

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

1 December 2010

AUTHOR/S: Executive Director (Operational Services)/
Corporate Manager (Planning and New Communities)

**S/1700/10 – OAKINGTON & WESTWICK
Extension - 9, Station Road, Oakington And Westwick
for Councillor Thomas Bygott**

Recommendation: Refusal

Date for Determination: 8 December 2010

Notes:

This application has been reported to the Planning Committee for determination, as the applicant is a District Councillor.

Site and Proposal

- 1.1 No.9 Station Road is a semi-detached two-storey dwelling adjoined to No.7 Station Road. The property has a hipped end with a cat-slide roof to the rear flank both of which are finished in plain roof tiles. The building's elevations have a pebble dashed painted render finish. The property is set back from the roadside with a Leylandii hedge enclosing the front garden with openings for a separate vehicular and pedestrian access from the public adopted highway. The property has a range of outbuildings upon the northeast boundary with no.11 Station Road and benefits from an expansive rear garden.
- 1.2 The common boundary between nos.9 and 7 Station Road comprises of a low fence line that is immersed within a hedgerow. No.7 has several windows within its rear elevation including a bedroom window at first floor and a kitchen and drawing room window at ground floor. In addition the sitting out amenity area of that property is located immediately to its rear with doors opening out onto the rear garden. The application site is located within the village development framework of Oakington. There are examples of extensions within the street, with no.11 Station Road being extended at two-storeys to the rear.
- 1.3 The proposal comprises the erection of two storey rear and side extensions. The rear extension would project approximately 6.5m to the rear of the existing dwelling for a width of approximately 8.5m, set 1.5m off the common boundary with no.7 Station Road. The two-storey side extension would project approximately 2.5m from the existing side elevation and incorporate a hipped roof. The proposals would also involve the re-roofing of the dwelling and alterations to the elevations including new fenestration and the re-rendering of the property.

2.0 Planning History

- 2.1 None

3.0 Planning Policy

3.1 South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework, Development Control Policies, DPD, 2007:

DP/1 Sustainable Development
DP/2 Design of New development
DP/3 Development Criteria
DP/7 Development Frameworks

3.2 South Cambridgeshire LDF Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):
District Design Guide, SPD, adopted March 2010

3.3 Government Circulars:

Circular 11/95 – The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions: Advises that conditions should be necessary, relevant to planning, relevant to the development permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects.

Circular 05/2005 - Planning Obligations: Advises that planning obligations must be relevant to planning, necessary, directly related to the proposed development, fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind and reasonable in all other respect.

4.0 Consultation

4.1 Oakington Parish Council – Recommends approval.

4.2 Trees & Landscaping – Raises no objections.

5.0 Representations

5.1 4 letters of support of the application have been received from the occupants of nos.5, 7, 11 and 13 Station Road. These letters are identical.

6.0 Planning Comments – Key Issues

6.1 The key issues to consider in this instance are the impact of proposals upon the residential amenity of neighbouring dwellings, the public realm and the design of the dwelling house.

6.2 Public Realm:

6.2.1 The application site is partially screened by a tall *Leylandii* hedgerow at the site's frontage. However, there are views of the property from the north when approaching the village. There are also oblique views of the dwelling when exiting the village from the south. Furthermore, the landscaping to the frontage and side of the site is not afforded by any statutory protection and could be removed at any time.

6.2.2 The main element of the proposal that would be visible from the street scene would be the proposed two-storey side extension. This extension would not be subservient to the main dwelling in its height or its span and would involve the removal of the cat-slide element to the roof that is mimicked by the

adjoined property at no.7. Furthermore, the two-storey rear extension would be adjoined in line with the two-storey side element, which would significantly increase the span of the dwelling with no demarcation of where the existing dwelling stops and the extensions begin. This lack of visual articulation in either the form or use of materials of the extension would result in a prominent and incongruous built form that would dominate the dwelling from views from the north east when approaching the village from Westwick. Whilst the adjacent dwelling at no.11 has a large two-storey rear extension, this is set back from the side of the property and is subservient to the main dwelling and not prominent within the public realm.

