window? We would suggest that it probably isn't, which might allow the scale of the ground floor to be slightly reduced. Although the design is contemporary which is the right approach, it does not complement the historic building to which it will be attached. The materials proposed should reference the historic building whilst reflecting that it is clearly a new addition, so we would suggest that roof tiles are considered instead of the zinc, and the height of the roof should be slightly lower than the existing ridge. Externally, rather than just plain red brick walls, we suggest a low red brick plinth and then covering the walls externally in weatherboard to soften its appearance and as a nod to the weatherboarding that will be removed from the gable end.</p> <p>Internally on the ground floor, we would like to see more of the existing kitchen wall retained, so the area where the existing window is can be slightly widened, but not removed entirely as shown on the proposed</p>
-----------------------------------	---

	<p>drawings. The existing kitchen wall should be retained by the side of the new staircase. Has consideration been given to changing the internal layout slightly - it might work better if the position of the new stairs and the utility room (and bathroom on the first floor) were swapped over. This would make the bathroom more of an en-suite to the new bedroom, and would incorporate the utility room with the kitchen without them being divided by the new stairs.</p> <p>As an aside, given that parts of this building dates from the 17th century and contain a timber frame, we are somewhat concerned by what appears to be (from the photographs) a lack of breathable materials being used. We apologise if this is not the case, but the photos appear to show a lot of modern hard plasters, modern paints and cement pebbledash renders. It is vital that historic buildings breathe, especially those containing timber frames as moisture can become trapped in the walls and if it cannot evaporate away it often starts to rot the frame. Would therefore encourage the use of lime plasters, renders and mortars, breathable insulation and breathable paints to be used wherever possible.</p> <p>Overall, we support the principle of a small new extension here, but would ask that more thought be given to its design and materials to allow it to sit more comfortably and remain subservient to the listed building. It may therefore be advisable to ask for this application to be withdrawn to give time to make adjustments to the design, layout and materials. We would advise further thought be given to the roof treatment and the style of the doors and windows, as the proposed large expanses of glass are at odds with the smaller windows in the listed building. Details of the doors, windows and new staircase should be provided.</p>
<p>Conservation & Design (DBC)</p>	<p>3 - 4 Una Way is the gabled rear wing of 6 High Street and is part of the grade II listed building which incorporates nos. 6, 8 and 10. The application site also lies within the Kings Langley Conservation Area. The listed building is early 17th century with 19th century alterations, constructed of timber frame with brick infill with a clay tile roof.</p> <p>The application is accompanied by a Heritage Statement in accordance with NPPF policy 189.</p> <p>The application property is pebbledash rendered externally with modern weatherboard to the gable end and has a clay tile roof. Internally timber frame is in evidence, particularly within the first floor bedroom and staircase area and this is thought to be 17th century. The current kitchen / bedroom 2 is an early 19th century extension on to the 17th century rear wing.</p>

This application follows a previous withdrawal of an application for a 2-storey rear extension, including removal of the entire gable end wall. Subsequent pre-app proposals for a more modest scale rear extension entailing less structural alteration to the gable end were supported in principle.

The NPPF, para 193 advises that 'When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation'

The scale of the extensions (both 2-storey and single storey) is now supported.

The proposed alterations to the existing gable end wall of the property are supported although it is queried whether the section of wall adjacent to the new staircase to the new first floor bedroom in the extension needs to be fully removed if a staircase could be built against it?

In terms of design, whilst a contemporary approach can be supported in this position on the listed building and within the Conservation Area it is felt the design needs some refinement. I am not convinced the use of both metal cladding and brickwork as currently proposed works all that well against the pebbledash rendered property. The use of the metal cladding to roof and walls is OK in principle but it may work better if the cladding continues down to plinth level and is used upon the whole extension, simplifying the scheme.

It is suggested the window on the front elevation is either reduced in size or split into 2 separate windows (to relate better to existing fenestration and the two-storey and single storey addition).

