

Case No: 0900058FUL (FULL PLANNING APPLICATION)
Proposal: ALTERATIONS AND EXTENSION TO FORM A NEW DWELLING
Location: 28 KISBY AVENUE
Applicant: MRS A AND MISS M BEARD
Grid Ref: 525393 270344
Date of Registration: 14.01.2009
Parish: GODMANCHESTER

RECOMMENDATION - REFUSE

1. DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND APPLICATION

- 1.1 The site relates to a semi detached dwelling sited within a residential estate to the east of Godmanchester. The application site is located to the end of the cul-de-sac; to the rear of the property is a flat roof single storey projection. There is an existing detached garage to the side of the property that adjoins the neighbouring property's garage; this is accessed from a shared driveway.
- 1.2 The application seeks the demolition of the applicant's garage and the single storey rear projection and the erection of a two storey side and rear extension to form a new terraced dwelling. The additional dwelling is to be approximately 3.6 metres wide, 10 metres deep, 4.8 metres high to the eaves and 7.5 metres high to the ridge; there is also to be a sloping roof canopy over the existing front door and the frontage of the proposed dwelling. The rear garden is to be divided almost in half with the existing dwelling having a garden approximately 5.6 metres wide and the new dwelling a rear garden approx. 4.4 metres wide. The extension to the rear will provide a larger kitchen to the existing dwelling after the removal of the flat roof projection and a larger bathroom at first floor level for the existing dwelling; this allows for the creation of an en-suite in place of the current bathroom. It is proposed to have parking to the front of the dwelling, one parking space is provided for the new dwelling and two for the existing; there is also to be a cycle locking frame and bin store to the front of the dwellings.

2. NATIONAL GUIDANCE

- 2.1 **PPS1: "Delivering Sustainable Development" (2005)** contains advice on the operation of the plan-led system.

- 2.2 **PPS3: “Housing” (2006)** sets out how the planning system supports the growth in housing completions needed in England.
- 2.3 **PPG13: “Transport” (2001)** contains objectives to integrate planning and transport at the national, regional, strategic and local level and to promote more sustainable transport choices for carrying people and for moving freight.

For full details visit the government website <http://www.communities.gov.uk> and follow the links to planning, Building and Environment, Planning, Planning Policy.

3. **PLANNING POLICIES**

Further information on the role of planning policies in deciding planning applications can also be found at the following website: <http://www.communities.gov.uk> then follow links Planning, Building and Environment, Planning, Planning Information and Guidance, Planning Guidance and Advice and then Creating and Better Place to Live

3.1 **East of England Plan - Revision to the Regional Spatial Strategy (May 2008)**

Policies viewable at <http://www.go-east.gov.uk> then follow links to Planning, Regional Planning then Related Documents

- **H1:** “Regional Housing Provision 2001 to 2021” – Local Planning Authorities should facilitate the delivery of district housing allocations – 11,200 for Huntingdonshire.
- **T14:** “Parking” – controls to manage transport demand and influencing travel change alongside measures to improve public transport accessibility, walking and cycling should be encouraged. Maximum parking standards should be applied to new residential development.
- **ENV7:** “Quality in the Built Environment” - requires new development to be of high quality which complements the distinctive character and best qualities of the local area and promotes urban renaissance and regeneration.

3.2 **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003)**

Saved policies from the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 are relevant and viewable at <http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk> follow the links to environment, planning, planning policy and Structure Plan 2003.

- No specific policies from the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003) are relevant to this application.

3.3 **Huntingdonshire Local Plan (1995)**

Saved policies from the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995 are relevant and viewable at www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/localplan95

- **En25:** "General Design Criteria" - indicates that the District Council will expect new development to respect the scale, form, materials and design of established buildings in the locality and make adequate provision for landscaping and amenity areas.
- **H31:** "Residential privacy and amenity standards" – Indicates that new dwellings will only be permitted where appropriate standards of privacy can be maintained and adequate parking provided.
- **H34** - Development should have regard to the amenity and privacy of adjoining neighbours.

3.4 **Huntingdonshire Local Plan Alterations (2002)**

Saved policies from the Huntingdon Local Plan Alterations 2002 are relevant and viewable at www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/localplan - Then click on "Local Plan Alteration (2002)

- **STR1** – District Hierarchy - Outlines the settlement hierarchy. Housing developments up to and including estate scale may proceed.
- **STR2** - Provides definitions for housing development – Infilling: the filling of an undeveloped plot in an otherwise built-up frontage by no more than two dwellings. Subject to other Local Plan policies.
- **STR3** – Market Towns – are Huntingdon; Godmanchester; St Neots; St Ives; Ramsey and Bury.
- **HL5** - States that good design and layout will be required for new housing development which makes efficient use of land, respects the townscape, provides an appropriate mix, incorporates landscaping, creates safe places and promotes energy efficiency
- **HL6** - Requires densities of between 30 and 50 dwellings per hectare.
- **HL7** - Support will normally be given to the re-use of previously developed land, the re-use of empty properties, and the conversion of underused dwellings or other buildings, for housing.

