
MAIN CASE

Reference No: 21/00304/FUL

Proposal: Demolition of existing conservatory & construction of new two storey and single storey rear extensions, along with internal additions & alterations

Site Address: 8 The Brook Sutton Ely Cambridgeshire CB6 2PU

Applicant: Mr & Mrs S Oliver

Case Officer: Rachael Forbes Planning Officer

Parish: Sutton

Ward: Sutton
 Ward Councillor/s: Lorna Dupré
 Mark Inskip

Date Received: 24 February 2021 **Expiry Date:** 9th June 2021
 (requested)

Report Number W14

1.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

1.1 Members are recommended to REFUSE this application for the following reason:

The proposed development by virtue of the depth and scale is considered to be an inappropriate addition to the existing dwelling, resulting in an unacceptable level of additional bulk and mass. The proposed materials are not cohesive with or complementary to, the existing dwelling, further exacerbating the scale of the proposed extension. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policies ENV 1 and ENV 2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan, 2015 as it does not provide a complementary relationship with the existing dwelling and the scale, massing and materials do not relate sympathetically to the existing dwelling. The proposal is also contrary to the design principles set out in the adopted District Design Guide SPD.

2.0 **SUMMARY OF APPLICATION**

2.1 The application seeks the demolition of the existing conservatory and the construction of a two storey and single storey rear extensions. The proposal also includes the addition of a front porch.

2.2 The full planning application, plans and documents submitted by the Applicant can be viewed online via East Cambridgeshire District Council's Public Access online service, via the following link <http://pa.eastcambs.gov.uk/online-applications/>

2.3 The application has been called in to Planning Committee by Cllr Dupré for the following reason:

"I am calling this application in to committee because I believe the recommendation for refusal gives insufficient weight to the reasoned justification for the details of the application. The proposed rear extension sits in a lengthy garden—its dimensions do not extend beyond the existing build line established by the properties at 1-19 Mepal Road and 2 The Brook, and are necessary for the proposed use of the dwelling to accommodate the needs of the owner. The materials palette and design elements of the extension have been carefully considered to result in an interesting building of some design merit, and are in any case barely visible from the road. The scheme has the additional merit of providing one more lifetime home in the village."

3.0 PLANNING HISTORY

3.1 No relevant planning history

4.0 THE SITE AND ITS ENVIRONMENT

4.1 8 The Brook is an end of terrace dwelling situated in the development envelope of Sutton. The dwelling is situated in a long plot with the dwelling itself situated towards the front of the plot. The surrounding area is largely residential and comprises dwellings of various designs and styles.

5.0 RESPONSES FROM CONSULTEES

5.1 Responses were received from the following consultees and these are summarised below. The full responses are available on the Council's web site.

Local Highways Authority - No Comments Received

Parish Council - 24 March 2021

'No concerns – ECDC to determine'

Ward Councillors – 14 May 2021

"I am calling this application in to committee because I believe the recommendation for refusal gives insufficient weight to the reasoned justification for the details of the application. The proposed rear extension sits in a lengthy garden—its dimensions do not extend beyond the existing build line established by the properties at 1-19 Mepal Road and 2 The Brook, and are necessary for the proposed use of the dwelling to accommodate the needs of the owner. The materials palette and design elements of the extension have been carefully considered to result in an interesting building of some design merit, and are in any case barely visible from the road. The scheme has the additional merit of providing one more lifetime home in the village."

- 5.2 A site notice was displayed near the site on 16 March 2021.
- 5.3 **Neighbours** – 7 neighbouring properties were notified. No responses have been received.
- 6.0 The Planning Policy Context
- 6.1 East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015
- | | |
|----------|--|
| GROWTH 2 | Locational strategy |
| GROWTH 5 | Presumption in favour of sustainable development |
| ENV 1 | Landscape and settlement character |
| ENV 2 | Design |
| ENV 4 | Energy efficiency and renewable energy in construction |
- 6.2 Sutton Neighbourhood Plan 2019
- | | |
|-----|-----------------------------|
| NP3 | Sutton Development Envelope |
|-----|-----------------------------|
- 6.3 Supplementary Planning Documents
- Design Guide
Climate Change SPD
- 6.4 National Planning Policy Framework 2019
- 2 Achieving sustainable development
12 Achieving well-designed places
14 Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- 6.5 Planning Practice Guidance
- 7.0 PLANNING COMMENTS
- 7.1 The main considerations in the determination of this application are visual amenity and residential amenity.
- 7.2 Visual Amenity**
- 7.2.1 Policy ENV 1 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan, 2015 states that development proposals should ensure that they provide a complementary relationship with the existing development and conserve, preserve and where possible enhance the distinctive and traditional landscapes and key views in and out of settlements. Policy ENV 2 states all new development proposals, including extensions and alterations to existing buildings and structures will be expected to ensure that the location, layout, scale, form, massing, materials and colour of buildings relate sympathetically to the surrounding area and each other, as well as creating quality new schemes in their own right.
- 7.2.2 The District Design Guide SPD states that extensions should not be dictated by a particular amount of additional floor space and the form and proportions of the

original dwelling will determine the extent to which it can be extended. When a dwelling has been extended, the original building should be legible and pre-dominate and, in most circumstances, the extension should be subservient to the existing dwelling.