The demolition of part of the existing late 18th or early 19th century boundary wall now forms part of the application as it is deemed to be unsafe (according to the structural report). The wall is listed by virtue of being attached to the property. The proposed partial demolition does raise a few areas of concern / queries.

The upper part of the wall doesn't look as secure as the lower part. Is the whole wall structurally unsound and needs rebuilding? If so this will need consent. Will the partial demolition of the wall (to allow rebuild for extension) destabilise the rest of the wall?

If the wall is part rebuilt in bricks and bond to match existing will it be tied in to existing brick wall in brickwork or will the extension need to be separate / therefore leaving the remaining section of wall unsupported at its eastern end?

	<p>If it is not feasible to build the extension off the existing (repaired) boundary wall then further details will be required prior to a decision being reached on this application.</p> <p>I would be happy to discuss these issues with the architect.</p>
Parish/Town Council	Noted.
National Amenity Societies	<p>Thank you for re-consulting the SPAB regarding the proposed extension to the Grade II listed property 3-4 Una Way, Kings Langley and we apologise for the delay in responding to you. We initially commented on these proposals on the 19th January 2021 and we note that although some changes have been made, others have not. These comments should therefore be read in conjunction with our previous email.</p> <p>There is no mention of investigative works being undertaken to establish the least sensitive position for the new bedroom doorway through the west gable end. We would strongly recommend that this is done and conditioned as the position of this doorway may need to be altered to avoid hidden historic timbers.</p> <p>We note that a slightly larger section of the original rear wall (now 900mm long) is now being retained adjacent to the stairs. However, we would like to see the kitchen wall (which is part of the historic building) retained the full length of the stairs as there is no justification for almost all of it to be removed.</p> <p>Externally we note that the balcony and roof light remain, which we questioned previously, and that design of the kitchen window is now slightly different. The big change is the external zinc cladding which is now to cover the whole extension apart from a very narrow brick plinth on the ground floor. The suggestion of using weatherboarding was to slightly soften the appearance of the extension and as a nod to the weatherboarding that will be lost. We are not entirely convinced that covering it completely in zinc is the right approach here, and the examples shown in the Design & Access Statement appear to relate to modern properties and not listed buildings. We would also strongly recommend that the ridge height of the new extension is slightly dropped.</p> <p>We are pleased to see that the garden wall is to rebuilt though and we would advise that the lime mortar mix should be conditioned to match the mix in the remaining section of wall. Details of the new doors, windows, stairs, balcony and roof light should be conditioned, and we would strongly urge you to request details of the paints and plasters to be used within the historic part of the building to avoid any damp</p>

	<p>problems affecting the timber frame.</p> <p>We will leave this application to you to determine so we do not need to be consulted again. However, we hope that more of the kitchen wall by the stairs can be retained, and that the existing gable end will be properly investigated prior to determining the position of the bedroom door.</p> <p>We hope these comments are helpful to you.</p>
<p>Conservation & Design (DBC)</p>	<p>3 - 4 Una Way is the gabled rear wing of 6 High Street and is part of the grade II listed building which incorporates nos. 6, 8 and 10. The application site also lies within the Kings Langley Conservation Area. The listed building is early 17th century with 19th century alterations, constructed of timber frame with brick infill with a clay tile roof.</p> <p>The application is accompanied by a Heritage Statement in accordance with NPPF policy 189.</p> <p>The application property is pebbledash rendered externally with modern weatherboard to the gable end and has a clay tile roof. Internally timber frame is in evidence, particularly within the first floor bedroom and staircase area and this is thought to be 17th century. The current kitchen / bedroom 2 is an early 19th century extension on to the 17th century rear wing. The brick wall which adjoins the rear wing shows evidence for former structures having been built up against it but these have been long demolished.</p> <p>This application follows a previous withdrawal of an application for a 2-storey rear extension, including removal of the entire gable end wall. Subsequent pre-app proposals for a more modest scale rear extension entailing less structural alteration to the gable end were supported in principle. The 17th century fabric of the rear wing will remain unaltered under the current proposals.</p> <p>The NPPF, para 193 advises that 'When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation'</p> <p>The scale of the extensions (both 2-storey and single storey) is now supported.</p> <p>The plans have been amended as part of the current application process to reduce the amount of 19th century wall removed at ground floor level. At first floor level a doorway opening will be created within the 19th century gable end wall.</p>

