

## SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

---

**REPORT TO:** Planning Committee

1<sup>st</sup> November 2006

**AUTHOR/S:** Executive Director / Head of Planning Services

---

### **S/2423/05/F - STAPLEFORD**

#### **Extensions to Dwelling and Garage at 12 Priams Way for J. Newson**

#### **Recommendation: Approval of Amendment**

Members will visit the site on Monday 30<sup>th</sup> October 2006.

#### **Site and Proposal**

1. No. 12 Priams Way is a two-storey, semi-detached brick and tile house that is situated on the northern side of Priams Way, within the Stapleford village framework.
2. No. 10 Priams Way is situated to the east of the site and forms the other half of the semi-detached property. It has a ground floor kitchen window in its rear elevation and a patio area immediately to the rear of the dwelling. No. 14 Priams Way is situated to the west of the site. It has a ground floor sitting room window in its side elevation.
3. Planning permission was granted for a two-storey side extension, single storey rear extension and garage extension in February 2006 (reference **S/2423/05/F**). The approved single storey extension had a depth of 3 metres and a height of 2.3 metres to the eaves and 3.2 metres to the ridge. The amended drawing P01 Rev D proposes an increase in the height of the single storey rear extension by 0.15 metres resulting in an extension that measures 2.45 metres in height to the eaves and 3.35 metres to the ridge.

#### **Planning History**

4. A planning application for a two-storey side extension and part two-storey, part single storey rear extension (reference **S/0360/05/F**) was withdrawn in April 2005.

#### **Planning Policy**

5. **Policy P1/3** of the **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003** seeks to ensure that all new developments incorporate a high standard of design that respond to the local character of the built environment.
6. **Policy HG12** of the **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004** states that extensions to dwellings within village frameworks will not be permitted where they would seriously harm the amenities of neighbours through being unduly overbearing in mass, through a significant loss of light, or through overlooking leading to a loss of privacy; or if they would have an unacceptable visual impact upon the street scene.

#### **Consultation**

7. **Stapleford Parish Council** recommends refusal of the amendment because of the persistent neglect of the requirements of the planning permission already given. The wall is overbearing to neighbours and is reducing their light. It is recommended that the Planning Committee should arrange a visit.

## Representations

8. Two letters of objection have been received to the amendment from the neighbours at **Nos. 10 and 14 Priams Way**. Issues of concern include the oppressive nature of the mass of the brick wall, a loss of light, obscured views from windows, building not in accordance with the approved plans, poor quality work, demolition of a wall, breach of the Party Wall Act, storage of building materials, noise, and loss in value of property.
9. Councillor Berent 'one of the local member representing Stapleford states: "Both I and the neighbours understand that the wall as currently built is already taller than is proposed in either the original or the revised planning application, but we feel that the height given in the originally approved application is at the limit of what is acceptable in this location".

## Planning Comments – Key Issues

10. The main issue to be considered during the determination of this amendment relate to the impact of the increase in the height of the extension upon the amenities of neighbours.
11. The current partly constructed extension is unauthorised and the side wall adjacent to No. 10 Priams Way measures approximately 2.83 metres in height to eaves level. If the amendment were to be approved, the height of the wall would be 2.45 metres to the eaves and 3.35 metres to the ridge. Approval of the amendment would not mean that the current height of the wall or any further unauthorised change to the approved plans would be acceptable in planning terms. Each proposal would be determined upon its own merits.
12. The extension as amended is no higher relative to the existing first floor windows, than shown on the approved scheme. The 0.15 metres increase in height is as a result of the distance between the ground level and the bottom of the first floor windows being shown 0.15 metres less than is actually the case on the approved plan.
13. No. 10 Priams Way has a ground floor kitchen window in its rear elevation. Whilst I acknowledge that the proposed single storey rear extension abuts the boundary with that property and the wall would be higher than that originally approved, I do not consider that an increase in height of the extension by 0.15 metres would seriously harm the amenities of that neighbour. The combination of the depth of the extension, its height, orientation to the west of No. 10 and boundary hedge is not considered to result in a dominant feature that would be unduly oppressive and overbearing in mass when viewed from, and lead to a significant loss of light to, the kitchen window and patio area of that property. There would be no additional overlooking that would result in a loss of privacy.
14. No. 14 Priams Way has a ground floor sitting room window in its side elevation. The single storey rear extension is orientated to the south east and situated approximately 3 metres from this window. The proposed increase in the height of the wall is not considered to adversely affect the outlook from, or result in a significant loss of light to, the sitting room window of that property, as a result of the height of the extension and distance between the two dwellings.
15. The proposed increase in the height of the single storey extension would not be visible from within the street scene.

16. Although there are no dimensions on the plans, they are drawn to scale.
17. The concerns raised by the neighbour with regards to the location of the storage of building materials on the site, the period of construction, rubbish from the builders, and the demolition of part of their boundary wall, is a civil matter between the two relevant parties. The breach to the party wall is a building regulations issue.

#### **Recommendation**

18.
  - a. Approval of amended drawing No. P01 Rev D.
  - b. Enforcement Action be instigated, if required, to ensure that the unauthorised works to the walls of the extension are removed within one month of the Notice coming into effect.

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

- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Planning File Reference S/2423/05/F

**Contact Officer:** Karen Bonnett – Planning Assistant  
Telephone: (01954) 713230