

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

2 October 2013

AUTHOR/S: Planning and New Communities Director

S/1083/13/FL– KINGSTON

Demolition of existing dwelling and garage and erection of replacement dwelling and garage, North Farm House, Church Lane for Mr I MacMillan

Recommendation: Approval

Date for Determination: 4 September 2013

Notes:

This Application has been reported to the Planning Committee for determination as the officer recommendation of approval is contrary to the recommendation of refusal from the Parish Council

Members will visit the site on 1 October 2013

To be presented to the Committee by Paul Sexton

Site and Proposal

1. This full application, as amended by drawings received 6 August 2013, proposes the demolition of an existing detached house and garage, and the erection of a new dwelling and garage, on a 0.096ha plot of land to the west of Church Lane, at the edge of the village.
2. The site currently comprises a part single and part one and a half storey dwelling, with its ridgeline running at right angles to Church Lane. The lower section is towards Church Street. To the south of the house, and immediately abutting the southern boundary is a detached, flat roofed double garage set back from the road.
3. The proposed replacement dwelling, as amended, will be two-storey with a main ridge height of 8.2m, running parallel to the road. At the northern end the ridge height drops to 7.9m. The main dwelling will be set back between 10m and 12m from the road, with a double garage located in the front north east corner of the site. The garage will be gable to the road and will have a pitched roof, with a ridge height of 5.1m, and solar panels in the south west facing roof.
4. Materials proposed are brick and render, with clay plain tiles.
5. To the south west is Rose Hide House, a two-storey detached house. Opposite the site is a pair of brick and slate cottages set close to the road, with a detached house to the north, set well back and screened from Church Lane. Church Lane is rural land with no footpaths.
6. The site is located outside, but within 20m of the north boundary of, the Conservation Area, and 50m to the north of the Church.

7. The application is accompanied by a Design and Access Statement.

History

8. S/2092/11 – Erection of dwelling following demolition of existing – Withdrawn

Planning Policy

9. National Planning Policy Framework 2012

South Cambridgeshire LDF Core Strategy DPD 2007

10. ST/7 Infill Villages

Local Development Framework Development Control Policies 2007:

11. DP/1 Sustainable Development
DP/2 Design of New Development
DP/3 Development Criteria
DP/7 Development Frameworks
HG/1 Housing Density
CH/4 Development Within the Curtilage or Setting of a Listed Building
CH/5 Conservation Area
NE/1 Energy Efficiency
TR/2 Car and Cycle Parking Standards
12. South Cambridgeshire LDF Supplementary Planning Documents
District Design Guide SPD – adopted March 2010
Development Affecting Conservation Areas SPD
Listed Buildings SPD

Consultation by South Cambridgeshire District Council as Local Planning Authority

13. **Kingston Parish Council** recommends refusal of the application as originally submitted. 'As for the previous application ref S/2092/11 the proposed dwelling, by reason of its width and height has an overbearing effect on neighbouring houses. The occupants of these houses would suffer an unacceptable loss of amenity due to overlooking and dominant impact of the proposed new house. Despite the falling ground level to Rose Hide House to the proposed house, the first floor rooms, partially in the roof space, the roof ridge is still higher than that of Rose Hide House. The width of the proposed house in relation to the width of the plot brings it too close to the boundaries of each side.'

Comments on the amended drawings will be reported.

14. The **Environmental Health Officer** requests a condition restricting the hours of use of power operated machinery during the period of demolition and construction. Informatives should be included in any consent.
15. The **Conservation Manager** gave advice in respect of the design details of the house at the pre-application stage, which this submission has followed, however concern has been expressed about the scale of the proposed dwelling in relation to the setting of the Church at the application stage

Representations by Members of the Public

16. Letters have been received from the occupiers of Rose Hide House and West View, Church Lane and 1 Chantry Close objecting to the application, as originally submitted, on the following grounds:
- i. Too close to Rose Hide House, ignoring the general layout and character of the village. Houses are generally widely spaced with green areas in between. The width of the plot is sufficient to avoid placement of a new dwelling so close to the boundary. The District Council recently refused permission for another property in Kingston which was over 6.0m from its neighbour.
 - ii. The proposed layout would create a suburban aspect and entry to the village. The house is too large and out of proportion with nearby houses. The proportions should be changed so that it does not extend from boundary to boundary, with a less steep roof pitch which would lower the roof line.
 - iii. The new house would dominate and be oppressive when viewed from the Victorian cottages opposite, which are sited very close to the road.
 - iv. Loss of amenity to occupiers of Rose Hide House.
17. Comments on the revised drawings will be reported.

