

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation Control Committee 6th October 2004
AUTHOR/S: Director of Development Services

**S/1648/04/F - Hardwick
Extension to 2 Ashmead Drive, for Mr and Mrs Heathcote**

Recommendation: Approval

Members will visit this site on Monday 4th October 2004

Site and Proposal

1. Number 2 Ashmead Drive is a modern two-storey detached property that sits on the junction with Egremont Road. It has a block of two single garages with a pitched roof, which is attached to the southern elevation of the dwellinghouse. On the northern elevation there is a lean-to extension, and the front elevation has been extended by way of a porch. The property falls within the Hardwick village framework.
2. Ashmead Drive is a residential street that is characterised by two-storey detached dwellinghouses. A large majority of these dwellinghouses have attached pitched roof garages. The village playing fields are opposite the entrance to Ashmead Drive, and adjacent to Egremont Road.
3. The application, received on 6th August 2004, proposes to increase the height of the garage roof in order to accommodate a fourth bedroom, with en-suite facilities. The height of the extended garage would be 4 metres to the eaves and 6 metres to the ridge. There would be Velux windows in the rear roofslope and a dormer window on the front.

Planning History

4. Planning consent was granted in 1999 (S/0264/99/F) for the aforementioned lean-to side extension and porch.

Planning Policy

5. **Policy HG12 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan: Adopted 2004 – Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings within Frameworks.**
This policy establishes that proposals to extend dwellings should have regard to the issues of scale, design, materials and the degree of impact upon surrounding properties and street scene.

Consultation

6. Hardwick Parish Council – Recommended that planning officers refuse the application due to concerns over lighting; it also requested a Committee site visit.
Councillor Stewart – No comment on the merits of the application, but has also requested a Committee site visit.

Representations

7. One letter has been received from the occupier of number 4 Ashmead Drive, who strongly objects to the application for the following reasons:
 1. He has lived in his property since new and one of the considerations he made before purchase was that nothing could be built between his property and number 2 Ashmead Drive.
 2. The principle of a two-storey extension right up to the boundary is going to erode the detached character of the residential area and is going to have an unacceptable impact on his property.
 3. The overbearing and overpowering of the extension, size, scale and bulk will have an un-desirable impact upon him with loss of residential amenity.
 4. There is only a 1 metre pathway between his property and 2 Ashmead Drive. It is a narrow gap that will result in overpowering by an extension. As far as he can see there are no other examples of two storey extensions extending right up to the boundary. With such a small space in between the properties it is totally unacceptable.
 5. He will have a loss of outlook from his kitchen window and door that he has enjoyed for over 20 years and loss of light due to the close proximity of the extension.
 6. He will not give permission for anyone to enter his land for building works or any future maintenance necessary. How can such an extension be built without interfering with his property?
 7. They have a shared driveway and un-doubtably there will be major disruption to this if such a scheme went ahead.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

8. The key issues for consideration in the assessment of this application are the visual impact upon the street scene and the impact upon the neighbouring property's amenities.

Visual Impact on the Street Scene

9. Number 2 is set back some five metres from the adjacent highway (Ashmead Drive), and the garage block is set back by a further 3.3 metres from the front elevation of the house. There is 1.1 metre wide passageway that separates the garage block from the side elevation of number 4. The eaves of the existing garage block are 2 metres in height, and the roof extends to 4 metres at its ridge.
10. The proposed two-storey extension would be a new feature in Ashmead Drive, and would certainly increase the prominence of the property on the street scene. The scale of the extension, and the fact that it would be well set back from both the front of the main dwellinghouse and the adjacent highway helps to reduce its impact. Its ridge height would be 1.4 metres lower than the ridge height of the main dwellinghouse, and it would be set back 3.3 metres from the front elevation (8.3 metres from the highway). The extension would be subservient in form to the main dwellinghouse and would not lead to an increase of its footprint. The dormer window

would not be an unacceptable addition to the street scene, and its pitched roof would relate well to the roof of the existing porch.

11. The extension would reduce the gap between numbers 2 and 4 Ashmead Drive, though the main dwellinghouse would screen views of the extension from Egremont Road. Again the set back nature of the extension, and the fact that it would be 1.4 metres lower than the two adjacent properties, would help to maintain a visual separation between them both.
12. As well as the two single garages there is an area of hard standing at the front of the property that serves as provision for further off street parking. No parking will be lost as a result of the proposal.

Impact upon the Amenities of Number 4 Ashmead Drive

13. The closest neighbour is number 4 Ashmead Drive, which is set back from both the road and the applicants' property. Number 4 is another two-storey detached dwelling with a detached garage block. The side elevation of number 2's garage block and a close-boarded fence define the property boundary.
14. The proposed extension would be located to the north of number 4, so any loss of direct sunlight to the property is considered minimal. The openings in the north elevation of number 4 consist of a small toilet window, which is obscure glazed, and a glazed kitchen door and small kitchen window. The kitchen also has a large window in the rear elevation of the property, which will not be affected by the proposal. This window would appear to be the main source of light entering the kitchen. The extension will not extend past the rear elevation of number 4 and would only extend by one metre forward of the front elevation. The proposal would not lead to a serious loss of light to the openings in the front elevation, and the rear garden of number 4.
15. None of the windows in the extension would result in a loss of amenity by way of overlooking. A condition would be used to prevent any openings being inserted in the south elevation of the extension.
16. At present the occupiers of number 4 already face a blank wall when using the aforementioned kitchen door. This blank wall would increase by 2 metres in height and would clearly have an impact on the outlook of the adjacent passageway. However, such a passageway is not considered to be an area of the property where the occupiers spend a large amount of time.
17. The outlook from the kitchen door would again clearly be reduced, though the loss of such an outlook is not considered to be sufficiently adverse to result in a refusal of this application.

Recommendation

18. Approval
 1. Standard Condition A – Time limited permission (Reason A);
 2. Sc22 – No windows at first floor level in the south elevation of the development (Rc22);
 3. Sc19 – Details and materials to match existing (Rc19)

Informatives

Reasons for Approval

1. The approved development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:**
HG12 (Extensions and Alterations to dwellings within Frameworks),
2. The proposal conditionally approved is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations which have been raised during the consultation exercise:
 - Residential amenity
 - Visual impact in the locality

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

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan: Adopted 2004;
- Planning Application File S/1648/04/F

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