

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

2 December 2015

AUTHOR/S: Planning and New Communities Director

Application Number: S/2334/15/FL

Parish(es): Great Abington

Proposal: Erection of Annexe following Demolition of Existing Piggery

Site address: 6 Chalky Road

Applicant(s): Mr and Mrs Hefford

Recommendation: Refusal

Key material considerations: Character and Appearance of the Area
Highway Safety
Neighbour Amenity

Committee Site Visit: No

Departure Application: No

Presenting Officer: Karen Pell-Coggins

Application brought to Committee because: Request from the Local Member and of local interest

Date by which decision due: 9 November 2015

Planning History

1. S/0893/09/F - Extension - Approved
S/0462/09/F - Extension - Approved
S/2324/03/F - Extension - Approved
S/1910/03/F - Extension - Refused
S/0878/87/F - Extension - Approved

National Guidance

2. National Planning Policy Framework 2012
National Planning Practice Guidance 2014

Development Plan Policies

3. **South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies DPD 2007**

DP/1 Sustainable Development
DP/2 Design of New Development
DP/3 Development Criteria
DP/7 Development Frameworks
HG/6 Extensions to Dwellings in the Countryside

4. **South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Supplementary Planning Documents**
District Design Guide SPD - Adopted March 2010
5. **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission 2014**
S/7 Development Frameworks
HQ/1 Design Principles
H/12 Extensions to Dwellings in the Countryside

Consultation

6. **Great Abington Parish Council** – Recommends approval.
7. **Local Highways Authority** – Comments that the development would not have a significant adverse impact upon the public highway. Request a condition to ensure that the annexe is tied to the existing dwelling.

Representations

8. The **Local Member** supports the application. Comments that the annexe shares an entrance with the main building and is of an appropriate scale, being subservient to the main building and sits well within the curtilage of the main building. It would not result in a cramped form of development as it is similar in scale to the piggery it would replace and although relatively close to the main dwelling, sufficiently removed from it and of a scale that does not impact upon the character and appearance of the area. It would not result in an unsustainable development as the site is located at the northern end of Chalky Road and a footpath leads to a bus stop on Pampisford Road (200 yards) and to the centre of the village (15 mins). It is also close to Granta Park that provides a large number of jobs. Recommends that the application is approved.

Site and Surroundings

9. The site is located outside the Great Abington village framework and in the countryside. No. 6 Chalky Road is a detached, one and half storey dwelling that is located on the southern side of a large plot. It has an existing single storey outbuilding on the northern side along with a vehicular access and parking area. There is a garden area in-between the dwelling and outbuilding. Chalky Road is a public footpath. The site lies within Flood Zone 1 (low risk).

Proposal

10. The proposal seeks the erection of a detached, part one and a half storey and part single storey annexe for the applicant's daughter and her partner following demolition of the existing piggery outbuilding. The building would measure 14.5 metres in length, 6 metres in width and have a height of 3.4 metres to the eaves and 6.2 metres to the ridge. The materials of construction would be stained weatherboarding above a brock plinth for the walls and pantiles for the roof. The accommodation would provide a sitting/dining room, kitchen, study, bathroom and hall at ground floor level and two bedrooms and a bathroom at first floor level. The garden and parking area would be

shared with the main dwelling.

