

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee
AUTHOR/S: Planning and New Communities Director

7 August 2013

**S/1196/13/FL – Dwelling house
38 Prentice Close, Longstanton CB24 3DY
For Mr F Monaghan**

Recommendation: Refusal

Date for Determination: 26 July 2013

Notes:

This Application has been reported to the Planning Committee for determination at the request of the Team Leader due to conflicting pre-application advice.

Members will visit this site on 6 August 2013

To be presented to the Committee by Rebecca Ward

Site and Proposal

1. This full planning application seeks permission for a dwelling house.
2. The application site is located in the village development framework of Longstanton, outside of the conservation area and not close to any listed buildings. The site was formally part of the rear garden of No.36 High Street under planning reference S/0287/10. The land has been since divided up and is now owned by the applicant of No.38 Prentice Close. The site is predominately unused for any purpose.
3. No.36 High Street is a bungalow with the rear garden backing onto the proposed application site. The application site also abuts the rear of No.34 High Street which is a veterinary practice.
4. The property to the north east (No.38 Prentice Close) is a two storey property with a single garage located along the shared southwest boundary with the application site. The entrance onto the site is proposed via that of No.38, thus aiming to avoid the area of land that runs parallel with Prentice Close from the High Street. This land is owned by the residents of Prentice Close as communal garden land.
5. A previous application was refused under delegated powers (S/1874/12/FL) for a two storey dwelling, see reasons below; further to this pre application discussion was had with officers to find an acceptable scheme.
6. The amended application seeks permission for a one and a half storey detached dwelling house with two bedrooms, parking allocation for up to two

cars and small patio/garden area. The plot has an area of 230m² which would be accessed via a shared drive with No.38.

Planning History

7. **S/0297/10/FL** Approved – Dwelling (No.36)

S/1874/12/FL Refused – Dwelling

- The design of the dwelling was not considered appropriate with its location in terms of scale, sitting or design in relation to the surrounding area.
- The height of the ridge (7m) and the distance from the boundary (1m) was considered to have an unacceptable overbearing impact to the occupiers of No.36.

PRE/0521/12/FL Advice sort for a one and a half storey dwelling

Planning Policy

8. **South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy, adopted January 2007**

DP/1 Sustainable Development

DP/2 Design of new Development

DP/3 Development Criteria

DP/4 Infrastructure and New Development

DP/7 Development Frameworks

HG/1 Housing Density

SF/10 Outdoor Play space, Informal open space and new developments

SF/11 Open Space Standards

TR/2 Car and Cycle Parking Standards

District Design Guide (Adopted March 2010) SPD

Consultation by South Cambridgeshire District Council as Local Planning Authority

9. **Parish Council** The Parish Council objected to the proposal for the following reasons:

- Location of the land is historically the garden of the High Street property and not Prentice Close therefore access should be via the High Street.
- Prentice Close has a specified number of developments i.e. 38
- Number 38 has already been extended and it is felt that this development is too large for the remaining plot
- Access is insufficient for potentially 4-5 cars.

If SCDC do approve the development the PC would like a condition to be that no access for developers or residents is to be via Hatton's Park, which is unsuitable due to the location of the primary school.

10. **Local Highways Authority** Conditions to be added in the case of approval; visibility splays, driveway is constructed in a bound material, no water from the site drains across the adopted public highway. A further informative added to ensure the developer does not carry out works within or disturbance to the public highway.

Representations by members of the public

11. Representations were received by No.32 and No.2 Prentice Close, No.34 and No.36 High Street, Prentice Close Residents Association. Material matters raised are as follows;
- Not in keeping with the area
 - Overdevelopment of the site
 - Potential to cause on street parking
 - Removal of front garden for the drive
 - Construction traffic causing impacts to the High Street
 - Private land being damaged during construction
 - Noise and light pollution to No.36 (bound material and fencing should be used)
 - Over looking to veterinary premises.
 - Potential to open up a rear access from No.38

Material Planning Considerations

12. The main impacts of this proposal are with regard to neighbouring amenity and impact upon the street scene. Whilst the Local Highway Authority have not raised any objections with regards to highway safety a number of objections have been received from members of the public so it will be addressed in the following comments. The applicant has submitted a draft heads of terms with regard to offsite contributions which will require the completion of a S106 agreement should the application be approved.

Neighbouring amenity

13. The proposal is for a detached one and a half storey dwelling with a ridge height of 6m and approximately 3m to the eaves. The proposed dwelling is to be located 3m from the shared boundary of No.36 High Street. The distance between these two units at the closest point is 10m, 15m at its furthest point. Due to the siting of the proposed dwelling the closest rear opening of No.36 would be offset from the blank elevation. Therefore it is not considered to cause significant harm to the outlook from No.36.
14. The proposal is not considered to have an overbearing effect on the garden amenity space of No.36 due to its positioning 3m from the shared boundary. Furthermore any over shadowing will only be apparent in morning and cover a corner of the south west boundary. Therefore it is not considered to cause significant harm.
15. The rear garden to the proposed unit is quite shallow equating to 5.3m in depth. Whilst this is in close proximity to the rear car park of the veterinary practice, the dormer window on the rear elevation can be conditioned so that it is obscure glazed and non-opening unless the parts which can be open are 1.7m above floor. The roof lights can be conditioned to sit above 1.7m of floor level to reduce from any further overlooking. All of which have been agreed by the agent/applicant.
16. Notwithstanding the above the scheme is considered to have an acceptable impact on occupiers of No.36 High Street and the vets.