6.3 Design:

- 6.3.1 There is no restriction on the size of household extensions as defined within local planning policy. However, the adopted District Design Guide SPD states that the scale of an extension and its position will normally emphasise a degree of subservience to the main building. This will usually involve a lower roof and eaves height, significantly smaller footprint, spans and lengths of elevations, and the use of different and traditionally subservient materials. It goes on to state that some buildings are more sensitive to extension than others. Symmetrically designed buildings may not be able to accommodate an extension without becoming unbalanced or dominated by the extension, or by detracting from the original design.
- 6.3.2 Notwithstanding the above, it is acknowledged that the proposed alterations to the dwelling, namely the re-rendering and fenestration changes to the principal elevation would be an improvement upon the aesthetics of the property. However, the extent of the proposed extensions would depart from the supplementary guidance within the District Design Guide. The proposal would double the footprint and span of the existing dwelling with a ridge height to match that of the existing. Furthermore, the extensions would provide no visual breaks or use of different materials to soften the scale of the impact of the proposals. It is considered that the above issues are important in this instance due to the fact that the property is one half of a pair of dwellings that share a high degree of symmetry. Therefore the proposals would unbalance the property and detract from its original form, resulting in poor quality design.

6.4 Residential Amenity:

- 6.4.1 The proposals are considered to be spatially divorced from the adjacent neighbouring property to the north at no.11 Station Road. Nevertheless, the adjoined property at no.7 Station Road would be within close proximity to the proposals and therefore is considered to be the most effected by the proposed development. The proposed two-storey side extension would be sited approximately 1.5m due north of the adjoined neighbouring property at no.7 Station Road. Due to this orientation it is considered that the proposed extensions would not result in a detrimental loss of sunlight to either habitable rooms or the immediate amenity area of no.7. The proposals would contain no windows that would overlook neighbouring properties and therefore no material loss of privacy would occur were the proposals to gain from planning permission.
- 6.4.2 Notwithstanding the above, the projection of approximately 6.5m at two-storey level within close proximity to this common boundary is considered to be

unduly overbearing upon the outlook of the amenity of no.7. Views from windows within the rear elevation of this property and that of the immediate amenity area to the rear of the property would be hindered by the sheer extent of the bulk and scale of the proposed rear extension. The rear extension would disrupt a 45-degree horizontal and 25-degree vertical angle from the centre of the garden area to the rear of the property. In light of this the proposal is considered to result in a poor outlook from this property as a result of being unduly overbearing to the detriment of the amenity that the occupiers of this property currently enjoy.

7.0 Conclusion:

- 7.1 Having regard to applicable national and local planning policies, and having taken all relevant material considerations into account, it is considered that planning permission should be refused in this instance.

8.0 Other Matters:

- 8.1 The above recommendation of refusal was discussed with the applicant with suggested amendments in order to address the concerns of officers. These revisions would be a reduction in the projection of the rear extension, in order to overcome the impact upon the adjacent residential property, whilst also enabling the extension to be more proportionate to that of the existing dwelling. In addition the provision of a recess between the side and rear extensions was discussed to help break up the scale and mass of the overall proposals, thus enabling the overall design to read as subservient to the main dwelling. These recommendations were not followed by the applicant, hence the recommendation of refusal.
- 8.2 If members are minded to approve the application against the recommendation of officers then it is considered that a condition should be imposed requiring details of the use of external materials are to be submitted to and approved in writing prior to development commencing on site.

9.0 Recommendation

Refuse

- 1. The proposals by virtue of the excessive rear projection of 6.5m at two-storey level, within close proximity to the common boundary would result in an unduly overbearing impact and poor outlook upon the amenity currently enjoyed by the occupiers of No.7 Station Road. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies DP/2 and DP/3 of the South Cambridgeshire Development Control Policies DPD, 2007, which states that planning permission will not be granted where the proposed development would have an unacceptable adverse impact upon residential amenity.**
- 2. The proposals by virtue of their excessive scale, mass and height would result in disproportionate additions that would dominate and unbalance the existing dwelling to the detriment of the building's design and views of the property from the public realm. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies DP/2, DP/3 and the District Design Guide SPD of the South Cambridgeshire Development Control**

Policies DPD, 2007, which states that all new development must be of high quality design and, as appropriate to the scale and nature of the development, should Preserve or enhance the character of the local area.

Contact Officer: Mike Jones - Senior Planning Assistant
01954 713253