HUNTINGDONSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

25/00897/HHFUL

OFFICER REPORT

Case No: **25/00897/HHFUL** **Householder (Full)**

Proposal: **Erection of first floor extension over existing ground floor extension**

Location: **6 Myrtle Green St Ives PE27 3YQ**

Applicant: **Mr Bob Catterick**

Grid Ref: **531495 272302**

DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND APPLICATION

6 Myrtle Green, St Ives is a two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouse located in a residential area of St Ives. The existing property is of a gable-end design with a single-storey flat roof extension to the rear. The property is constructed with facing rustic bricks and Marley double Roman grey roof tiles.

This application seeks permission for the erection of a first-floor extension over the existing ground floor flat roof extension at No. 6 Myrtle Green, St Ives.

This application follows a previous refusal of planning permission for the erection of a first-floor rear extension (Ref: 18/02757/HHFUL). The refusal was subsequently appealed and dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate (APP/H0520/D/19/3228252).

Officers have scrutinised the plans and have familiarised themselves with the site and surrounding area.

NATIONAL GUIDANCE

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2024) sets out the three objectives - economic, social and environmental - of the planning system to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. The NPPF 2024 at paragraph 10 provides as follows: 'So that sustainable development is pursued in a positive way, at the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development (paragraph 11).'

The NPPF 2024 sets out the Government's planning policies for (amongst other things):

* delivering a sufficient supply of homes;
* building a strong, competitive economy;
* achieving well-designed, beautiful and safe places;
* conserving and enhancing the natural, built and historic environment.

Planning Practice Guidance and the National Design Guide 2021 are also relevant and material considerations.

For full details visit the government website: https://www.gov.uk

PLANNING POLICIES

Huntingdonshire's Local Plan to 2036 (Adopted 15th May 2019)

LP11: Design Context
LP12: Design Implementation
LP14: Amenity

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) and Guidance:

Huntingdonshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2024)
Huntingdonshire Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2017)
Huntingdonshire Landscape and Townscape SPD (2022)

The National Design Guide (2021)

C1 - Understand and relate well to the site, its local and wider context
C2- Value heritage, local history and culture
I1 - Respond to existing local character and identity
I2 - Well-designed, high quality and attractive
I3 - Create character and identity

Local policies are viewable at https://www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

18/02757/HHFUL - Erection of a first floor extension to the rear of the property - Refused, with the appeal dismissed.

17/00004/HHFUL - Erection of a single storey extension to rear of the property and a single storey porch extension to front of the property. Create drop kerb to allow for access - Approved.

16/00474/HHFUL - Erection of a two storey extension to rear of the property and single storey extension to front. To extend the tarmac parking area to the rear of the property and create a drop kerb to allow for better access - Refused, with the appeal dismissed.

CONSULTATIONS

St Ives Town Council - Members observed a potential loss of light to neighbouring properties but noted that no objections had been raised. Therefore, the Committee agreed there were no grounds to object.

REPRESENTATIONS

No third-party representations were received during the course of the application.

SUMMARY OF ISSUES

The main issues to consider in the determination of this application are:

- Design and Visual Amenity
- Residential Amenity

* Design and Visual Amenity

Policy LP11 of the Local Plan states that a proposal will be supported where it is demonstrated that it responds positively to its context. Policy LP12 states that new development will be expected to be well designed and that a proposal will be supported where it can be demonstrated that it contributes positively to the area's character and identity and successfully integrates with adjoining

buildings and landscape. This is also reflected in the Huntingdonshire Design Guide SPD and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).

This application seeks approval for the erection of a first-floor extension atop an existing single storey flat roof rear extension at No. 6 Myrtle Green, St Ives. The proposed extension would be of a gable-end design, be constructed of matching materials to the main dwellinghouse and measure a depth of 4.5m, a width of 6m, an eaves height of 4.5m and a ridge height of 6.7m.

No. 6 Myrtle Green lies in a primarily residential area, comprised predominantly of two-storey dwellings. The rear of the properties is highly prominent in the streetscene due to the vehicular access being provided to the rear and sloping land levels. Nos. 2-8 Myrtle Green form a group of dwellings of similar original uniform design - in which the two-storey rear unity makes a positive contribution to the defined character and appearance of the area.

