

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee
AUTHOR/S: Executive Director / Head of Planning Services

7th February 2007

S/2451/06/F – BASSINGBOURN-CUM-KNEESWORTH House, Adjacent 5 Park View for T Mendham

Recommendation: Approval

Date for Determination: 15th February 2007

Notes:

This Application has been reported to the Planning Committee for determination because the officer recommendation of approval is likely to conflict with the comments of the Parish Council.

Members will visit this site on the 5th February 2007

Site and Proposal

1. The 0.017 ha site of the proposed dwelling is an area of undeveloped land adjacent to a two-storey semi-detached property, 5 Park View. Presently the land accommodates a single storey element of the said property and is used primarily for parking. To the west of the site there is the first of a terrace of bungalows (number 3A Park View) that are in line with the two-storey semi-detached properties characterising the eastern part of Park View. The site is within the village framework and within an area of identified flood risk (zone 3 - high risk).
2. The full planning, received on the 21st December 2006 proposes to erect an attached dwellinghouse on land to the west of 5 Park View. The proposed dwelling is 0.3m below the height of the existing dwelling (8.5m) and set back by 0.5 from its front elevation. The width of the proposed dwelling is 5.7m, which leaves a distance of 2m between the development and the western boundary of the site. The depth of the proposed dwelling is 9.9m at a ground floor level closest to the west boundary as it incorporates a single storey element to the rear. A two-storey element to the rear is kept 3.3m away from the west elevation and comes out in line with the single storey element.
3. Parking for both the proposed dwelling and the existing one would be located at the front of each property. The materials of the proposed dwelling are to match the red brick and concrete tiles of the existing property. An extension of the existing dwelling is also proposed, though this would be classed as permitted development.

Planning History

4. An earlier application received in 2006 was withdrawn before officers had the opportunity to refuse it due to the impact upon the character of the street scene and neighbour amenity (**S/1024/06/F**). It was also not accompanied by a flood risk assessment.

Planning Policy

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003

5. **Policy P1/3** 'Sustainable Design in Built Environment' states that a high quality of design will be required for all new developments and promotes more compact forms of development through higher densities.
6. **Policy P5/3** 'Density' requires Local Authorities to increase the density of new housing developments in order to maximise efficiency in the use of sites.

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004

7. **Policy SE3** 'Limited Rural Growth Villages' sets out the requirements for new dwellings in rural growth village frameworks considering issues of impact upon character and amenities of the locality.
8. **Policy HG10** 'Housing Mix and Design' sets out the requirements for residential developments to make the best use of sites in addition to be informed by the wider character and context of the surrounding area.
9. **Policy CS5** "Flood Protection" aims to protect development from flooding and to prevent flooding elsewhere.

Consultation

10. **Bassingbourn Parish Council** – Has not responded at the time of writing this report, though its comments on the previous application were: "insufficient parking plus overbearing on neighbours living in bungalow". It recommended refusal.
11. **Chief Environmental Health Officer** – Had not commented at the time of writing this report.
12. **Environment Agency** – Had not commented at the time of writing this report.

Representations

13. One letter of objection has been received from the owner/occupiers of 3A Park View who are totally opposed to any building on a plot of land of this size. It is believed that it will totally ruin their environment towering above the bungalow in such close proximity to it.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

14. The main issues for Members to consider are the impact upon neighbour amenity, and the visual impact of the development on the street scene of Park View and flood risk.

Impact upon neighbour amenity

15. The proposed elevation facing number 3A Park View is void of any openings so overlooking is not considered to be an issue in the determination of this application. Similarly the west elevation of the neighbouring bungalow is also blank so the main impact that the neighbours will experience is when viewing the proposed dwelling from the side of their property and their rear garden.

16. In terms of the side of the property there is a 1m gap between the side of the bungalow and the boundary fence, however this area is not a part of the curtilage where the occupants are likely to spend a great deal of time. It is accepted that the proposed dwelling would represent a significant visual impact upon the neighbouring property by virtue of its height and depth. In light of the distance between the rear garden of the bungalow and the new property I do not consider that the development will be unduly overbearing, especially as it drops to a single storey element at the rear and beyond the rear - elevation of the bungalow. Any overshadowing would be limited by the eastern orientation of the development and the fact that there is already existing built form to the east of number 3A.
17. The proposed dwelling would have an additional window in the rear that is nearer to the side boundary of 60 North End, though as a result of the trees forming the boundary at the rear of the site I do not consider that any overlooking would be serious enough to recommend the refusal of this application.

Impact upon the street scene

18. The street scene of Park View is a diverse one with bungalows, semi-detached and detached properties. The proposed dwelling will create a terrace, though I do not consider there to be an in principle objection to such a development. The fact that the dwelling has been set in from the front elevation of the existing dwelling means that it will produce a visual break in the frontage of the dwellings, making the new property more subservient in character and form.
19. The provision of parking at the front of the site is similar to the bungalows to the west, though it is accepted that other semi-detached properties in the area have parking at the side. I do not consider that the proposed parking spaces at the front of the two dwellings would be unacceptable in terms of the visual impact upon the street scene.
20. The Flood Risk Assessment concludes that the finished floor level will match the adjacent property, which will provide a freeboard over the highest predicted 1:100 flood level for the site of the order of 450 mm.
21. There will be no increase in hardstanding or impermeable area from the proposed development. Soakaways, a form of sustainable drainage system, is proposed. I await the comments of the Environment Agency.

Recommendation

22. Subject to the comments of the Environment Agency, Approve – Subject to the following conditions:
 1. Standard Condition A – Time limited permission (Reason - A);
 2. Sc5a – Details of materials for external walls and roofs (Rc5a);
 3. Sc60 – Details of east boundary treatment (Rc60);
 4. Sc5f – Details of materials to be used for hard surfaced areas within the site including roads, driveways and car parking areas (Reason – To minimise disturbance to adjoining residents);
 5. Sc22 – No windows at first floor level in the west elevation of the development (Rc22);

6. Restriction of hours of use of power operated machinery during the period of construction. (Reason - To protect the amenities of neighbours during the period of construction);
7. Notwithstanding the provisions of Regulations 3 and Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order), the following classes of development more particularly described in the Order are expressly prohibited in respect of the property and each unit thereon unless expressly authorised by planning permission granted by the Local Planning Authority in that behalf:-
8. PART 1, (Development within the curtilage of a dwellinghouse), Classes A, B, C, D and E. (Reason - To ensure that additions or extensions which would otherwise require planning permission do not overdevelop the site with consequent harm to the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.)

Reasons for Approval

1. The development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:
 - **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003:**
P1/3 (Sustainable design in built development)
P5/3 (Density)
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:**
SE3 (Development in Limited Rural Growth Settlements)
HG10 (Housing Mix and Design)
CS5 (Flood Protection)
2. The development is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations which have been raised during the consultation exercise:
 - Residential amenity (overbearing)
 - Visual impact on the locality

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 Ref: S/1024/06/F and S/2451/06/F

Contact Officer: Edward Durrant – Planning Assistant
Telephone: (01954) 713082