

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation Control Committee 6th July 2005
AUTHOR/S: Director of Development Services

**S/0925/05/F - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth
Extensions at Hyde Cottage, 157 North End
for Mrs R Parrish**

**Recommendation: Refusal
Determination Date: 6th July 2005**

Site and Proposal

1. The site lies outside of the village framework for Bassingbourn but within a group of dwellings situated either side of the road in a ribbon of development extending out of the village.
2. The dwelling is oriented perpendicular to the road as is its neighbour at No. 155 which lies to the south.
3. The dwelling to the north, No. 159, is a bungalow that sits parallel to the road, perpendicular to the application property.
4. There is a first floor bedroom window in the north elevation of No. 155 that looks directly into the garden of the application property and towards two first floor bedroom windows in the south elevation of the application property. There is also a bedroom window in the north elevation of the application property that looks directly into the garden of No. 159.
5. The full planning application, submitted 11th May 2005, proposes a two storey rear extension with a ridge line running perpendicular to the main body of the dwelling. A first floor bedroom window would be inserted into the southern end gable of the extension some 3.3m closer to the side wall of No. 155 than the existing south facing bedroom windows. The northern gable element would lie just off the southern boundary of No. 159.
6. The internal layout will remove the bedroom window which faces this property through the re-designation of the accommodation on this side to a dressing room with the introduction of a further bathroom in the extension.
7. The garage is to remain and there is sufficient space for car parking within the site.

Planning History

8. There is no planning history of relevance to the application.

Planning Policy

9. **Policy HG13** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 - Extensions to Dwellings in the Countryside states (in part, referring to **HG12**) that Planning Permission for the extension and alteration of dwellings will not be permitted where the proposal would

harm seriously the amenities of neighbours through undue loss of light or privacy, being unduly overbearing in terms of its mass, or would adversely affect surrounding properties by virtue of its design, layout, location or materials.

Consultation

10. **Bassingbourn Parish Council** recommends approval.

Representations

11. One letter of objection has been received from the occupiers of the adjacent property, No. 159 North End. The points of objection are:
1. The extension will be very obtrusive. The change of the window arrangements will be helpful but the overall effect will be to 'close in' the garden.
 2. The length of the dwelling will be along approximately 75% of the garden boundary going from 8m to 12m.
 3. Permission was refused for a single storey ground floor extension at No. 159 due to potential impact on neighbours.
 4. The proposal will obliterate all views to the left of the bungalow.
 5. Loss of value
 6. Due to illness the impact of the development viewed from within the bungalow will be greater due to the increasing time spent in the bungalow.

Planning Comments - Key Issues

12. The key issue is the impact of the proposal on the amenities of both adjoining neighbours.

Impact on No. 155

13. The extension contains a large bedroom window which will face the side elevation of No. 155. This elevation contains a window serving a bedroom and direct views between the two windows will be possible. At a distance of approximately 12m this is unacceptable.
14. There are already two windows in the side of the application property that faces No. 155 but these are approximately 3.3m further away, are smaller and views are partially obscured by an existing tree.
15. In my view it would be possible to relocate this window into the western elevation to overcome the problem.

Impact on No. 159

16. The extension will be to the south of the garden to No. 159. As it is due south the loss of direct sunlight will be minimal and in the winter months only. The occupiers of No. 159 have verbally stated that they do not have any concerns over loss of light having assessed for themselves the height of the sun in the south in relation to the position

of the proposed extension. In addition there are tall trees to the rear of the site which already block some sunlight as the sun moves around from the south to the west.

17. There is currently a bedroom window in the side of the application property that directly overlooks the garden to No. 159 although a carefully planted tree does minimise this impact. The proposal would remove this overlooking as all windows on the elevation to No. 159 would contain obscure glazing. This is to be welcomed and is acknowledged by the occupiers of No. 159 to be of benefit.
18. Of greater concern is the impact of the bulk of the proposal when viewed from the garden and from within No. 159. The existing application property runs just off and along the southern boundary well behind No. 159. The proposal will significantly extend this elevation and introduce a dominant gable. It will create a combined bulk that will appear overbearing to the occupiers of the property when viewed from their garden and from within their property and will effectively "close off" the southern boundary. There are clear views across the western boundary to the surrounding fields and countryside and the garden has an open feel but this is not sufficient to counterbalance the harm of the proposal.

Percentage increase

19. The proposal represents an approximate 55% increase in floor area over the existing property. The extent of the dwelling that is original is not known but I cannot find any record of any planning applications to extend the property. Notwithstanding this the existing property has four bedrooms and the proposed extensions do not seek to increase this but merely to improve the internal layout and increase the size of the bedrooms. I do not therefore consider that the increase will prejudice the aim and objective of criterion 3 of Policy HG13 of either maintaining the stock of smaller and medium sized dwellings in the countryside or ensuring that the extension is in scale and character with the existing dwelling.

Recommendation

20. Refusal for the following reasons:
 1. The proposed extension will seriously harm the amenities of the occupiers of No. 155 North End through loss of privacy as a result of the introduction of a first floor bedroom window that will allow direct views into an existing bedroom window in the side elevation of this property. As such the proposal is contrary to Policy HG13 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.
 2. The proposed extension will seriously harm the amenities of the occupiers of No. 159 North End, Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth through appearing unduly overbearing when viewed from within this property and from its garden as a result of its height and bulk and the introduction of a dominant gable element. The proposal will 'close in' the garden to No. 159 on this southern boundary. As such the proposal is contrary to Policy HG13 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.

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

- Planning File reference S/0925/05/F, South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.

Contact Officer: Nigel Blazeby - Senior Planning Assistant
Telephone: (01954) 713256