Impact to street scene

17. The unit has been positioned closer to No.38 in order to resolve neighbouring amenity impacts to No.36. In doing this it has created a narrow gap between No.38 and the proposed unit, giving it a cramped appearance that is not in keeping with the rest of Prentice Close.
18. The design of the property is unlike any other in the street scene or the immediate vicinity. The dormer windows are unfamiliar in the wider area of Longstanton and as a result the development would appear dominant in the street scene. In previous pre application discussion an informal view was given that the unit would grade between No.36 High Street (bungalow) and No.38 Prentice Close (two storey house). However it is considered that these properties are viewed from the public realm along two different streets rather than a group. As such the proposed dwelling would be out of context and not reflect local distinctiveness.
19. The front garden of No.38 will be converted into an area of hard landscaping for the provision of car parking spaces. In correspondence with the agent a landscaping scheme was agreed to soften the appearance of the new hard surfacing to the front of No.38 with additional shrubs and small trees (see *drawing 5988/2 as amended 20 June 2013*). Whilst it would see the loss of a front garden the landscaping provision will help the ease in which the bound drive sits in with the street scene.

Parking and highway safety

20. The application site is proposed to be accessed via the existing access of No.38 Prentice Close and the LHA has not raised any concerns with regard to this approach. Shared accesses are no uncommon and in this instance it would appear to be the most practical. Due to the proximity of the drive to neighbouring amenity, any approval should be condition to ensure the drive is made from a bound material so the noise of parking cars is kept to a minimal.
21. The dwelling will have two onsite parking spaces and the turning point will be provided on the shared access with No.38. As proposed the scheme meets the requirements set out by policy TP/2 of the Local Development Framework. Concerns were expressed about on street parking, however as there is no parking restrictions in Prentice Close and the proposal meets the relevant criteria set out by the said policy it is not considered be a concern.

Other considerations

22. As previously addressed the car parking spaces to the unit will sit opposite an opening belonging to No.36 High Street. At present a 1.8m high fence sits along this boundary and in the amended block plan this will remain in place. Therefore any light pollution from parking cars will be obscured.
23. Due to the substantial separation between No.38 and No.36 Prentice Close, the proposed car parking arrangement at the front of No.38 is not considered to cause significant harm in terms of light pollution to the occupiers of No.38
24. If minded for approval conditions could be put in place to control construction traffic preventing the use of the 'Association' land for storage of materials and the protection of the trees located outside of the application area.

25. Concerns were raised over the potential to access the site through Hattons Park to the rear of No.38. This aspect was not included on the planning permission set before us and therefore has not been considered in this decision.
26. Comments stating that access should be made via the High Street and the specific number of dwellings on Prentice Close should be kept to 38, are not material planning considerations and have not been taken into account in this decision.

Conclusion

27. Whilst neighbouring amenity issues have been resolved in this application, the alterations to the scale, siting and design of the proposed dwelling are not considered to overcome the dominant and incongruous appearance of the unit upon the street scene.
28. Therefore having regard to nation and local planning policy and taken all other considerations into account it is considered that planning permission should not be granted in this instance.

Recommendation

29. It is recommended that the Planning Committee refuses the application for the following reasons;

The design of the dwelling is not considered to be appropriate with its location in terms of scale, siting or design in relation to the surrounding area. These factors combined cause harm to the street scene and adversely impact the character of the local area. The proposal therefore is considered to create an unduly prominent building that is contrary to the requirements of policy DP/2 a and f. and DP/3 I. of the Local Development Framework Development Control Policies adopted 2007 which aims to prevent development that is not of high quality design or has an adverse impact on the village character.

Conditions

In the case of any approval the following conditions should be attached;

- (a) Timescales
- (b) Approved plans
- (c) Restriction to rear first floor openings
- (d) Drive to be constructed in bound material
- (e) Visibility splays
- (f) Water run-off
- (g) Control construction traffic – preventing use of the 'Association' land for storage of materials.

Informatives

In the case of any approval the following informatives should be attached;

- (a) Works are not carried out in disturbance with the public highway

Background Papers

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

- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy (adopted January 2007)
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 (Delete as appropriate)
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 (Delete as appropriate)
- Planning File Ref: (These documents need to be available for public inspection.)
- Documents referred to in the report including appendices on the website only and reports to previous meetings

Case Officer: Rebecca Ward- Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713236