

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

3 August 2011

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

S/0919/11 - CONINGTON
Erection of two storey side extension including demolition of existing garages
2 Elsworth Road, Conington
for Mr & Mrs Holmes

Recommendation: Refuse

Date for Determination: 29 June 2011

The application has been referred to the Planning Committee at the request of Councillor Wright.

Site and Proposal

1. The application site is a two storey, semi-detached house with a single storey extension to the rear and a flat roof, attached garage to the side. The house is located to the South of Conington, outside of the Development Framework in the countryside. The South side and rear boundaries of the site are enclosed by timber post and rail fencing and trees. There is vehicle access from the road to the front. To the South side and rear of the site there is open countryside.
2. The proposed development is the erection of a two storey side and rear extension, including the demolition of the existing attached garage.

Relevant Planning History

3. C/0391/65/D – Planning permission granted for the erection of the attached garage to the side of the property.

Planning Policies

4. **DP/2** Design of New Development
DP/3 Development Criteria
HG/6 Extensions to Dwellings in the Countryside

Consultations

5. Parish Council – has recommended approval.

Representations

6. One representation has been received in respect of the proposed development, from the owner of the attached property to the North, No. 1 Elsworth Road, supporting the proposed development.

Planning Comments

7. The main planning considerations in this case are the Impact on the countryside and the impact on residential amenity.
8. Impact on the countryside – The proposed development has been considered under policy HG/6 – Extensions to Dwellings in the Countryside as the site falls outside of the Development Framework of Conington. The policy seeks to prevent incremental harm to the openness of the countryside from large extensions and maintain a stock of smaller and medium sized dwellings in countryside areas.
9. The extension is clearly in compliance with clauses (a), (b) and (e) of the policy as it would not create a separate dwelling, is no higher than the main house and is of a permanent design and construction.
10. HG/6 (c) requires that the extension does not lead to a 50% increase or more in volume or gross internal floor area of the original dwelling. In this case, the original property is not considered to include the single storey rear extension which appears to be post 1948, and therefore has a gross internal floor area (GIA) of approximately 95 sqm. The combination of the existing rear extension and the proposed two storey extension would provide approximately 94 sqm of total GIA, resulting in almost a 100% increase. This is double the limit set by the policy and the proposed extension is therefore contrary to clause (c) of policy HG/6. In addition, the property currently has 3 bedrooms and is considered to be a medium sized dwelling. The two storey extension would provide two further bedrooms and is considered to result in the loss of a small or medium sized dwelling, something that the policy specifically seeks to prevent.
11. With regard to clause (d) of HG/6, extensions to dwellings in the countryside are required to be in scale and character with the existing property and to not materially change the impact of the dwelling on the surrounding countryside. In isolation, the design of the proposed two storey side extension is broadly in scale with the existing property set down from the ridge slightly and back from the main front elevation. The rear element is set down further from the side element and has a narrower span. Although the large wrap around windows are not particularly characteristic of the main house, the scale of the extensions relate reasonably well to the existing house. However, clause (d) also requires that the proposed extension not materially change the impact of the dwelling on its surroundings. The combination of the two storey extension to the side of the property which would significantly increase the width of the property and the two storey element of the extension which extends further to the rear would significantly increase the impact of the dwelling on the openness of the countryside and materially increase the impact of the dwelling on its surroundings. This is contrary to the aim of the policy which is to prevent the incremental loss of openness of the countryside.
12. The proposed extension is therefore considered to be harmful in terms of its impact on the countryside and unacceptable in terms of policy HG/6 clauses (c) and (d) and also to policies DP/2 and DP/3.
13. Impact on the residential amenity – The proposed extension is far enough from the nearest neighbouring properties that it would not cause any significant loss of light, visual intrusion or overshadowing. The future insertion of windows into the first floor of the North side of the extension could be controlled by condition, to successfully mitigate any potential overlooking of the neighbouring property, protecting current

levels of privacy.

Recommendation

14. Having regard to applicable national and local planning policies, and having taken all relevant material considerations into account, it is recommended that the application be refused Planning Permission, for the following reason(s):
 1. The proposed development, by virtue of the scale and massing of the two storey extension to the side and rear of the property resulting in a 99% increase in floor area over the original dwelling, would materially increase the impact of the dwelling on the countryside and result in a loss of openness and consequent harm to the character of the area. In addition, the increase in the size of the property would result in the loss of a small or medium sized dwelling in the countryside and contribute towards the gradual reduction in the stock of such dwellings in countryside areas. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies HG/6, DP/2 and DP/3 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies DPD 2007.

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

- **Local Development Framework Development Control Policies 2007**
- **Circular 11/95 – The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions**
- **Planning File ref: S/0919/11**

Contact Officer: Daniel Smith - Planning Officer
01954 713162