

---

**MAIN CASE**

**Reference No:** 18/00660/FUL

**Proposal:** Two storey extension to existing house.

**Site Address:** 13 Dovehouse Close Ely Cambridgeshire CB7 4BY

**Applicant:** Mr Nick Green

**Case Officer:** Chris Hancox, Planning Officer

**Parish:** Ely

**Ward:** Ely East  
Ward Councillor/s: Councillor Richard Hobbs  
Councillor Lis Every

**Date Received:** 16 May 2018      **Expiry Date:** 8<sup>th</sup> August 2018

[T72]

---

**1.0 RECOMMENDATION**

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

1 –Local Character & Design

The predominant pattern in the housing estate surrounding the application site is characterised by pairs of 1950s semi-detached houses to the north and 1970 style single bungalows to the south. The proposed two-storey side extension is to be constructed of dark grey bricks, some wooden cladding and to use wooden roof shingles on the long roof elevation, all of which are alien to the host building and the surrounding area. The extension has been designed to look visually separate to the host, which has been so successfully that it creates a 'terracing effect' that would be at odds with the predominant semi-detached two storey or semi-detached bungalow urban grain and layout of the surrounding area. The proposal will therefore have a detrimental effect on the character of the area due to this '*terracing effect*'.

The side garden area of the application site provides a green 'buffer' at a point of transition between the two building types and makes a contribution to the character of the development. The proposed side extension will reduce this green 'buffer', so will have a negative impact on this transitional space between the two building types and erode the positive contribution it provides to the streetscene.

The design and materials of the proposed extension relate neither to the semi-detached houses to the north nor to the bungalows to the south and is somewhat at odds in its appearance to the rest of the local area. The sensitivity of the position,

between the two-storey dwelling and bungalows, of the site, appears to have driven the long sloped roof of the contemporary design. However, this has created an awkward and unbalanced design, using alien materials, window shutters and a style that is not in-keeping. Although the contemporary design is not meant to be in-keeping, it does not achieve high quality juxtaposition design, so is completely at odds with the local area. In addition, doing very little to protect or enhance the host building. The proposal creates a visually intrusive extension, which causes significant demonstrable harm on the visual amenity of the host building and surrounding area that does not protect or enhance,

Therefore the proposal will have a detrimental impact on the design and character of the area, so is contrary to Policies ENV1 and ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and Policies LP22 and LP28 of the Submitted Local Plan 2017.

## **2.0 SUMMARY OF APPLICATION**

- 2.1 The application seeks consent for the creation of a two storey side extension, plus a single storey extension behind. The two storey element of the proposal will facilitate a ground floor living room and first floor bedroom with ensuite, which is accessed through a new side opening to the host dwelling. The single storey element of the proposal will facilitate a dining room area, with access to the existing dwellings kitchen area and doors opening to the garden. The proposed exterior materials are timber shingles on the roof, grey aluminium windows, aluminium gutters and downpipes, aluminium solar shade (side elevation) and a dark grey facing brick (Luna Apollo).
- 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/>. **Alternatively a paper copy is available to view at the East Cambridgeshire District Council offices, in the application file.**
- 2.3 The application was called-in to Planning Committee by Cllr Hobbs as he is "*fully supportive*" of the application as it "*meets a very standard of design*" and "*the recommendation for refusal is one of a perceived view of the visual appearance*".

## **3.0 PLANNING HISTORY**

- 3.1
- |              |                       |         |            |
|--------------|-----------------------|---------|------------|
| 08/00727/FUL | Proposed new dwelling | Refused | 08.09.2008 |
| 09/00262/FUL | Proposed new dwelling | Refused | 01.06.2009 |

## **4.0 THE SITE AND ITS ENVIRONMENT**

- 4.1 The property is a residential two storey 1950s semi-detached dwelling, of a 1930s-40s design with the characteristic bay windows. The property is located on a large corner plot, so has a large side garden and smaller rear garden. The property has a high hedge that fronts the boundary following the highway around the corner. The front garden includes a narrow existing driveway that has parking to accommodate at least two cars.
- 4.2 The property is located on Dovehouse Close, within Ely development envelope, which is a residential side road defined with a linear pattern of development and a medium density urban grain. The surrounding streetscene appears to have two main characteristics of urban development, which are separated by a 90 degree bend in the road. The two storey 1950s semi-detached development is located to the north (which the application site is part of) and 1970s mainly bungalow development is the south.

## 5.0 **RESPONSES FROM CONSULTEES**

- 5.1 The full responses are available on the Council's web site.

City of Ely Council – Raises no concerns.

