

## SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

---

**REPORT TO:** Development and Conservation Control Committee      2<sup>nd</sup> November 2005  
**AUTHOR/S:** Director of Development Services

---

### **S/1787/05/F – Fowlmere Extensions at Burnaby, Thriplow Road for Mr and Mrs M Townend**

**Recommendation: Approval  
Date for Determination: 14<sup>th</sup> November 2005**

#### **Members to visit the site on the 31<sup>st</sup> October 2005**

#### **Site and Proposal**

1. Burnaby is a large detached property that sits within a roughly triangular curtilage at the junction of Thriplow Road and Cambridge Road. The property faces the rear gardens and rear elevations of two other residential properties, all of which, together with Burnaby, fall within the Fowlmere village framework.
2. The full planning application received on the 19<sup>th</sup> September 2005 proposes to extend the dwellinghouse by way of a two-storey asymmetrically ridged roof extension on the north west elevation, extending by 3.4m in depth to a height of 7.1m, and a bay window on the south west elevation.

#### **Planning History**

3. Outline planning consent was granted for four dwellinghouses, including the three aforementioned properties, under **S/0181/87/O**.
4. Consent was granted for the extension of Burnaby in 2003 under application reference **S/1297/03/F**. In the same year an application for the siting of a storage building and boundary fences was granted under **S/2057/03/F**.
5. A second letter of objection received from the owners/occupiers of 2 Cambridge Road. The large part of this letter is concerned with addressing the points made in the agent's covering letter about the extensions of other properties in this group of dwellings. Their main objection is that the two-storey element does not comply with policy HG12 as it extends largely to the edges of the site and up to the boundary with their property. They believe that the design and location of the proposed extension will adversely affect their property. The whole effect will be of a very large and imposing structure adjacent to their boundary which will give an unacceptable sense of enclosure both from their garden and from the main living rooms of their property. The mass of the proposed extension is unduly overbearing and a clear overdevelopment of the site when viewed from their property, that will affect their outlook. The final objection relates to the obscure glazed windows that they believe could be opened and directly overlook their garden.
6. Earlier this year a similar application (**S/1015/05/F**) for a two-storey extension on the north west elevation of the property and a bay window to the rear was refused due to the fact that it would have had an overbearing impact upon the occupiers of number 2

Cambridge Road and would have resulted in an unacceptable degree of overlooking of the said property's rear garden.

### **Planning Policy**

7. **Policy HG12 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings within Frameworks'** sets out requirements for development of dwellings within frameworks having regard to impact upon neighbour amenity and the street scene.

### **Consultation**

8. **Fowlmere Parish** Council recommends that the application be refused.

### **Representations**

9. One letter of objection received from the owner/occupiers of Pear Tree House (formally Dunedin), who believe that the extension would impact upon their property and harm their amenity as neighbours. They also believe that any further extension of Burnaby would be an unacceptable overdevelopment of the plot, given that the four houses there are closely spaced and are on relatively small plots which closely interact with each other. Any such extension will be out of keeping with, and clearly detrimental to, the four houses.

### **Planning Comments – Key Issues**

10. The key issues to consider when determining this application are whether the proposed two-storey element constitutes a development that is out of keeping with the character of the area and whether it would have an unacceptable impact upon neighbour amenity by virtue of being unduly overbearing. Neither during the determination of this application nor during the determination of the previous application has there been any objections relating to the proposed bay window.

### **Impact upon amenity**

11. The two-storey element of the previously refused application had a first floor opening in the north west elevation that was used as a reason for refusal, due to the unacceptable level of overlooking that would have occurred. This window has subsequently been reduced in size and obscure glazed. If consent is granted a condition will be used to require that this opening be maintained with obscure glazing and non-opening.
12. Although the footprint of the extension has not altered from that of the refused application the overall height has been reduced by 0.5m. Moreover the asymmetrical roof design has taken the apex away from number 2 Cambridge Road and the reduction in the north east eaves height has lessened the visual impact upon the said property. The closest point of the extension will be approximately 2m from the property boundary with number 2 Cambridge Road and, due to the reduction in the eaves height, will be 2.7m in height. This shared boundary is defined by a close-boarded fence and two mature trees on the applicants' side. Although these trees would not totally screen the development they would help to lessen the visual bulk of the extension.

### **Character of the Area and Overdevelopment of the Site**

13. Although consent was originally granted for Burnaby along with three other properties there is no uniformity to the group of dwellings in terms of their design (due to the fact that they have all been extended in some way), curtilage or orientation. Burnaby should be seen as a separate entity and not as part of a group of dwellings that are of no particular historic or architectural interest and are not located in an area of special protection.
14. The curtilage in which Burnaby sits is relatively generous, as are those of the adjacent properties, and there would still be ample garden land left for the occupiers' enjoyment. The development is therefore not considered to constitute an overdevelopment of the site, or to be detrimental to the character of the area.

### **Recommendation**

15. Approval – Subject to the following conditions
  - a. Standard Condition A – Time limited permission (Reason A) - 3 years.
  - b. Sc22 – No windows at first floor level in the north west elevation of the development (Rc22);
  3. Sc23 The first floor window in the northwest elevation of the extension, hereby permitted, shall be fitted and permanently maintained with obscured glass. (Rc22).

### **Reasons for Approval**

1. The development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policy:
  - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004: HG12** (Extensions and Alterations to dwellings within frameworks)
2. The development is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations which have been raised during the consultation exercise:
  - Residential amenity (overbearing)
  - Character of the Area (overdevelopment)

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

- South Cambridgeshire local Plan 2004
- Planning File Refs: S/1787/05/F and S/1015/05/F

**Contact Officer:** Edward Durrant – Planning Assistant  
Telephone: (01954) 713082