Application Number: F/YR13/0043/F Minor Parish/Ward: Tydd St Giles Date Received: 17 January 2013 Expiry Date: 14 March 2013 Applicant: Mr P Adams Agent: Mr D Upton, Peter Humphrey Associates

Proposal: Erection of a 2-storey 4-bed dwelling Location: Land east of Field House, Hockland Road, Tydd St Giles

Site Area/Density: 0.018ha/

# Reason before Committee: The level of support received

## 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY/RECOMMENDATION

The proposal is located within the defined settlement of Tydd St Giles albeit in a position which is behind the established building line. There are conflicting styles within the design of the building and no focal point thereby resulting in an incongruous feature within the area. The position of the proposal which wraps around the curtilage of the neighbouring property to the north east would result in an overbearing impact on the occupiers of this property to the detriment of their residential amenities. In addition highway safety has been compromised by the lack of vehicular turning provision which would ultimately result in vehicles reversing onto a classified highway.

In view of the above it is considered that the proposal is contrary to policies of the Development Plan and it is therefore recommended that planning permission is refused.

#### 2. HISTORY

Of relevance to this proposal is:

2.1	F/YR10/0325/F	Erection of 2 x 2/3-bed detached bungalows with shared detached double garage	Refused – 24.06.2010
	F/YR10/0338/EXT	Erection of a dwelling (renewal of planning permission F/YR06/0358/O)	Granted – 11.06.2010
	F/YR08/0168/RM	Erection of a 5-bed detached house with integral garage	Approved – 22.05.2008
	F/YR07/0379/RM	Erection of a 4-bed detached house with detached double garage with study over	Refused – 24.05.2007

F/YR07/0012/RM	Erection of 1 x 4-bed detached house with detached double garage with study over involving demolition of existing buildings	Refused – 13.02.2007
F/YR06/0358/O	Erection of a dwelling	Granted - 18.05.2006
F/YR03/0482/O	Erection of a dwelling	Approved – 30.05.2003

# 3. PLANNING POLICIES

## 3.1 National Planning Policy Framework:

Paragraph 2: Planning law requires that application for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan.

Paragraph 14: Presumption in favour of sustainable development.

Paragraph 17: Seek to ensure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants.

Paragraph 58: Development should respond to local character and be visually attractive as a result of good architecture and landscaping.

## 3.2 **Draft Fenland Core Strategy:**

CS1: A Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

CS3: Spatial Strategy, the Settlement Hierarchy and the Countryside

CS15: Facilitating the Creation of a More Sustainable Transport Network in Fenland

CS16: Delivering and Protecting High Quality Environments

#### 3.3 Fenland District Wide Local Plan:

E8: Landscape and amenity protection

H3: Settlement Area Boundaries

#### 4. **CONSULTATIONS**

- 4.1 *Parish/Town Council:* Not received at time of report
- 4.2 **FDC Tree Officer:** No objections in principle however a site specific method statement for construction of the access roads within the root protection areas of retained trees is required

4.3	CCC Highways:	The parking and turning area does not work – 6m is required behind the parking spaces and the western boundary to accommodate turning. Conditions relating to the provision of gates, temporary facilities, reserving parking and turning and drainage measures are required
4.4	FDC Scientific Officer:	Unsuspected land contamination condition is required
4.5	North Level:	Not received at time of report
4.6	Neighbours:	<ul> <li>7 letters of support received, reasons including –</li> <li>Enhancing the street scene</li> <li>Bringing families to the village</li> <li>The site is infill</li> <li>Planning permission already exists on site</li> <li>This lower level house will be more in keeping with the plot and surroundings</li> <li>It would look better if the land was tidied up and a dwelling was constructed</li> <li>The development is a good quality individual design</li> <li>The area is residential</li> <li>14 letters of objection from separate sources received, concerns regarding –</li> <li>backland development is not a feature of Hockland Road or the village in general</li> <li>Out of character with the area</li> <li>The development will spoil the village</li> <li>The proposal is contrary to the characteristic linear development in the village</li> <li>The dwelling extends outside of the development boundary</li> <li>The Design and Access Statement says that the application is for 'dwellings' inferring that further applications may follow</li> <li>The application is over and above what was already granted</li> <li>Loss of privacy</li> <li>It would set a dangerous precedent</li> <li>The village already has several plots of land where planning permission has been granted but are still awaiting development</li> <li>The sewerage system is already overloaded</li> <li>Risk of flooding</li> </ul>

- The proposal does not sit within the approved application footprint and is even further outside the DAB

- The village is overcrowded

- The land is agricultural land

- The development does not comply with the Core Strategy

- The development could cause a precedent to the detriment of the whole village

- The development is out of keeping with the building line

- The land is agricultural land

- The proposal is out of keeping with the village shape

- No mention has been made to the maintenance of or preservation of existing hedgerows and conifers

- there is no demand for more housing

- The infrastructure of the village is already struggling to meet demands without adding a further building

- Villagers have had to continually fight applications that do not conform to FDC policies which are put in place by councillors voted in by the people

- Loss of light

## 5. SITE DESCRIPTION

5.1 The site is located on the southern side of Hockland Road with the majority of the land positioned behind the established building line. The site is currently laid to grass with a large metal shed positioned directly south of the access. The land is currently used as paddock land and has a history of agricultural use. The surrounding area is characterised by residential development in linear form with agricultural land to the south.

