

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

7 March 2012

AUTHOR/S: Executive Director / Corporate Manager - Planning and
New Communities

S/2034/11 – HISTON

Removal of Existing Single Storey Rear Extension and Erection of Two Storey and Single Storey Extension to the Rear of Existing Property at 8 West Road

Recommendation: Approval

Date for Determination: 9 December 2011

Notes:

These Applications have been reported to the Planning Committee for determination because the Team Leader considers that the application should be presented to Committee for decision.

Members will visit this site on Tuesday 6 March 2012

Site and Proposal

1. The application site comprises a semi-detached dwelling on the north-east side of West Road. In common with most of the properties in this built up street of older dwellings, it has no off-street parking and is sited almost on the back edge of the footway. The original dwelling, along with its semi-detached neighbour, comprised a two-storey house with a shared pitch roof rear wing that provided the kitchens and bathrooms.
2. The site lies within the village framework of Histon. West Road is a cul-de-sac leading off Station Road near the centre of the village. The site lies outside the Conservation Area, the boundary of which touches the rear corner of the garden.
3. The application, which has been amended twice, proposes to replace an existing single storey extension with a two-storey rear extension, and a further single storey element beyond that. The extension would extend 9.7m at ground floor level to match the end elevation of an extension already approved, but as yet un-built, at the neighbouring property No 6. The first floor element would extend 4.8m from the existing rear elevation and would have a hipped roof. Along with internal re-arrangements, the extension would provide a kitchen/dining/family room and a third bedroom and upstairs bathroom above. The site would retain a 27.5m long garden, backing onto a verge in Dwyer-Joyce Close.

Planning History

4. S/0411/96 – a single storey rear extension, widening and extending the rear kitchen and bathroom wing, was approved in 1996. It was not implemented.

5. S/1613/95 – a two storey rear extension was refused on the basis that its depth, height and position adjacent to 6 West Road would result in a poor outlook and create an oppressive feeling from the rear of that property. That proposal was for a narrower extension that is now proposed, along the boundary with No 6, but was the same length and had a dual pitched roof with a gable end. The current proposal (as amended) has a hipped end to the roof. Please see plans at Appendices 1a and 1b.
6. S/1527/80 – a two storey extension was approved. That proposal was for a wider extension as is now proposed, but at 5.8m long was 1m longer than is now proposed. The roof was shown as flat, with the top of the extension at the eaves height of the main roof. That permission was not implemented. Please see plans at Appendices 2a and 2b
7. The attached house at No 6 West Road has planning permission (S/1788/10) granted in February 2011, for a single storey rear extension on the end of its half of the rear kitchen wing. It is to be wider than the rear element and has a dual pitch roof to keep the height down. That application was approved after careful consideration of the impact on the neighbour at No 4, which has a rear wing in close proximity to the extension containing windows in the side elevation that are the only windows serving its kitchen and dining room. The extension has yet to be built. Please see plans at Appendix 3

Planning Policy

8. South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework, Development Control Policies, DPD, 2007:
DP/1 Sustainable Development
DP/2 Design of New Development
DP/3 Development Criteria
TR/2 Car and Cycle Parking Standards
9. South Cambridgeshire LDF Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):
District Design Guide – Adopted 2010
10. Circular 11/95 (The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions) – Advises that conditions should be necessary, relevant to planning, relevant to the development permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects.

Consultation

11. **Histon Parish Council** – Recommended approval of the original plans, noting that a first floor window should be obscure glazed, and expressing concern at the increase in the number of bedrooms and no provision for on-plot parking. The Parish Council recommended refusal of the first set of amended plans, on the basis that the revised roof design (single storey element) would cause a significant loss of light to No 10 and massing will now be created by the pitched roof. Parking still remains a major concern as there is no provision on property. Comments regarding the final amended plans are awaited.
12. **Trees Officer** – Site is outside Conservation Area, no significant trees to be impacted upon: No objections.

