

## **SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

---

**REPORT TO:** Development and Conservation Control Committee

7<sup>th</sup> June 2006

**AUTHOR/S:** Director of Development Services

---

**S/0704/06/F – Willingham**  
**Extensions and Alterations at 158 Station Road, for S. Parker**

**Recommendation: Refusal**  
**Date for Determination: 5<sup>th</sup> June 2006**

Members will visit this site on the 5<sup>th</sup> June 2006.

### **Site and Proposal**

1. The application relates to an approximately 0.015 hectare (0.37 acre) site to the south of the village framework of Willingham. It is situated to the west of the B1050 leading from Willingham to Longstanton. It lies at the end of a small ribbon development of frontage development. An orchard/field lies to the north of the site.
2. Number 158 Station Road is a two-storey detached grey rendered house with a single storey garage with a shallow roof pitch to the side. A conservatory base has been constructed on the south elevation of the house. The dwelling appears to be have been erected in the Edwardian period. The existing garage does not appear to be used for parking.
3. The site is served by a vehicular access on the southern side of the plot from Station Road. Along the road frontage is an award drain. A yard with a rural building lies to the rear of the site, with adjacent land in the same ownership. A detached bungalow is situated to the south of the site (No. 164). On the opposite side of Station Road, there are several dwellings of mixed height and appearance.
4. The full application received on 10<sup>th</sup> April 2006 proposes several alterations to the dwelling, including a first floor front extension and raising of the ridge height of the dwelling, first floor rear extension and a two-storey rear extension, following the demolition of the existing side garage. The extensions will create an additional bedroom, upstairs bathroom/ensuite, enlarged kitchen/family room and enlarged two bedrooms.

### **Planning History**

5. An application for an extension to the original dwelling and erection of a garage was refused in 1973 (Ref: **C/73/1279**), with a new application to extend the dwelling and erect a garage approved the following year (Ref: **S/74/0367**).
6. In 2000, planning permission was given for a rear conservatory and detached garage to the rear of the site (Ref: **S/0659/00**). The construction of the conservatory base has resulted in the implementation of the consent, although approved works have not been completed.
7. In May 2002 planning permission was refused for an extension to the dwelling, and was subsequently dismissed at appeal (Ref: **S/0591/02/F**). This proposal involved a

first floor front extension, a raising of the ridge height and a two storey rear extension, following demolition of the side garage, which resulted in a 114% cumulative increase in the floorspace of the original dwelling.

8. The Inspector stated in the appeal decision that “I consider that the proposed development would result in material harm to the character and appearance of the area by virtue of the scale of the proposed rear extension and would be contrary to adopted Local Plan Policy H31 and emerging Local Plan Policy HG18 (now HG13).”
9. In June 2002, planning permission was given for the erection of a storage barn/stables on land to the rear of the site (Ref: **S/0645/02/F**).
10. On 11<sup>th</sup> February 2003, a planning application for an extension to the dwelling was received (Ref: **S/0292/03/F**) and subsequently withdrawn prior to determination.
11. On the 15<sup>th</sup> July 2003, planning permission was given for a new vehicular access to the site (Ref: **S/1168/03/F**).
12. Within the immediate vicinity of the site, it is noted that the following applications have been received for extensions to dwellings in the Countryside between 2003 and 2006.
  - (a) **S/0119/06/F** – Extension to 171 Station Road Willingham. Approved. Resulted in less than 44% increase in the volume of the original dwelling.
  - (b) **S/1351/05/F** – Extension and Alterations to 111 Station Road, Willingham. Refused as contrary to policy HG13. Proposal resulted in a 94% increase in the floorspace of the original dwelling and the raising of the ridge height.
  - (c) **S/1019/05/F** – Extension and Alterations to 171 Station Road, Willingham. Refused as contrary to policy HG13. Proposal involved an extension to a bungalow to create a two storey dwelling.
  - (d) **S/0730/05/F** – Conservatory at 135 Station Road, Willingham. Approved.
  - (e) **S/2113/04/F** – Extension at 145 Station Road, Willingham. Approved at December 2004 Committee, contrary to officer’s recommendation. Proposal resulted in an approximately 145% increase in the volume of the original dwelling and 86% increase in floor area.
  - (f) **S/1462/04/F** – Roof Extension to Dwellings and Pitched Roofs to Garages at 153 and 155 Station Road, Willingham. Approved. Whilst proposal raised the ridge height of the bungalows, it represented a 12% increase in the volume over the original dwellings.
  - (g) **S/0355/04/F** – Single storey rear extension to 127 Station Road, Willingham. Approved.
  - (h) **S/0742/03/F** – Extension at 145 Station Road, Willingham. Approved. Extension resulted in a 59% increase in floor area.