#### 6. PLANNING ASSESSMENT

- 6.1 The key considerations for this application are:
  - Principle and policy implications
  - History
  - Design, layout and residential amenities
  - Other matters
  - (a) <u>Principle and policy implications</u>

The site lies within the settlement of Tydd St Giles albeit on land which is predominantly positioned behind the established building line.

Design policies within the current Local Plan, the emerging Core Strategy and guidance contained within the NPPF (E8, CS16 and section 7 respectively) stipulate that new development should respond to local character in terms of materials, scale, layout and landscaping and should not have an adverse impact on highway safety, neighbouring amenities or the natural environment. These points will be discussed in more detail in the 'Design and Layout' section of this report.

## (b) <u>History</u>

Outline planning permission for a detached dwelling on the site was granted in 2006 and, following lengthy negotiations, the Reserved Matters were approved in 2008. However the applicants have since allowed this Reserved Matters application to lapse and as such only the outline consent can be afforded weight in the consideration of this application. It should be noted that the current proposal exceeds in scale and layout that which was supported through the now lapsed Reserved Matters approval.

# (c) <u>Design, layout and residential amenities</u>

The access to the site is positioned between two residential properties and forms a link between, what appears to be, two building line trends: the properties to the west of the site have long frontages whereas the properties to the east are positioned very close to the highway boundary.

Part of the proposal has been positioned so as to bridge the gap between the two adjoining properties. As the front part of the site is very narrow, the remainder of the proposed building has been positioned perpendicular to the frontage element thereby creating an 'L' shaped structure. This raises significant concerns in terms of form and character as the result is that the proposal appears as tandem, backland development to the rear of the existing property at Randor.

Due to the character of the area being that of linear form it is contended that the proposal would be inconsistent with its surroundings. Members will recall a recent refusal for development to the rear of Amberley, which is located to the north east of the site, given the conflict of the development with the character of the area. Given the similarities between the two cases, Officers attach weight to the recent Committee decision at Amberley when assessing this application.

The proposal has been designed to look like a barn-style conversion. However concerns are raised with regard to the conflict in styles and awkward appearance given the presence of typically domestic features, such as chimneys and dormer windows, on the building. The situation is worsened by the fact that only glimpses of the development will be able to be viewed from Hockland Road which will appear at odds with the area. The proposal lacks a front elevation and its obstructed view from a public perspective is such that the development has no sense of arrival and would appear incongruous within the street scene.

The comments received from CCC Highways stipulate that there is insufficient space provided to allow for vehicles within the parking spaces to turn. Hockland Road is a C classified highway and it is therefore imperative that turning, to allow vehicles to enter and exit in forward gear, is provided. It is

noted that there is sufficient space within the site to provide the turning area however this would require an amendment to the drawings. Since there are issues with the principle of the proposal it was not considered reasonable to ask the agent to go to the expense of providing amended plans when the recommendation to the Committee would have remained the same.

Although there is a tall conifer hedge located on the boundary between the application site and the neighbouring dwelling to the north, Randor, concerns are still raised with regard to the impact on the amenities of the neighbouring property. The position and orientation of the proposal is such that the curtilage of Randor will be enclosed by the activities surrounding the proposal. It is contended that this would be to the detriment of the living conditions of the occupiers at Randor.

# (d) Other Matters

Although 7 letters of support have been received in respect of the proposal these must be balanced against the 14 letters of objection which have also been received. The comments raised in support of the application have been noted and have already been addressed within the body of this report.

# 7. CONCLUSION

7.1 Despite the location of the site, part within the defined settlement of Tydd St Giles, the proposal cannot be supported in principle due to the resulting tandem form of development which is inconsistent with the defining characteristics of the area. The appearance and siting of the proposal is such that there are conflicting elements within the design and no focal point thereby resulting in a building which would appear at odds with the street scene.

Concerns are also raised with regard to the relationship with the neighbouring property to the north east and the harmful impact on their residential amenities. Insufficient space has been provided within the site to allow for vehicles to turn so as to enter and exit in forward gear. This would be to the detriment of highway safety. For the reasons above it is recommended that planning permission is refused.

# 8. **RECOMMENDATION**

#### Refuse

1. The proposal would result in a tandem form of development in an area which is strictly characterised by road frontage development. The scheme would therefore be at odds with the character of the area and could set a dangerous precedent for other backland development to the detriment of the defining characteristics of the locality. The application is therefore contrary to CS16 of the Fenland Local Plan, emerging Core Strategy (proposed submission February 2013), E8 of the Fenland District Wide Local Plan and section 07 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 2. By virtue of the lack of provision for on site turning the proposal fails to address highway safety, contrary to E8 of the Fenland District Wide Local Plan and CS15 of the Fenland Local Plan, emerging Core Strategy (proposed submission February 2013).
- 3. Due to the location of the site, the position and orientation of the building, the neighbouring occupiers of the property to the north east would suffer from an overbearing impact and reduced amenities contrary to E8 of the Fenland District Wide Local Plan and CS16 of the Fenland Local Plan, emerging Core Strategy (proposed submission February 2013).
- 4. The conflicting elements of design, lack of focal point and position of the building in relation to the public viewpoint at Hockland Road is such that the proposal would fail to address the street scene or respond to its setting. The proposal would appear as an incongruous feature to the detriment of the character of the area. The application is therefore contrary to E8 of the Fenland District Wide Local Plan, CS16 of the Fenland Local Plan, emerging Core Strategy (proposed submission February 2013) and section 07 of the National Planning Policy Framework.



