

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation Control Committee 2nd August 2006
AUTHOR/S: Head of Planning Services

S/0844/06/F - Haslingfield
Conversion of Garage and Extension Above, 39 New Road for Mr and Mrs S Turner

Recommendation: Refusal
Date for Determination: 23rd June 2006

Site and Proposal

1. Number 39 New Road is a semi-detached property with a double garage to the side along the boundary of 1 College Crescent. The double garage backs onto the rear garden of 1 College Crescent, which is triangular in shape.
2. This full planning application was received on the 20th April 2006 and proposes to convert one of the garages and extend above it. The garage conversion will provide accommodation for dining room and the first floor element will accommodate a new bedroom with en-suite. The original plans proposed a window in the rear elevation and a roof light and window in the front elevation. Amended plans were received on 9th June 2006 omitting the first floor window in the rear elevation. At the front of the property the proposal will come forward to be in line with the existing front elevation as will the remaining garage. The two-storey element will have a ridge height 0.5m lower than the original dwelling.

Planning History

3. None relevant to this application

Planning Policy

4. **Policy HG12** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 sets out requirements for development of dwellings within frameworks having regard to impact upon neighbour amenity and the street scene.

Consultation

5. **Haslingfield Parish Council** – Recommends approval of the scheme as amended stating “the removal of the rear first floor window addresses our main concerns but we would like to request that the roof window at the rear is obscured glazed and non-opening.” It had recommended refusal of the application as originally submitted.

Representations

6. The Occupiers of 1 College Crescent – Raised objections. The window in the first-floor rear elevation would result in the loss of privacy. They had concerns whether the quality of the foundations would be able to withstand a two-storey development. They believe that there could be some damage to their property and also that there is a risk of subsidence and potential damage to the party wall. They are concerned that there were no detailed plans of the intended height of the new structure and how far

forward it will project. They believed that the new extension will be imposing and would reduce some light. They considered that the two-storey extension would be overdevelopment and that there is not enough information on roof drainage and the proposal could increase wind speed, which could increase risk of structural damage.

7. The Occupiers of 1 College Crescent made further comments with regards to the amended plans. They “have very strong objections to the double storey part of the proposal. It would be very imposing and intrusive even without any windows at the rear” and they considered this over development. They believe that the applicants have not addressed details of the foundations, the eaves would overhang the boundary of 1 College Crescent, and the plan does not specify how the walls would be indented to prevent imposition on 1 College Crescent. The original points raised in their first letter have yet to be resolved. The proposed works will cause long-term disruption to them; they would not be able to let their children play in the garden until works is completed. Their main concern is regarding the two-storey element of the proposal. They would not object to any change of use of the garage or extension forward. They state that there were no direct consultation by the applicants with them and they would have welcomed the chance to have discussed their concerns with the applicants sooner.
8. Occupier of 2 College Crescent – Raised concerns about increase overlooking of part of the garden of no. 2 College Crescent, which would render “any privacy non-existent”. Concerns were also raised about setting a precedent, which could lead to the whole appearance of the Crescent being spoilt.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

9. The key issue to be considered is the impact of the proposed works on the amenity of adjoining properties.
10. The layout of the properties along College Crescent and 39 New Road is very unusual. The double garage belonging to 39 New Road, backs immediately onto the garden of 1 College Crescent. The conversion one of the garage would not necessarily have a significant impact on the adjacent properties, however the addition of a two-storey element above the existing garage would cause serious harm to neighbour amenity through being unduly overbearing. The rear garden at No. 1 College Crescent is very small and the extension above the garage would enclose the rear garden even further on the north east side. The amended plans date stamped 9 June 2006 has addressed the loss of privacy issue by the omission of the window in the rear elevation. However the overbearing affect of the proposal is unacceptable.
11. Concerns regarding the impact of construction work upon the adjoining property is not a material planning issue.

Recommendations

12. Refusal:

The proposed extension, by virtue of its siting, height and mass would seriously harm the amenities of neighbours by being unduly overbearing. It would particularly affect the occupiers of No. 1 College Crescent as the proposed extension backs immediately onto their rear garden. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy HG12 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004, which states that planning

permission for the extension of a dwelling will not be permitted where the proposal would harm seriously the amenities of neighbours through being unduly overbearing.

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

- South Cambridgeshire local Plan 2004
- Planning File Ref: S/0844/06/F

Contact Officer: Laura Clarke – Planning Assistant
Telephone: (01954) 713162