3.5 **Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007**

Policies from the Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007 are relevant and viewable at <http://www.huntsdc.gov.uk> click on Environment and Planning, then Planning then Planning+Policy then Informal policy statements where there is a link to Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007

- **G2** – The introduction of incongruous or intrusive elements into views (by virtue of the development's siting, scale, form, colour or use of materials) should be avoided.

- **B1** - Development should demonstrate a high quality of design.
- **B2** – Proposals should make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of streets and public spaces.
- **B4** - States development should not have an unacceptable impact upon amenity in terms of:
 - Access to daylight and sunlight
 - Privacy
 - Noise and disturbance
 - Air quality, light spillage and other forms of pollution
 - Safety and security
 - The resultant physical relationships would be oppressive or overbearing.
- **H2** – Housing Density - lists the minimum density standards housing developments should achieve. Within or adjacent to key centres: 35-55 dwellings per hectare.
- **T1** - States a development proposal should be capable of being served by safe convenient access to the transport network and do not give rise to traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of the local transport network
- **T2** - States development proposals should limit car parking and provide cycle parking facilities

3.6 **Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework submission Core Strategy 2008**

Policies from the Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework submission Core Strategy 2008 are relevant and viewable at <http://www.huntsdc.gov.uk> click on Environment and Planning then click on Planning and then click on Planning Policy where there is a link to the Local Development Framework Core Strategy.

- **CS3**: “The Settlement Hierarchy” – identifies Godmanchester as ‘Key Service Centres’ in which development schemes of moderate and minor scale and infilling may be appropriate within the built up area.

3.7 Huntingdonshire Design Guide (2007); Chapter Two: House Extensions and Residential ‘Infilling’; Chapter Four: House Design and Detailing.

3.8 Communities and Local Government Department for Transport Manual for Streets (2007); Chapter 8: Parking

4. PLANNING HISTORY

4.1 0801366FUL – alterations and extensions to dwelling to form a new dwelling – permission refused (7.7.08)

- 4.2 The previously refused application was almost identical to the current proposal however it sought a flat roofed canopy over the existing and proposed front doors. **(copy attached as Green Paper)**

5. CONSULTATIONS

- 5.1 **Godmanchester Town Council recommends APPROVAL (copy attached).**

6. REPRESENTATIONS

- 6.1 **ONE** representation received from the adjacent property in support of the application. The neighbour feels that the proposal will enhance their property as it will remove the position of parked cars from the currently shared driveway adjacent to the side ground floor kitchen window. The neighbour also details that the hardstanding for the driveway is to be extended to remove the shared element.

7. SUMMARY OF ISSUES

- 7.1 The main issues to consider with this application are the principle of the development, the acceptability of the proposed design, the impact on the residential amenity of surrounding properties and the impact on highway safety.

Principle of Development

- 7.2 Policy CS3 of the Local Development Framework Submission Core Strategy 2008 classifies Godmanchester as a Key Centre (Potential Growth); the application site is within the defined settlement boundary. The principle of residential development is therefore acceptable subject to the proposal conforming to all other relevant Policies.

Acceptability of the Proposed Design

- 7.3 The area is characterised by semi detached dwellings sited at regular intervals; there are some examples of two storey side extensions however, the prevailing character is of semi detached properties set within good sized plots with side driveways.
- 7.4 The design of the proposed dwelling is similar to the extension put forward and approved for number 24; the side addition is to be set back from the face of the existing dwelling house and stepped down in height from the main ridge height. Whilst this would be satisfactory as an extension maintaining the existing relationship of the dwelling within the street scene and having a subordinate appearance, the proposal is for a new dwelling. PPS3 requires that the design of new dwellings “integrates with, and complements the neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally in terms of scale, density, layout and access”.
- 7.5 The previous application with the flat canopy over the front doors was considered to give the dwelling a visual prominence within the streetscene which served to create an unbalanced appearance within an area characterised by properties of a similar size of both built form and plot.