The proposed extension, by virtue of its width (comprising the width of the main two-storey element), depth (4.5m - greater than half the depth of the main two storey element) and prominent location, would appear unacceptably dominant and an incongruous addition to the existing dwelling.

While it is noted that the neighbouring properties of Nos. 10 and 12 have similar extensions to the rear of their properties, these extensions are a pair and the extensions to those properties are distinctly different to the current proposal, which is considered to unbalance the application property and its semi-detached neighbour.

An identical application was refused (18/02757/HHFUL) and the appeal subsequently dismissed. The Inspector noted at the time that the extension 'would dominate the rear elevation, at the expense of the character and appearance of the existing dwelling. This would not be in keeping with the scale and form of the existing dwelling, particularly in relation to its position in a row of dwellings of similar design and would unbalance the appearance of the pair of dwellings comprising Nos 6 and 8 Myrtle Green.' It is not considered that there has been any material change in circumstances since the previous refusal and therefore the reason for refusal has not been overcome.

Overall, taking the above factors into consideration the proposal would not be a subservient addition to the main dwellinghouse and would have detrimental visual impacts on the character and appearance of the existing property and the streetscene of Myrtle Green. The proposed development is therefore considered to be contrary to Policies LP11 and LP12 of Huntingdonshire's Local Plan to 2036, the Huntingdonshire Design Guide SPD and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) in this regard.

*Residential Amenity

Policy LP14 of the Local Plan to 2036 states a proposal will be supported where a high standard of amenity is provided for all users and occupiers of the proposed development and maintained for users and occupiers of neighbouring land and buildings.

The closest neighbouring residential properties that are likely to be impacted upon as a result of the proposed development are Nos. 4 and 8 Myrtle Green, St Ives.

The proposed extension would breach the 45 degree rule, as defined in the Huntingdonshire Design Guide SPD, with the rear elevation windows of the neighbouring property of No. 8 Myrtle Green and is therefore considered to result in unacceptable overshadowing and loss of light impacts. Furthermore, given the proposal directly abuts the shared boundary, the two-storey scale and the 4.5m projection to the rear of the property, the proposal would result in unacceptable overbearing impacts on the neighbouring property and its private rear amenity space, creating an unacceptable sense of enclosure.

It is also worth noting that the previous proposal was refused and dismissed at appeal for two reasons, including its impact on the amenities of the neighbouring property of No. 8 Mrytle Green. The Inspector concluded that 'from my observations, due to the scale, height and proximity of the proposed extension I consider that it would overshadow windows in the rear elevation of this neighbouring property. Thus the proposal would create a loss of daylight received into rear windows and would make the rooms less pleasant places to use.' No changes have been made to the proposal to overcome the previous reason for refusal and therefore these concerns remain.

With regard to No. 4 Myrtle Green, the proposed extension would be located directly south of the neighbouring property and approximately 1.7m from the shared boundary. The proposed extension would also breach the 45 degree rule with the rear elevation windows of No. 4, albeit to a lesser degree than that of No. 8 - however, given the proposal would be located to the south, the overshadowing and loss of light impacts are still considered to be severe enough to warrant refusal of planning permission in this instance.

The proposed extension is not considered to result in any overlooking impacts on any neighbouring residential property as there would be no first-floor side elevation windows and there is considered to be adequate distance to the neighbouring properties to the south-west.

Overall, the proposal is considered to result in unacceptable impacts on neighbouring properties amenities and therefore would be contrary to Policy LP14 of Huntingdonshire's Local Plan to 2036, the Huntingdonshire Design Guide SPD and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) in this regard.

*Conclusion

Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

By virtue of the scale and visual prominence, the proposal is considered to result in visual harm to the character and appearance of the existing dwellinghouse and the streetscene of Myrtle Green. Furthermore, the proposed extension is considered to result in unacceptable impacts on neighbouring properties amenities. The proposal is identical to that previously refused and dismissed at appeal and there has been no material change in circumstances since the previous refusal.

As such, the proposal is deemed to be contrary to Policies LP11, LP12 and LP14 of the adopted Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036, the Huntingdonshire Design Guide SPD and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Taking national and local planning policies into account, and having regard for all relevant material considerations, it is concluded that the proposed development is contrary to policy and not acceptable. There are no overriding material considerations that indicate that permission should be granted in this instance. Therefore, it is recommended that the application be refused.

CONTACT OFFICER:
Enquiries about this report to **Jennifer Wallis**