

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

2 March 2011

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

**S/0116/11 – OAKINGTON & WESTWICK
Extensions - 9, Station Road, Oakington
for Councillor Thomas Bygott**

Recommendation: Refusal

Date for Determination: 23rd March 2011

Notes:

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

Site and Proposal

- 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.
- 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.
- 3 The proposal comprises the erection of two storey rear and side extensions. The rear extension would project approximately 5m to the rear of the existing dwelling for a width of approximately 8.4m, set 1.5m off the common boundary with no.7 Station Road. The two-storey side extension would project approximately 1.5m 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.

Planning History

4. Planning Application S/1700/10 for a two storey side and rear extension was refused due to the detrimental impact upon the street scene and the amenity of the adjacent neighbouring dwelling at no.7 Station Road. Members of the Planning Committee visited the site in the course of their consideration of the application.

Planning Policy

5. 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
6. South Cambridgeshire LDF Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):
District Design Guide, SPD, adopted March 2010
7. 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.

Consultation

8. Oakington Parish Council – No comments have been received.

Representations

9. None have been received.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

10. 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.

Public Realm

11. 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 any statutory protection and could be removed at any time.
12. 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 be

subservient to the main dwelling in height but not its in span and would involve the removal of the cat-slide element to the roof that is presently mirrored by the attached property at no.7, providing symmetry. However, the proposed two-storey rear extension would be articulated from the existing dwelling by way of a stepped building line and chimneybreast. Despite the span of the extension this visual articulation would soften the prominent length and scale of the extension from views from the northeast when approaching the village from Westwick. The adjacent dwelling at no.11 also has a large two-storey rear extension, which is set back from the side of the property and is subservient to the main dwelling and not prominent within the public realm.

Design

13. 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 should 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.
14. 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 in part from the supplementary guidance within the District Design Guide. The proposal would approximately double the footprint and span of the existing dwelling despite a lower ridge height than that of the existing dwelling. The visual breaks and use of different materials would however soften the scale of the impact of the proposals upon public views of the building. The above issues are considered to be important, as the property is one half of a pair of dwellings that share a high degree of symmetry. Nevertheless, whilst the proposals would unbalance the property and detract from its original form, the degree of subservience and use of alternative materials is considered to mitigate this impact. As a consequence the proposals are considered to be appropriate design.

Residential Amenity

15. The proposed side extension would be spatially divorced from the adjacent neighbouring property to the north at no.11 Station Road. The proposal would however introduce a bedroom window upon its north elevation that would overlook the side elevation of the neighbouring property at no.11 Station Road at a distance of 15m. No.11 has roof light windows within this side elevation and therefore a material loss of privacy would occur to the dwelling and to its rear garden. During pre-application discussions the applicant was advised that the adopted design guide states that a distance of 25m from window to window is the guideline to safeguard overlooking.
16. The attached property at no.7 Station Road would be within close proximity to the proposals and would therefore be the most affected by the proposed

development. The proposed two-storey rear extension would be sited approximately 1.5m north of the boundary with the attached 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.

16. The rear projection of 4.9m at two-storey level within close proximity to the common boundary with no.7 Station Road is considered to be unduly overbearing upon the outlook and 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 currently enjoy. The applicant was advised during pre-application discussion to reduce the depth of the extension to 4m in order to overcome this issue or move the extension further from the boundary.

Conclusion

17. 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.

Recommendation

18. **Refuse** for the following reasons:
 1. **The proposed rear extension, by virtue of the excessive rear projection of 4.9m 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 proposed first floor bedroom window within the side elevation of the proposed side extension would overlook the house and garden of the adjacent residential property at no.11 Station Road to an unacceptable degree. No.11 Station Road has roof light windows within its south facing elevation at a distance of approximately 15m from the proposed bedroom window within no.9 Station Road. As a consequence these windows and the rooms to which they serve would be overlooked to the detriment of the privacy of the occupier of this property. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies DP/2 and DP/3 of the South Cambridgeshire Development Control Policies DPD, 2007, which state that planning permission will not be granted where the proposed development would have an unacceptable adverse impact upon residential amenity.**

Contact Officer: Mike Jones – Senior Planning Officer – 01954 713253