## **Planning Policy**

13. The site is located within the countryside, outside of the village development framework defined in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.
14. South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 Policy **HG13** states that extensions to dwellings in the countryside (i.e. outside of village frameworks defined in this Plan) will be permitted where: 1) the proposed development would not create a separate dwelling or be capable of separation from the existing dwelling; 2) the extension does not exceed the height of the original dwelling; 3) the extension does not lead to a 50% increase or more in volume or gross internal floor area of the original dwelling; 4) 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; 5) the proposed extension has regard to the criteria in Policy **HG12** of this Plan.
15. Local Plan 2004 Policy **HG12** is concerned with extensions and alterations to dwellings within frameworks and refers to the use of appropriate design and materials; impact on neighbouring amenities; the loss of parking spaces; unacceptable visual impact on the street scene; and boundary treatment.
16. Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 Policy **P1/2** states that development in the countryside will be restricted unless the proposals can be demonstrated to be essential in a particular rural location.
17. Policy **P1/3** of the County Structure Plan requires a high standard of design and sustainability for all new development and which provides a sense of place which responds to the local character of the built environment.

## **Consultation**

18. **Willingham Parish Council** – Recommendation of Approval, subject to neighbours being consulted, and to the size of the proposed works being within planning guidelines.
19. **Old West Internal Drainage Board** – No comment from a drainage point of view.
20. **Councillor Corney** – Request that application be considered at Planning Committee, and be subject to a member site visit.

## **Representations**

21. None received.

## **Representation by Agent**

22. The following information (summarised) has been provided by the agent in support of the application.
  - (a) Calculations of the original dwelling should include structures adjacent the existing dwelling which have been subsequently demolished.
  - (b) The proposal results in a 40-55% increase in floor area above the “existing” dwelling.

- (c) The Inspector for the appeal for the 2002 planning application, raised no objection to the raising of the ridge height of the dwelling in the appeal decision.
- (d) Proposal will improve the visual appearance of the dwelling, by the loss of the side garage and replacement of windows along the front elevation.
- (e) The proposal does not result in an increased building footprint.
- (f) The mass of the building as proposed, when viewed from the front is reduced.
- (g) Other extensions to dwellings in the Countryside have been allowed, which are inconsistent with criteria in policy HG13; and
- (h) Proposal will not result in a large dwelling, by current standards.

### **Planning Comments – Key Issues**

- 23. The application was informally discussed at the Chairman's Delegation Meeting of 19<sup>th</sup> May 2006, at which it was resolved that the application should come before Members at Committee, following a site visit.
- 24. The key issues in relation to this application are:
  - (a) The increase in floor space and volume of the dwelling from the original.
  - (b) The increase in ridge height; and
  - (c) The scale and character of the proposed development in context with the original dwelling and the resultant impact on the countryside.
- 25. The site lies within the countryside. Policy HG13 of the Local Plan requires extensions to dwellings in the countryside to not lead to a 50% increase or more in volume or gross internal floor area of the original dwelling and to not exceed the height of the original dwelling.
- 26. The policy looks to restrict the size of proposed extensions to dwellings in the countryside to carefully protect the character of rural locations and also to prevent the reduction in the stock of smaller and medium sized dwellings in countryside areas. This application proposes raising the ridge height from 6.5m to 7.5m, a first floor front and rear extension and a two storey rear extension. The proposal would result in an approximately 78% increase in external volume over the original dwelling and 72% increase in external floor area; and an increase in the number of bedrooms from 3 to 4.
- 27. It is calculated that previous extensions to the dwelling have resulted in a 55% increase in external floorspace to the original dwelling and 64% increase in volume. The proposal is calculated to result in an increase in floorspace of 20.4sq.m over the existing dwelling (as at 2006) taking into account the implemented conservatory permission and removal of the existing garage, and a 49.7 cubic metre increase in volume.
- 28. With respect to the calculations of the cumulative increase in volume and floorspace over the original dwelling, is noted that the agent has expressed the view, that calculations of the original dwelling should include buildings attached to the dwelling, which have been subsequently demolished. It is noted that no mention of these previous buildings was raised during the assessment of the earlier planning applications for extensions to this dwelling, that these structures/buildings are not