Ward Councillors – Fully supports the proposal and has called the application into committee. *“Whilst there are two neighbours that have raised concerns other near neighbours are supportive of this application. In my opinion this application meets a very standard of design. The recommendation for refusal is one of a perceived view of the visual appearance, which is a highly subjective area to refuse.”*

Consultee For Other Wards In Parish - No Comments Received

- 5.2 **Neighbours** – Nine neighbouring properties were notified and a site notice was posted and five responses were received. These are summarised below. A full copy of the responses are available on the Council's website.

32 DOVEHOUSE CLOSE – Object to the proposal, stating it is too large, contemporary design will be out-of-keeping with area, will create a terrace effect, not enough parking space and concern regards to overlooking.

36 DOVEHOUSE CLOSE – Supports the proposed extension and find it an interesting contemporary design.

42 DOVEHOUSE CLOSE – Raises concerns of the proposal, including out-of-keeping with the immediate area in terms of height and scale, and loss of privacy.

38 DOVEHOUSE CLOSE – Supports the proposal. In favour of the contemporary design and does not interrupt the building line.

11 DOVEHOUSE CLOSE – Supports the proposal with an in-keeping contemporary design and use of materials that appear to blend in.

## **6.0 The Planning Policy Context**

### 6.1 East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015

GROWTH 2      Locational strategy  
ENV 1      Landscape and settlement character  
ENV 2      Design  
COM 8      Parking provision

### 6.2 Supplementary Planning Documents

Design Guide

### 6.3 National Planning Policy Framework 2012

7      Requiring good design

### 6.4 Submitted Local Plan 2017

LP3      The Settlement Hierarchy and the Countryside  
LP22      Achieving Design Excellence  
LP28      Landscape, Treescape and Built Environment Character, including Cathedral Views

## **7.0 PLANNING COMMENTS**

### **7.1 Principle of Development**

7.1.1      The site is within the development envelope, where in principle extensions to residential properties are considered acceptable subject to compliance with other local and material planning policies plus all other material planning considerations that form part of the planning balance for this application.

### **7.2 Previous Planning Refusals on the site**

7.2.1      There have been two previous planning permissions on the site, both for a separate dwelling to be located in the side garden area of the property:

08/00727/FUL	Proposed new dwelling	Refused	08.09.2008
09/00262/FUL	Proposed new dwelling	Refused	01.06.2009

Both applications have been refused on the grounds that the proposed two story properties would be out at odds with the characteristic semi-detached and single bungalow pattern of the area and would give a terracing effect. Detrimental effect on residential amenity, poor quality private amenity space and cramped and contrived.

### **7.3 Visual Amenity**

- 7.3.1 Policy  
Policies ENV1 and ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and Policies LP22 and LP28 of the Submitted Local Plan 2017 require all proposed developments to be of high quality design and to protect or enhance the distinctive character of the area.
- 7.3.2 Proposal  
The proposal is to erect a contemporary two storey and small single storey side extension to the existing semi-detached dwelling, which is located on a 90 degree corner plot, which fronts the public highway on two elevations. Therefore the proposed extension will have a larger impact on the streetscene on both of these sides.
- 7.3.3 Contemporary Design  
The Council are a supporter of good contemporary design. Good contemporary design either takes reference from its local surroundings and/or takes a juxtaposition (two things being seen or placed close together with contrasting effect), however, this will need to be of extremely high quality and visually enhance both design principles.
- 7.3.4 Local Character  
The predominant pattern in the housing estate surrounding the application site is characterised by pairs of 1950s semi-detached houses to the north and 1970 style single bungalows to the south. The side garden area also provides a green 'buffer' at a point of transition between the two building types and makes a contribution to the character of the development.
- 7.3.5 The proposed two-storey side extension is to be constructed of dark grey bricks, some wooden cladding and to use wooden roof shingles on the long roof elevation, all of which are alien to the host building and the surrounding area. The extension has been designed to look visually separate to the host, which has been so successfully that it creates a 'terracing effect' that would be at odds with the predominant semi-detached two-storey or semi-bungalows urban grain and layout of the surrounding area. The officer notes that one of the reasons for the refusal of previous applications (08/00727/FUL and 09/00262/FUL) on the site for a new dwelling was due to a similar 'terracing effect' reason that was at odds with the predominant semi-detached two-storey or semi-detached bungalow character of the local area. The proposal will therefore have a detrimental effect on the character of the area due to this '*terracing effect*'.
- 7.3.6 The side garden area of the application site provides a green 'buffer' at a point of transition between the two building types and makes a contribution to the character of the development. The proposed side extension will reduce this green 'buffer', so will have a negative impact on this transitional space between the two building types and erode the positive contribution it provides to the streetscene.
- 7.3.7 Therefore the proposed extension would have a detrimental impact on the character of the surrounding area, so is contrary to Policy ENV1 and ENV2 of the East

Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and Policy LP22 and LP28 of the Submitted Local Plan 2017.