Representations

13. The Occupiers of **10 West Road** strongly object: 10 West Road is entirely reliant on light across the rear of No 8 for all light to the centre and rear living accommodation of our home. We lie immediately to the west of No 8 where any 2 storey extension would completely block all direct sunlight and most other light to these rooms (half of our living accommodation). The loss of light would mean having electric lights on all day in these parts of the house which are continuously occupied. There are no windows in the western aspect of No 10 as this is less than 3 feet away from No 12 so any loss of light cannot be compensated for. On the first floor, light would be significantly reduced to the family bathroom and the ensuite to the rear bedroom. The extension would also create an oppressive outlook from the main entrance porch to No 10 which is on the eastern aspect of our property. There will be an impact on parking, as this proposal creates a 3 bedroom property with NO off-street parking on a road with well-documented parking issues. The majority of properties on West Road have no off-street parking and any further development would make the situation worse. Some residents already resort to parking in the adjacent Dwyers-Joyce Close. It is not clear how the applicant intends to carry out the building works without blocking access to our main door and driveway. A previous planning application for a 2 storey extension was rejected in 1996 on the grounds that it would create an oppressive outlook for No 6, as there is already a 2 storey extension at No 4. This has not changed. We would suggest it would be more appropriate to create a roof conversion as at No 6.
14. Amended Plans – We reiterate our objections on the grounds of major loss of light to a major part of our home, significant massing and an oppressive outlook from our main entrance, parking problems, previously refused two storey extension in 1996. The inclusion of a pitched roof to the single storey element further increases our loss of light.
15. The occupier of **4 West Road** objects: At present we get no direct sunlight in our computer room/small dining room. The proposed 2 storey extension would turn this into "The Black Hole of Calcutta". Our kitchen currently gets direct sunlight only in the late afternoon in summer. However, should this extension go ahead, this too would be in darkness. This extension would also overshadow our small upstairs bedroom, as it only has a small window above head height. I feel the single storey extension will break the 25 degree planning rule. The height is much higher than the proposed extension to no.6 West Road, which was a very marginal pass. They have taken the liberty of raising the extension to no.6 to coincide with their plan! If this is passed it would have a very detrimental effect on our enjoyment of our property inside and out as it will also affect the light to our rear patio and garden.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

16. The key issues are the impact on neighbouring amenity and parking.

Impact on neighbouring residential amenity.

17. **No 10 West Road** lies to the north west of the site and comprises an L-shaped detached house with a driveway between it and the site, leading to a garage level with the rear of that house. That house has been previously extended – please see plans at Appendix 4, and has an unusual internal arrangement at ground floor level, whereby internal rooms gain “borrowed” light from the external rooms (such as the porch) by having glazed doors and retaining original external windows. It is therefore difficult to assess the impact of the proposal upon habitable rooms in the standard

way. Nevertheless the proposed extension would be to the east to south-east of this neighbour, so would have an impact in terms of morning sunlight. The extension would have an overshadowing effect upon the porch and study, and to a lesser extent the utility room windows in the side elevation of No 10 for some time during the mornings, but by lunchtime these windows would be in the shade of the existing dwellings at 8 and 10. A porch is not a habitable room, although this one provides onward light to an internal room shown on the plans for that property as a reception hall. That room is already quite dark as a result of the porch extension and the lack of light in this room is to some extent of its own making. Similarly, the utility room provides onward light to the original part of the kitchen through the use of a glazed internal door, but the kitchen also suffers a lack of light as a result of a rear extension and is therefore again a problem partly of its own making. It is not considered that the extension would reduce light to these internal rooms to any greater degree than they already experience. Whilst it would affect the study, it is considered that as this would only be affected for part of the morning as described above, this would not be sufficient to warrant refusal of the application. The garage on that property prevents any impact from the single storey element of the proposed extension. At first floor level, only bathroom windows face the site. These are not habitable rooms, so there is no impact on them. A rear facing bedroom window would not be affected by the two storey element of the extension as it is set a similar distance back into the site as the application proposal. As the proposed extension would be located level with the driveway of No 10, it would not have an overbearing impact upon the external amenity areas of that property, which are to the rear. A first floor bedroom window is proposed in the side elevation of the extension. Whilst it would only directly overlook the driveway and obscure glazed windows of No 10, it would obliquely overlook the main sitting out area of No 10's garden and should therefore be installed as either a high level or obscure glazed window. This can be achieved by condition. The other windows proposed for the first floor side elevation would serve a bathroom and staircase. It is therefore considered that subject the obscure glazing condition for the side facing bedroom window, the proposed extension would not have an unduly overlooking, overbearing or overshadowing impact on the amenities of No 10.