illustrated on the 1974 application plans for an extension to the dwelling, the applications plans for the 2000 extension (conservatory) show a small timber lean-to shed to be demolished adjacent the dwelling and no other outbuilding, and little information is presented on the domestic use of these structures. Overall, I am of the view that these demolished structures should not be included in the calculation of the original volume and floorspace of the dwelling.

29. Furthermore, it is noted that planning permission remains for a detached garage measuring 13.3m by 6.0m on the rear portion of the site, although this structure has not yet been built.
30. Policy HG13 of the Local Plan also states that extension to dwellings in the countryside should be in scale and character with the existing dwelling and not lead to a material change in the impact of the dwelling on its surroundings. The proposal would add to the visual bulk of the dwelling as viewed from the road and adjacent field by the first floor front extension and raising the ridge height of an existing two storey dwelling; and increasing the depth of the two-storey section of the dwelling at the rear. Collectively these extensions are considered to lead to an unacceptable change to the scale and character of the dwelling.
31. When considering this proposal it is also important to consider the context to which the site relates. I am of the view that officer recommendations have been consistent regarding extensions to dwellings in the countryside within the vicinity.
32. Unlike the current case, extensions at 153 and 155 Station Road, Willingham opposite the site, involved the raising of the ridge height for two bungalows positioned between two two-storey dwellings. This led to a small increase in volume over the original dwellings of 12%. The two sites are not considered comparable, as No. 158 is a two-storey dwelling which does not immediately adjoin existing dwellings. The percentage increase in volume is also significantly larger.
33. It is noted that planning permission was given for extensions at 145 Station Road, Willingham, which led to an increase in volume over the original dwelling of 145%. Members at the 1<sup>st</sup> December 2004 Committee meeting resolved to approve this application, as the site was situated amongst scattered dwellings, with restricted views of the proposed extension. The extended dwelling was considered of modest size and having minimal impact upon the visual amenity of the countryside. Due to the greater visual prominence of the current site, with the extensions readily visible from the road and adjacent field, these two sites are not considered comparable.
34. I am also of the view that applications should also be assessed on their own merits and note that adopted planning Policy HG13 makes no distinction between sites within the open countryside and sites which form part of a linear line of development adjacent a road frontage such as Station Road, Willingham or dwellings occupying large and small plots.
35. I have noted that the Appeal Inspector in 2002 did not consider that alterations to the front elevation and slight increase in ridge height (to 7.3m/7.4m) would harm the character and appearance of the area. He considered that the length of the rear extension (10.5m) would be out of character with the existing dwelling, would be intrusive in the countryside and would represent a significant increase in floorspace. I have taken those comments into consideration but do not consider they outweigh the harm to the character of the area by the scale of the extensions.

## **Recommendation**

### **36. Refusal**

1. No.158 Station Road is a detached dwelling sited in a loose ribbon of development outside the defined village framework for Willingham.
2. The proposed extensions including alterations to the front elevation, when combined with previous additions to the original property, would represent an increase in 78% and 72% in volume and floorspace respectively, over the original dwelling, which materially increases the impact of the dwelling on its surroundings when viewed from the road and field to the north. The proposed extensions are considered unsympathetic to the scale and character of the existing dwelling. The proposal would therefore contravene Policy HG13 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 which requires extensions to dwellings in the countryside to be in scale and character with the existing dwelling, not to exceed the height of the original dwelling and to not lead to an increase of 50% or more in volume or floorspace of the original dwelling.

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

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- Planning File Refs: C/73/1279/F, S/74/0367/F, S/0659/00/F, S/0591/02/F, S/0645/02/F, S/0292/03/F, S/1168/03/F, S/0119/06/F, S/1351/05/F, S/1019/05/F, S/0730/05/F, S/2113/04/F, S/1462/04/F, S/0355/04/F, S/0742/03/F and S/0704/06/F

**Contact Officer:** Allison Tindale – Planning Assistant  
Telephone: (01954) 713159