7.3.8 Design

The predominant pattern in the housing estate surrounding the application site is characterised by pairs of 1950s semi-detached houses with a 1930s-40s design including the characteristic bay windows to the north and 1970s style bungalows to the south. The local area materials is mainly dark red and yellow bricks, plus dark concrete roof tiles. The proposed contemporary two storey extension will be located on the corner plot, having two elevations that are highly visible from the streetscene, so any proposal will have a significant impact on the local visual amenity.

7.3.9 The contemporary design and materials of the proposed extension relate neither to the semi-detached houses to the north nor to the bungalows to the south and is somewhat at odds in its appearance to the rest of the local area. The sensitivity of the position, between the two-storey semis and semi-bungalows, of the site, appears to have driven the long sloped roof of the contemporary design. However, this has created an awkward and unbalanced design, using alien materials, window shutters and a style that is not in-keeping. Although the contemporary design is not meant to be in-keeping, it does not achieve high quality juxtaposition design, so is completely at odds, doing very little to protect or enhance the host building or surrounding area. The proposal creates a visually intrusive extension, which causes significant demonstrable harm on the visual amenity of the host building and surrounding area that does not protect or enhance, so is contrary to Policies ENV1 and ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and Policies LP22 and LP28 of the Submitted Local Plan 2017.

**7.4 Residential Amenity**

7.4.1 Policy ENV2 of the adopted East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and Policy LP22 of the Submitted Local Plan 2017, require proposals to ensure that there are no significantly detrimental effects on the residential amenity of nearby occupiers.

7.4.2 Concern has been raised by neighbours in terms of loss of privacy from No.42 and overlooking from No.32 Dovehouse Close, both on the other side of the public highway, with the extension facing their public elevations. Therefore even though there will be an impact to these neighbours, it is not considered detrimental harm as the proposal will only effect the already public elevations of these neighbours.

7.4.3 The proposed rear elevation of the extension will face the side elevation of No.15 Dovehouse Close (a bungalow). The 1<sup>st</sup> storey element of the proposal has sufficient distance not to have an overbearing or overshadowing effect and has no windows that might cause overlooking. The ground floor single storey element of the proposal has a low mono-pitch roof and is sufficiently far enough from the neighbouring boundary, not to have an adverse effect on their residential amenity.

7.4.4 The proposal does not cause detrimental harm to the neighbours residential amenity, so complies with Policy ENV2 of the adopted East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and Policy LP22 of the Submitted Local Plan 2017,

## **7.5 Highways/Parking**

7.5.1 The proposed side extension will be removed, some of the existing driveway and one car parking space, while creating an extra car parking space in the front garden, maintaining a similar tandem car parking arrangement. Concern has been raised that the proposed extension to the front driveway into the front garden area will not be sufficient to accommodate the car parking. The plans indicate that a two car tandem parking arrangement can still be maintained on the site, would comply with the current car parking Policy COM8 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015. The case officer does note that the Policy LP22 of the Submitted Local Plan 2017 does not support tandem car parking, but has a low weighting as it has not yet been adopted and has received substantial objection to it.

## **7.6 Other Material Matters**

7.6.1 If members are minded to approve the application, a materials condition should be applied to the decision.

## **7.7 Planning Balance**

7.7.1 The proposed side extension does not have a detrimental impact on car parking for the site and does not cause unacceptable harm to the residential amenity of the neighbouring occupiers. However, this is out-weighed by the proposal causing significant and demonstrable harm to the visual amenity of the host building and character of the surrounding area, which does not do enough to visually protect or enhance the streetscene. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies ENV1 and ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and Policies LP22 and LP28 of the Submitted Local Plan 2017, which require all proposed developments to be of high quality design and to protect or enhance the distinctive character of the area.

---

<b><u>Background Documents</u></b>	<b><u>Location</u></b>	<b><u>Contact Officer(s)</u></b>
18/00660/FUL	Chris Hancox Room No. 011 The Grange	Chris Hancox Planning Officer 01353 665555 chris.hancox@eastc amb.s.gov.uk
08/00727/FUL 09/00262/FUL	Ely	

National Planning Policy Framework -

[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf](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>