- 7.6 The current proposal has a sloping roof across the frontage width of the proposed addition and above the existing dwelling's front door; it is considered that this does help to reduce the dominance of the addition however it is felt that this does not represent a high quality design. Furthermore, the extension is to have a depth of approximately 10 metres which will be prominent within the streetscene when viewed from the south given the set back siting of the adjacent pair of properties to the south (Nos. 30 and 32). The cumulative impact of the side addition wrapping round to the rear two story addition is the creation of a large and bulky addition with a vast area of exposed brickwork; this is not considered to respect the scale and form of the simple and well proportioned dwellings and will therefore be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
- 7.7 Owing to the development utilizing the full width of the plot there will be no rear access to the properties, whilst not unacceptable in planning terms it results in all servicing and recycling requirements, such as parking and bin storage, being accommodated to the front of the dwellings. This will result in the area to the front of the street becoming visually cluttered and will further emphasize the narrow and poorly detailed dwelling, contrary to Policies B1 and B2 of the Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement (2007). This cluttered appearance will be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area which is characterised by a spacious and open feel. The Manual for Streets (2007) details that the loss of front gardens to parking area can cause significant loss of visual quality as well as increasing rainwater run-off.
- 7.8 The footprint of dwellings within the locality is approximately 60 square metres with a large rear garden and space to the side of the dwelling; the proposed dwelling is to have a footprint of approximately 36 square metres and a narrow rear garden. This subdivision is not considered to respect the size, form and character of the locality as required by policies and is felt to constitute overdevelopment of the site.
- 7.9 Whilst it is accepted that the design as proposed is designed in a manner similar to approved, and constructed examples of two storey side extensions within the immediate locality and the wider area, it has to be emphasised that this is not an extension and is to create a new dwelling. Extensions to these dwellings do not require additional front doors which create an unbalanced appearance, nor do they generate additional parking and refuse storage which are pushed to the front of the dwelling and serve to visually clutter the fronts of dwellings which is to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.

Residential Amenity

- 7.10 The addition to the rear of the dwelling is to be sited approximately 3.4 metres from the common boundary with the adjoining property (No. 26). There is not a first floor window proposed in this side elevation, as such it is not felt that the extension to the rear of the existing dwelling will be harmful to the amenity of the adjoining neighbours in terms of overlooking. The rear extension is to have a depth of approximately 3 metres; the area of separation between this

element and the common boundary is considered sufficient to ensure that the depth of the extension does not project beyond the 45 degree line from the neighbouring property's first floor window. Number 30, the adjacent property to the south west has windows within the side elevation; these however are not to habitable rooms with the first floor openings serving the landing and bathroom. It is not considered that the extension and resultant new dwelling will have an oppressive or overbearing relationship with the neighbouring property owing to it being sited closer to the highway than numbers 30 and 32.

- 7.11 It is therefore considered that the proposal will not be significantly detrimental to residential amenities of surrounding occupants.

Highway Safety

- 7.12 The existing drive layout incorporates a shared driveway for both the application property and No. 30; this driveway is not however wide enough to accommodate two cars side by side. As such the proposed introduction of a car parking space on part of this driveway will prevent No. 30 from being able to access their own garage and parking area.

- 7.13 The applicant's supporting letter details that the shared driveway is to be extended by hardsurfacing over the grassed area close to No. 30; this will result in there being sufficient space for a vehicle to be parked in front of the additional dwelling and the occupants of No. 30 being able to utilise their driveway and gain access to their garage. The previous proposal did not allow for this and the associated impacts of such a relationship formed the basis of the second reason for refusal.

- 7.14 It is considered that the principle of extending the driveway is acceptable however; there would be the need to condition the works to ensure that they took place prior to the commencement of works on the additional dwelling to ensure that the occupants of No. 30 can maintain access.

Conclusion

- 7.15 Having regard for applicable National and Local Policies and having taken all relevant material considerations into account, it is considered that planning permission should be refused in this instance owing to the overdevelopment of the site.

If you would like a translation of this document, a large text version or an audio version, please contact us on 01480 388388 and we will try to accommodate your needs.

8. RECOMMENDATION – REFUSE, for the following reasons:

- 8.1 The proposed new dwelling and associated cycle bins stores, by virtue of their siting, design and layout will result in a visually cluttered appearance that will be dominant within the street scene and out of keeping with the scale and form of buildings in the locality. This overdevelopment of the site will be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal is therefore, contrary to PPS1, PPS3, ENV7 of the East of England Plan (2008), En25 of the

Huntingdonshire Local Plan (1995), B1 and B2 of the Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement (2007) and the Huntingdonshire Design Guide (2007).

Background Papers:

Planning Application File Reference: 0801366FUL; 0900058FUL
East of England Plan – Revision to the Regional Spatial Strategy May 2008
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan, 2003
Huntingdonshire Local Plan, 1995
Huntingdonshire Local Plan Alteration, 2002
Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007
Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Submission Core Strategy 2008

CONTACT OFFICER:

Enquiries about this report to Ms Charlotte Fox Assistant Development Control Officer 01480 388457