7.2.3 The existing dwelling is approximately 6.8 metres (22.3ft) in depth. There is an existing single storey element to the rear, the main body of which is approximately 4 metres (13.1ft) in depth at its deepest point. There is a small projection adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site which is approximately 2 metres (6.56ft) in depth. This is proposed to be demolished and replaced by a part single, part two storey rear extension.

7.2.4 At ground floor level, the extension will project approximately 7 (22.9ft) metres from the rear elevation. At first floor level, the proposed extension will project approximately 5.7 (18.7ft) metres from the rear elevation; the roof will be approximately 8.3 (27.2ft) metres in length. The existing rear projection is approximately 2.5 (8.20ft) metres in height; the proposed extension will be approximately 5.7 (18.7ft) metres in height. It is considered that the proposed extension would result in a disproportionate addition to the existing dwelling by virtue of the depth and height of the proposed extension. While it is noted that there is a single storey element at present, this of a modest scale and height. The proposed extension will double the depth of the existing dwelling at ground floor level and although it is slightly shorter at first floor level, the roof line is of a greater depth than the existing dwelling adding considerable bulk to the host dwelling. The proposed extension does have a slightly lower ridgeline than the existing dwelling but this only amounts to 0.3 (0.98ft) metres and is considered to contribute to the bulky appearance.

7.2.5 The existing dwelling is constructed from facing brickwork on the principal elevation and render on the side and rear elevations. The materials to be used in the extension are Cambridge Whites facing brickwork on the ground floor and Colorcoat Urban Cladding for the first floor with cedar boarding around the Juliet balcony. The agent has confirmed that the colour of the cladding would be Anthracite, which from the brochure, is a black/grey colour. While it is noted that the street scene does have a variation of dwelling types, styles and materials (although largely brick and render), the proposal introduces three new materials to the existing materials palette of the host dwelling, which is considered to appear at odds with the predominant brick and tile host dwelling. The use of Cambridge Whites brick would be a very pale contrast against the buff brick on the existing dwelling, even though the side flank wall is rendered in white. Cambridge Whites are not a traditional brick within East Cambridgeshire, although it is similar to the Burwell Whites which is more creamy than white. Nonetheless, it is considered that the brick would represent a poor match against the buff brick on the existing property. The anthracite cladding is also considered to relate poorly with the existing property. It is noted that the existing roof tiles are dark grey and it is understood that the anthracite cladding is intended to blend in with this, however, this type of cladding is not prevalent within the locality and is considered to contrast negatively against the existing dwelling and its impact on the street scene.

7.2.6 It is also noted that there are somewhat limited public views of the proposed extension, however, it will be visible on approach from the west. It is considered that

the inappropriate scale of the proposed extension will be further exacerbated by the materials chosen, particularly the dark cladding at first floor level against the light render on the existing side elevation.

- 7.2.7 The Local Planning Authority sought amendments to the proposal in respect of the depth of the proposed extension, the materials and the scale of the front porch. The front porch element has been reduced in width and the Local Planning Authority now consider this element of the proposal acceptable. However, the applicants did not want to amend the rear extensions and therefore these elements remain as originally submitted.
- 7.2.8 The Local Planning Authority also questioned the need for the parapet above the proposed single storey element and whether the intention was to use the flat roof as a balcony and if this was the case then there would be concerns with regards to residential amenity. The agent has confirmed this is not the case and could be controlled by planning condition and the reason for the parapet was to prevent the flat roof being visible where it projects beyond the first floor element. However, the Local Planning Authority consider that the parapet is an unnecessary feature and adds further height to the single storey element which cumulatively results in further bulk.
- 7.2.9 The Local Planning Authority have been made aware that the scale of the proposed extension is due to the applicant's personal circumstances. Officers cannot consider personal circumstances when determining a planning application, although Officers always aim to work with applicants to seek alternative approaches. Furthermore, the Local Planning Authority are not objecting to a two storey extension in principle but consider the proposed extension to be unacceptable for the reasons set out above. In Cllr Dupre's comments, she has stated that the scheme has the additional merit of providing one more lifetime home in the village. Lifetime homes are mentioned in Policy HOU 1 – Housing Mix, which refers to new housing developments and is required for 50 dwellings or more and therefore does not apply in this case. The application is seeking permission for a household extension and as such has been assessed in accordance with the relevant policies for this type of development.
- 7.2.10 Cllr Dupré has also raised that the proposed extension would not result in the proposal stepping beyond the built form line of The Brook and that the rear garden is large so can accommodate an extension of this scale. It is agreed that the proposed extension does not step beyond the line of built form and the rear garden is large, however, when using the principles of the District Design Guide, it is the form and proportions of the original dwelling that should determine the extent to which it can be extended.
- 7.2.11 The proposed extension by virtue of the depth and scale is considered to be an inappropriate addition to the existing dwelling and will result in an unacceptable level of additional bulk and mass. The chosen materials are not cohesive with or complementary to the existing dwelling and it is considered that they will further exacerbate the scale of the proposed extension. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies ENV 1 and ENV 2 of the Local Plan, 2015 as it does not provide a complementary relationship with the existing dwelling and the scale, massing and materials do not relate sympathetically to the existing dwelling.