18. **No 6 West Road** was cited in the reason for refusal of the 1995 application as suffering from an oppressive impact at its first floor rear window (the ground floor already protruded the same distance). However, a 1m longer extension with a flat roof had previously been approved in 1980. It would seem to have been the consideration at the time of the 1995 application that the addition of a roof, in spite of the shorter length of extension, was sufficient to tip the balance such that the proposal was unacceptable. The current proposal is for that same shorter length of extension, and with a dual pitched roof, but that has now been hipped at the end. The Council also now has the benefit of standards to apply to such proposals. The extension would cut a 45 degree horizontal line from the centre of the first floor bedroom window at No 6 such that 1.6m of the extension would fall within the intended clear zone, but it is considered that the sloping-away roof, coupled with the hipped end of the roof, would minimise any overbearing impact to an acceptable degree. In addition, the extension would not cut the 25 degree vertical line from eye level at that window. The window is on the north-east rear elevation which is already in shadow for much of the day, so there would be no additional overshadowing of that window from the proposed extension. Similarly, the approved single storey extension at No 6 means that the proposed extensions at No 8 would not overshadow that property any more than the existing houses already do. No windows are proposed in the side elevation of the extension facing No 6, and the proposed window is no different to that found on semi detached properties generally. It is therefore considered that there would be no undue adverse impact upon the amenities of the occupiers of No 6 West Road to warrant refusal of the application.

19. The occupiers of **4 West Road**, next door but one to the south-east, have raised concern about the earlier amended plans, which showed an amendment to the roof of the single storey extension approved at No 6. This would have had the effect of raising the height of that roof in front of the only kitchen window in the side elevation of No 4's rear extension. The plans have now been amended to retain the approved extension at No 6 as approved, with dual pitched roof, and the single storey element of the proposed extension at No 8 would be similarly finished with a dual pitched roof, such that this would not now be visible from No 4. The two storey extension would be visible from No 4's kitchen and dining room windows, above the ridge of the existing rear wing to No 6. However, the existing rear wing already blocks views of the sky from these windows, apart from when standing right in front of them, so the additional height proposed at No 8, approximately 5.5m away would only have an impact on No 4 when standing at the kitchen sink or standing at the dining room window. It is not therefore considered that the two storey element would be unduly overbearing on the amenities of No 4, the more important element being the single storey rear wing which would continue to afford oblique views from these windows.

Impact on the parking provision

20. There is no allocated parking associated with the property at present, and none is proposed to be provided or removed by the proposal. The *status quo* is therefore maintained. Policy TR/2 does **not** require the provision of additional parking when a dwelling is extended. There is therefore no conflict with the Council's policy on parking. Indeed this is a sustainable location with good access to facilities and services and well served by public transport, such that the Council would seek to minimise parking provision.

Conclusion

21. The proposed extension, as amended, is the maximum that can be accommodated on the site without being unduly detrimental to the amenities of neighbouring properties. Provided the wide window to the bedroom is obscure glazed, it is considered acceptable in compliance with Policy DP/3.

Recommendation

22. APPROVE, as amended by plans stamped 10 February 2012 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 ensure that consideration of any future application for development in the area will not be prejudiced by permissions for development, which have not been acted upon.)
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2010-018-P05, 2010-018-P04 rev P4, 2010-018-P06 rev P3.
(Reason - To facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.)
 3. The proposed first floor bedroom window in the side elevation of the extension, hereby permitted, shall either be permanently glazed with obscure glass or shall be

installed so that the cill level is at least 1.7m above the floor level of the room it serves.

(Reason - To prevent overlooking of the adjoining property in accordance with Policy DP/3 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows, doors or openings of any kind, other than those expressly authorised by this permission, shall be constructed in the side elevations of the extension at or above first floor level unless expressly authorised by planning permission granted by the Local Planning Authority in that behalf.

(Reason - To safeguard the privacy of adjoining occupiers in accordance with Policy DP/3 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

5. During the period of demolition and construction, no power operated machinery shall be operated on the site before 0800 hours and after 1800 hours on weekdays and 1300 hours on Saturdays, nor at any time on Sundays and Bank Holidays, unless otherwise previously agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

(Reason - To minimise noise disturbance for adjoining residents in accordance with Policy NE/15 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

- Application files S/2034/11, S/1788/10,

Contact Officer: Kate Wood – Development Control Team Leader (East)
Telephone: (01954) 713264