Planning Appraisal

11. The key issues to consider in the determination of this application relate to the impacts of the development upon the character and appearance of the countryside and the amenities of neighbours.
12. Policy HG/6 of the adopted LDF states that extensions to dwellings in the countryside will only be permitted where:
 - a. The proposed development would not create a separate dwelling or be capable of separation from the existing dwelling;
 - b. The extension does not exceed the height of the original dwelling;
 - c. The extension does not lead to a 50% increase or more in volume or gross internal floor area of the original dwelling;
 - d. The proposed extension is in scale and character with the existing dwelling and would not materially change the impact of the dwelling on its surroundings;
 - e. The dwelling is of permanent design and construction.
13. Policy H/12 of the emerging Local Plan removes reference to the height specific floor area and volume increase figures under parts b and c the adopted policy but retains parts a, d and e. This policy can be given some weight in the determination of the application given the lack of objections and status of the plan.
14. The existing piggery outbuilding is used as a garage. It has a length of 9.4 metres, width of 6 metres and height of 2.1 metres to the eaves and 4 metres to the ridge. The materials of construction are timber for the walls and corrugated sheeting for the roof. The building has a simple agricultural character and the scale and design of the building is considered to be appropriate to an outbuilding found in the countryside.
15. The proposed building would increase the ridge height of the building by 1.3 metres at single storey level and 2.2 metres at one and a half storey level. The length would increase by 5 metres. The building would have a domestic character and the scale and design of the building is not considered to be appropriate to a building found in the countryside as an annexe to a main dwelling.
16. Whilst it is acknowledged that the building would be subservient in scale and height to the main dwelling, it is still of a significant scale and is considered to materially change the impact of the site upon the surrounding countryside. The increase in the height and length of the building would result in a visually dominant development that would be seen from public viewpoints to the north and west of the site along the public footpath on Chalky Road. The design of the building with features such as a large number of windows, patio doors, a dormer window and roof lights would give the appearance of a domestic dwelling rather than an ancillary outbuilding and a visually incongruous building that would detract from the rural character of the site and surrounding area.
17. Although it is noted that the proposed development is an annexe and that it has been stated that the garden and parking area would be shared with the main dwelling, the siting of the building, layout of the site and scale of the building is considered to be capable of separation from the existing dwelling. The scale of the building would provide wholly independent living accommodation including two bedrooms, a hallway and study that you would find in a dwelling, the siting of the building is a significant distance from the dwelling being over 30 metres away and there is already a fence

that separates the main garden and parking area from the outbuilding. In addition, a new access could be easily created on to Chalky Road through the removal of a wire fence. Notwithstanding the above, the information submitted to support the application makes it clear that the main reason for the building is because the applicant's daughter and partner cannot afford to live in the area. Whilst there is some sympathy for the situation, it would not justify the provision of this scale of accommodation in this countryside location that could be used independently to the main dwelling when there are properties available in the district that are likely to be affordable. At the time of writing, a quick search on a property website revealed 86 houses below £250,000 within 10 miles of the site. This would be significantly closer to the site than the existing accommodation. The reference made in relation to the close proximity of the applicant's daughter to help with the management of the main dwelling is of limited weight given that there is not considered to be an essential need for someone to live on the site.

18. With reference to the application for dwellings in the area in the comments from the Local Member and applicant's agent, it should be noted that the application is for an annexe rather than a dwelling and the policy considerations in relation to an application for a dwelling and the impact upon the character of the area in terms of plot sizes and the sustainability of the site are not therefore relevant to this case.
19. The planning permission granted for annexes in the area put forward by the applicant would also not set any precedent for this development as each application is determined upon its own merits and in the case of both sites, they were the conversion and extension of existing buildings with more limited accommodation.
20. The development would not have an adverse impact upon neighbours or be detrimental to highway safety.
21. Having regard to applicable national and local planning policies, and having taken all relevant material considerations into account, it is considered that planning permission should not be granted in this instance.

Recommendation

22. It is recommended that the Planning Committee refuses the application for the following reasons: -
 - i) The proposed annexe, by virtue of its bulk, height and design, is not considered to be in scale and character with the existing dwelling and would materially change its impact on its surroundings. The increase in the length and height of the building together with the introduction of domestic features would detract from the existing low scale and simple agricultural character and appearance of the building and result in a visually dominant and incongruous development from viewpoints along the public footpath on Chalky Road. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy HG/6 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies DPD 2007 and Policy H/12 of the Local Plan Submission 2014 that states extensions to dwellings outside the village frameworks will only be permitted where the extension is in scale and character with the existing dwelling and would not materially change its impact on its surroundings.
 - ii) The proposed annexe, by virtue of its siting and scale is considered to be capable of separation from the existing dwelling. The siting of the building at a distance of over 30 metres from the main dwelling together with the provision

of a significant amount of living accommodation is considered to result in an independent unit that is easily capable of separation from the main dwelling particularly with regards to the existing layout of the site. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy HG/6 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies DPD 2007 that states extensions to dwellings outside village frameworks will only be permitted where the development would not create a separate dwelling or be capable of separation from the existing dwelling.

Background Papers:

The following list contains links to the documents on the Council's website and / or an indication as to where hard copies can be inspected.

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies DPD 2007
- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Supplementary Planning Documents
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission 2014
- Planning File Reference S/2334/15/FL

Report Author:

Karen Pell-Coggins
Telephone Number:

Principal Planning Officer
01954 713230