Material Planning Considerations

18. The site is within the village framework, although it is located at the northern edge of the village with the countryside beyond. The principle of development is therefore acceptable and therefore the key issues to consider in this case are the impact on the street scene and residential amenity.

Street scene

19. The proposed replacement dwelling represents a different approach to the development of the site, and would replace the existing modest scale property, which sits gable end to the road, with a larger dwelling, set further back into the site with its ridge running parallel to the road. The detached pitched roof garage would maintain the form of the front section of the existing dwelling.
20. The width of the proposed dwelling would be greater than that of Rose Hide House to the south, however it will be set further back into the site. The amended drawings reduce the width of the house from that originally proposed. The property will be set a minimum of 3.6m from the south boundary and 1.8m from the north boundary. The ridge height of the proposed dwelling will exceed that of the existing house to the south, however officers are of the view that its impact in the street scene, and at the edge of the village, will be acceptable
21. When entering the village from the north, the north elevation of the existing house is viewed with the Church to the left hand side of the road, although that building is located 50m to the south of the application site. The revised position and design of the proposed dwelling, will alter the relationship with the Church when entering the village, but officers are of the view that given the view will now be of the north elevation of the garage and the gable end of the replacement dwelling, which is set 12m back from the road, the relationship is acceptable.

Residential amenity

22. Although the flat roofed garage of the existing property is set on the boundary with Rose Hide House to the south, the main dwelling is currently set approximately 8m from the southern boundary, with a large bedroom window in the south facing elevation, which overlooks the garden of Rose Hide House. The new dwelling, as amended will be set closer to the boundary than the existing house and taller, but will be gable end to the adjacent house. The front wall of the new dwelling will be set marginally further forward than the rear wall of Rose Hide House, and as amended at its closest will be 3.6m from the boundary, compared to 2m as originally submitted. There are no windows proposed in the gable end facing Rose Hide House.
23. Having viewed the site from the garden of Rose Hide House, which slopes down from the rear of the dwelling, officers were of the view that the proposed dwelling, in the location originally submitted, would have an overbearing impact when viewed from the garden of that property. These concerns were not expressed at the pre-application stage, when advice would have been given without the benefit of the visit to the neighbouring property. The amended drawings move the proposed dwelling a further 1.6m from the boundary. Although the proposed dwelling will be more prominent than the existing when viewed from the garden of Rose Hide House, on balance, officers are of the view that the impact will not be such as to warrant refusal of the application on these grounds.
24. The location of the site to the north of Rose Hide House, means that there will be no unreasonable loss of sunlight to that property.
25. The existing house is viewed from both ground and first floor windows of the cottages on the opposite side of Church Lane. The front of the proposed dwelling will be 21.15m from the front wall of the adjacent cottages. As amended the windows at first floor level facing the road will serve a bedroom, bathroom and an ensuite. The two latter windows can be obscure glazed by condition. Officers do not consider that overlooking from a single bedroom window, at the distance proposed, will result in an unreasonable loss of amenity to the occupiers of the properties opposite the site.
26. The outlook from both the ground and first floor windows of the properties opposite the site will be changed as a result of the proposal. At the present time these look out onto the lower front gable to the existing house, with views out of the village beyond. The proposed dwelling, whilst set further 8m back into the site, will be higher than the existing dwelling and occupy a greater width of the site. Although the outlook from these properties will be changed officers are of the view that any overbearing impact or loss of light will not be such to warrant a refusal of the application on these grounds.

Other matters

27. It was agreed at the pre-application stage that as the proposal is for a replacement dwelling, with no net increase in the number of bedrooms, a Section 106 Agreement in respect of open space and community infrastructure contributions would not be required in this case.

Conclusion

28. The proposed dwelling is larger in scale than the existing which it will replace, however officers are of the view that whilst it will have a greater impact on the street

scene and neighbouring properties, that impact is not such as to warrant refusal of the application.

Recommendation

29. Approve subject to conditions to include:

3 year time limit

Approved plans

Details of materials

No further windows – first floor south elevation

Obscure glazing to bathroom and ensuite in front elevation

Restriction of operation of power driven machinery during period of demolition and construction

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 Development Framework Development Control Policies (adopted July 2007)
- Planning File Ref: S/1083/13/FL and S/2092/11

Case Officer: Paul Sexton – Principal Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713255