

## SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

---

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

1<sup>st</sup> December 2004

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

---

**S/1997/04/F - Histon  
Extension at 6 New School Road  
for Mr. P. Osbourne**

**Recommendation: Approval**

Members will visit the site on the 29<sup>th</sup> November 2004.

### **Site and Proposal**

1. The site is a Victorian mid-terrace property that has an existing single storey, flat roofed, rear extension. This is the full width of the property to a depth of 2.3m closest to the house and narrows to accommodate a path for a further depth of 3.75m. A single storey, flat roofed extension at No. 4 New School Road, adjoins the extension and path, which is southeast of the application site. The neighbouring dwelling to the northwest (no. 8 New School Road) also has single storey rear extensions comprising a kitchen extension with a flat roof and a conservatory with a glazed lean-to roof. Due to a 'kick' in the boundary, the site 'wraps' around the conservatory at no. 8 New School Road. It is proposed to build on a similar 'kick' on the boundary with no. 4, therefore a certificate B notice has been served on the owner of that dwelling. The rear of the house faces northeast.
2. This full planning application, received on the 28<sup>th</sup> September 2004 proposes the erection of a single storey rear extension following demolition of the existing building, which is reported to be in poor repair. This will have a pitched roof and will fill in the 'wrap-around' area adjacent to the conservatory at no. 8 New School Road.
3. The application was amended on the 11<sup>th</sup> November 2004. The amendment included an alteration to the roof so that a lower ridge height can be achieved, with the design altered from an asymmetrical roof to a central ridge line and corrected the elevational details to nos. 4 and 8 New School Lane.

### **Planning History**

4. There is no planning history for this site.

### **Planning Policy**

5. **HG12 Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings within Frameworks** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 sets out the requirements that must be met in order for proposals to extend or alter dwellings within village frameworks to be considered for approval.
6. **Policy P1/3 'Sustainable Design in Built Development'** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 states that a high standard of design and sustainability should be adopted for all new forms of development.

## **Consultations**

7. **Histon Parish Council** recommended refusal on grounds that the extension is of an excessive scale and will result in the loss of access for essential maintenance.

## **Representations**

8. Councillor Muncey has requested that the application be considered at Committee, as the Parish Council is concerned about the effect it will have on the neighbour.
9. Councillor Mason has also requested the application be put to Committee with a site visit for reasons that the Parish Council objected on grounds of poor design, loss of amenity and ownership/boundary issues. It is unclear from the drawings as to the use of walls not in the applicant's ownership. The proposed extension would appear to project beyond the ground floor extensions of adjoining properties.
10. Letters of objection have been received from the neighbouring occupiers at nos. 2, 4 and 8 New School Road on grounds of:
  - Roof design – loss of light, out-of-keeping design and the size and shape will be overbearing.
  - Depth - loss of light, out-of-keeping with neighbouring extensions and will be overbearing. Building on land not within the applicant's ownership.
  - 'Wrap-around' – loss of amenity.
  - Precedent
  - Details of joins with neighbouring extensions and drainage are unclear.
11. Other issues raised which are not directly planning matters include maintenance of walls where the buildings link, lack of access to drainage pipes, existing seal on wall where the conservatory at no. 8 joins the existing extension at no. 6, loss of property value, loss of view, and house purchase contract conditions.

## **Planning Comments – Key Issues**

12. The key issues to consider in respect of this application are the scale and impact upon neighbouring residential amenity.

### ***Scale***

13. For the reasons set out in the following paragraphs below, the scale is not considered to be unacceptable.

### ***Residential amenity***

14. The issue of light is not considered to be a significant concern. The proposed extension will project 2m past the rear extension to no. 4. The neighbouring extension has no rear facing windows. Any light loss will be very minimal and restricted to late afternoon and evening to the adjoining garden.
15. The existing conservatory and kitchen extensions to no. 8 will adjoin the proposed extension. It will block some early morning light from the conservatory at no. 8 however, the eaves adjacent to the boundary are a height of 2.7m for the main part of the extension, lowering further to 2.1m where it comes across the rear of the

conservatory. The light will not be significantly reduced, as the existing extension to no. 6 New School Road has a parapet wall to a height of 2.72m along the boundary.

16. The projection past the property at no. 4 will not be visually overbearing, having a depth of just 2m and a relatively low ridge height. The extension is not visible from within the dwelling and any small impact will be limited to the private garden area of this dwelling, which is also separated from the main part of the dwelling by the single storey extension to it.
17. The wrap-around adjacent to no. 8 New School Road is of greater concern, however it has been designed so that only a small triangle of wall will be visible above the wall of the conservatory. Similarly a small area of wall and roof will be visible from within the garden of no. 8. While not ideal, this is not considered to be visually overbearing.

#### ***Other matters that are not material planning considerations***

18. The approval of this proposal would not set a precedent, as all applications for planning permission are determined on their own individual merits.
19. Details of the drainage and boundary walls are not particularly clear, however the application before the Committee is to be determined based upon the information supplied. Matters covered by separate legislation such as the Party Wall Act and Building Regulations are not for consideration under this planning application. If the applicant requires guttering and drainpipes to overhang the boundary a new planning application could be required, with the appropriate notices served. The drawings submitted show plans to build only within the application site (with the possible exception of adjacent to no. 4, where notice has properly been served). If the proposals alter to require building over a party wall boundary a new planning application will be required. An informative can be added to draw the applicant's attention to this.
20. In light of the planning considerations detailed above, I do not consider that there will be harm to the amenities of neighbouring properties to warrant refusal of the application.

#### **Recommendation**

Approve as amended by letter dated 9<sup>th</sup> November 2004 and plan franked 16<sup>th</sup> November 2004, subject to:

1. Standard Condition A – Time limited permission (Reason A).

#### **Informatives**

1. If the guttering and drainpipes on the approved extension are to overhang the boundary line a new planning application will be required, with the appropriate ownership certificate and notices served. The drawings submitted and hereby approved, show plans to build only within the application site (with the possible exception of adjacent to no. 4, where notice has properly been served).
2. If the proposals alter to require building over a party wall boundary a new planning application will be required, with the appropriate ownership certificate and notices served.

3. The granting of planning permission does not confer or imply land ownership entitlement to the applicant. This is a matter of civil law that should be resolved before works commence on site.

### **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).**
  - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004: HG12 (Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings within Frameworks).**
2. The development is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations, which have been raised during the consultation exercise:
  - **Scale**
  - **Residential amenity**

**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/1997/04/F

**Contact Officer:** Melissa Reynolds – Senior Planning Assistant  
Telephone: (01954) 713 237