

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee 2 March 2011
AUTHOR/S: Executive Director / Corporate Manager – Planning and New
Communities

S/2058/10 – WESTON COLVILLE
Dwelling – Land South of Springhill Lodge, Brinkley Road
For Mr & Mrs Chennells

Recommendation: Approval conditionally

Date for Determination: 24 January 2011

Further Information received after publication of the agenda report.

Comments received from Mr Kerby of Springwood Church End regarding the amended drawings (Mr Kerby circulated his comments to Members by email on 22 February 2011):

1. The revised drawing does not resolve any issues that the plot is too narrow for the proposed development and that the slope of the plot makes a deep narrow building unacceptable. The applicants' agent stated that there were examples of plots in the locality in similar width, however, it is not the case given that detached properties at Church End are well spaced. Only the row of old terrace houses is on similar width plots but this is not comparable.
2. The concern about the front building line of the proposed dwelling set forward from the dwelling at Springwood has not been addressed. Given that trees at the application site were removed, the proposed development would be visible from Springwood and therefore the close proximity and forward position of the proposed dwelling would cause unacceptable loss of amenity.
3. The split level height of the single storey rear element does not resolve the issue of the ground floor heights of the proposed dwelling due to the depth of the building and the narrow sloping plot.
4. The rear facing patio doors are directly next to the shared boundary with Springwood. Presumably there will be a patio area, a 1.75m high person will be above the fence line when looking out the windows directly adjacent to fence and would result in overlooking to Springwood. The level difference of the site and the relative floor level of the proposed dwelling should be marked up on drawings.
5. The existing three properties, Springhill Lodge, Springwood and Fenfire at Church End, have a step in ground level at the back of the properties. Loss of privacy is minimised due to the normal depth of the buildings and the space between buildings.
6. The applicants could develop to the north of the existing house at Springhill Lodge as the building shown on the drawing blocking access to the north side of the property does not exist.

7. If permission is to be given, it should be within the existing building line of Springwood and with a sensible distance from the shared boundary in excess of 2m so to minimise the effects of the level difference of the site.

Agenda report paragraph number 6– Agent’s response to the further comments of Mr Kerby of Springwood:

1. The fenestration shown to the rear/ west elevation of the kitchen is not identified as including any doors and could be fixed casement style glazing, therefore, it would be no logical reason to assume that a patio area would be sited adjacent to Springwood. Any view from the kitchen would be directly to the countryside beyond the site and at an oblique angle and would not cause an unacceptable level of overlooking.
2. Members should note at the site visit that the garden area of Springwood nearest to the site is used for garden shed and greenhouse and the main private amenity area of the rear garden is located at the far end of the property’s curtilage. The main habitable accommodation of Springwood is also set away from the site.

Planning comments

Comments made by the occupiers of Springwood were addressed in the report to Planning Committee of 2 February 2011. The recommendation is one of approval subject to conditions.

Contact Officer: Emily Ip – Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713250