7.2.12 The proposed development is therefore considered contrary to Policies ENV 1 and ENV 2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan, 2015 and the District Design Guide, SPD.

7.3 Residential Amenity

7.3.1 8 The Brook has two adjacent neighbours; 6 The Brook which is the attached dwelling to the east and 10a The Brook which is detached, situated to the west.

7.3.2 Policy NP3 of the Sutton Neighbourhood Plan states that sustainable development proposals within the development envelope will be supported in principle subject to being of an appropriate scale and not having an unacceptable impact on the amenity of residents.

7.3.3 In respect of overlooking, the proposal introduces three new windows and two rooflights at first floor level. One window will be on the rear elevation (the Juliet balcony) and two windows will be on the side (west) elevation to serve an en-suite and a bathroom. The rooflights will serve the bedroom. There is already a window serving a bedroom on the rear elevation and it is considered that although the Juliet balcony will project further from the rear elevation that it would not result in a significant overlooking impact to either neighbouring dwelling. The windows on the side elevation could be conditioned to be obscure glazed to avoid overlooking and this is also noted on the plan.

7.3.4 The proposed extension is likely to create an overshadowing impact when the sun is in the east towards 10a The Brook and when the sun is in the west towards 6 The Brook. 10a The Brook does have a window on the side elevation and it is believed that this serves a kitchen but that the kitchen and lounge are one room with double doors and rooflights. Furthermore, any impact would pass once the sun was in the south east and therefore it is considered that any overshadowing impact would not be significant. The proposed extension is situated approximately 3.9 (12.7ft) metres from the neighbouring dwelling at number 6 The Brook and it is considered that any overshadowing impact would only occur once the sun was in the west.

7.3.5 A 45 degree line has been shown on the submitted plans from the centre of the first floor neighbouring window at number 6 The Brook which aims to illustrate the extent of any loss of light impact and given the separation distance it is considered that the proposed extension would not result in a significant loss of light to number 6 The Brook and is therefore considered to be acceptable.

7.3.6 It is considered that the proposed development would not result in any significantly detrimental effects on the residential amenity of nearby occupiers and therefore complies with Policy ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan, 2015 in respect of residential amenity.

7.4 Climate Change and Sustainability

Policy CC1 of the Council's Climate Change SPD is relevant and supports Policy ENV4 of the Local Plan in which it seeks applicants to demonstrate how they have considered maximising all aspects of sustainable design and construction. The agent has confirmed that the development will take a fabric first approach to

sustainability and they are committed to delivering robust projects that exceed the minimum requirements of the Building Regulations. The proposed development is therefore in accordance with policy.

7.5 Planning Balance

The proposed development is not considered to have a significant impact on the residential amenity of adjacent neighbours. However, the proposed extension is considered to be an inappropriate addition by virtue of the depth and scale, resulting in an unacceptable level of additional bulk and mass. The proposed materials are not cohesive with, or complementary to, the existing dwelling, further exacerbating the scale of the proposed extension. Furthermore, it does not provide a complementary relationship with the existing dwelling and the scale, massing and materials do not relate sympathetically to the existing dwelling.

On balance, although the proposal would not have a significant impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, it is considered that this is outweighed by the proposal causing significant and demonstrable harm to the visual amenity of the host building. The development, by virtue of its mass, bulk and materials would result in a proposal that is out of keeping with the existing dwelling and is therefore considered contrary to Policies ENV1 and ENV2 of the Local Plan 2015 and the Design Guide SPD. The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

8 APPENDICES

None

<u>Background Documents</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Contact Officer(s)</u>
21/00304/FUL	Rachael Forbes Room No. 011 The Grange Ely	Rachael Forbes Planning Officer 01353 665555 rachael.forbes@eastcambs.gov.uk

National Planning Policy Framework -

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf

East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 -

<http://www.eastcambs.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Local%20Plan%20April%202015%20-%20front%20cover%20and%20inside%20front%20cover.pdf>

Sutton Neighbourhood Plan, 2019 -

<https://www.eastcambs.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Made%20Sutton%20Neighbourhood%20Plan%20May%202019%20SMALL%20FILE.pdf>