The design of the extension has been amended and is now simpler, being clad with grey aluminium cladding to plinth level. Following consultation a grey aluminium cladding is now proposed instead of the black aluminium cladding initially proposed as the grey provides less of a contrast with the existing white render of the rear wing. Whilst the contemporary approach does not always work with listed buildings / within Conservation Area locations, in this case the proposed contemporary design as desired by the applicant is considered acceptable as the extension is discretely sited to the rear of the historic High Street properties and provides an honest approach to extending the rear wing of the listed building. As previously advised the window within the front wall of the side extension has been moved so it sits more comfortably upon this elevation.

Further information has been submitted in relation to the use of and rebuilding of part of the existing listed brick wall which adjoins the rear wing. The wall is in poor structural condition so will need to be partially rebuilt as part of the works. The proposed repair of the rest of the length of wall (to be stabilised prior to works starting) will be a welcome outcome of the scheme.

The proposals are considered to preserve the significance of the grade II listed property and to preserve the character and appearance of the Kings Langley Conservation Area in accordance with the relevant conservation based policies within the NPPF and policy CS27. Recommend approval.

The following conditions are recommended:

The 6.5 metre length of existing garden / boundary wall to be rebuilt as part of the extension shall be taken down by hand, the bricks retained, cleaned and reused within the rebuilt extension rear wall.

The wall to be rebuilt to match existing in terms of height, brick bond and mortar finish and to be tied into existing walls. Any new bricks required should match existing.

The rest of the garden / boundary wall to be stabilised / propped during the construction works and repaired on a like-for-like basis.

Details of the grey aluminium cladding to be used for the extension to be submitted for approval

Details of new windows / doors (colour / material) to be submitted for approval

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS - RESPONSE TO SPAB COMMENTS:

The west gable end of 3-4 Una Way is 19th century and of red brick construction (pebbledashed externally with modern timber weatherboard to the upper part of the gable), this has been ascertained on 2 separate site visits and only a 19th timber tie beam is visible below the first floor window. The construction of the 19th century gable end wall has been sufficiently assessed and as such I do not think it harmful to remove the section of brickwork at ground floor (the opening has been reduced from the initial proposal) or the creation of a doorway at first floor into new extension. The eastern end of the property (17th century, timber frame and of higher architectural significance) will remain unaltered as part of the extension to the property.

In relation to the extension, the property is small and a 2-storey extension is considered reasonable (again, it has been reduced in scale at first floor). The lowering of the ridge height was advised at the pre-app stage but as the first floor ceiling height is already very low upstairs to lower the ridge height of the extension will cause issues with head height.

SPAB concerns regarding the use of zinc cladding are understood and the use of timber cladding was discussed at the pre-app stage. However, the applicant is keen to create an extension of contemporary design and the use of zinc cladding, in this case, is not considered harmful. During the course of the application the zinc cladding was changed from a black finish to a silver / grey finish to soften its appearance and provide less of a contrast with the 20th century painted pebbledash render on the existing rear wing (to continue the extension in render was not considered appropriate).

The site is accessed through a narrow gap between 4 and 6 High Street. It is very secluded and the extension will not be visible within the street scene. Of course, it will be visible from surrounding properties and whether it is publicly visible or not does not have any bearing on whether it will be acceptable within the Conservation Area however it is considered that there is scope here for a modest extension of contemporary design.

The proposals will result in the repair of the existing red brick boundary wall (in poor condition) which will represent a benefit to the setting of the listed building and the retention of a historic boundary wall within the Conservation Area.

APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES

Number of Neighbour Comments

Neighbour Consultations	Contributors	Neutral	Objections	Support
0	0	0	0	0

Neighbour Responses

Address	Comments
----------------	-----------------