



Planning Statement

Elm Cottage, Longstanton

1. Introduction

- 1.1. This submission document has been prepared by PlanIt Architecture to accompany the planning application made to South Cambridgeshire District Council ("the LPA") for the rear and first floor extension to the existing dwelling, along with the conversion of a storage area to granny annexe at Elm Cottage, Over Road, Longstanton ("the site").
- 1.2. This document will briefly outline the site characteristics, relevant planning history and any relevant environmental constraints. A summary of the development proposal and key planning policy considerations will also be outlined and supplemented by the drawings/plans submitted alongside this document.

2. Site Description and Background

- 2.1. This section will outline the key characteristics of the development site, the planning history and summary of the site's local and wider context.
- 2.2. The narrow and long 0.3ha plot of land comprises the existing single-storey dwelling at the front of the plot, set back slightly from Over Road, with a well-established tree belt between the highway and the dwelling. A long garden leads to open fields to the rear and contains a swimming pool and storage outhouse, close to the rear of Elm Cottage. The site is mostly obscured from the view of Over Road by hedging and the dwelling itself is located between an agricultural plot with depot storage and paddocks.
- 2.3. Over Road marks the western extent of Longstanton, with the main settlement located to the east and north of the site. The main services and facilities on offer in the village are located to the southeast at the original linear core of the settlement.
- 2.4. The site does not contain any statutorily or locally listed buildings. The site is not located within the Cambridge Green Belt.
- 2.5. The site is in an area at very low risk of surface water flooding, whose responsibility is the Lead Local Flood Authority, Cambridgeshire County Council. Regarding flooding from the rivers and the sea, the site is located within Flood Zone 1 (low risk).
- 2.6. Regarding relevant planning history, the site itself has not been subject to any relevant historic planning applications. Several approvals for extensions of varying sizes have been approved within the wider vicinity; these include the neighbouring plot to the north which

benefits from a recent permission for a two-storey outhouse containing a studio and office (20/02970/FUL)

3. Proposed Development

- 3.1. Planning permission is being sought for an upward extension at first floor, to create a two-storey dwelling with dormer windows. A smaller side/rear extension is proposed at ground level. Consent is also sought for a part-conversion of the garage to provide annexe accommodation for the applicant's family.
- 3.2. The first floor extension will be kept within the confines of the existing property and be constructed in render and vertical cladding.
- 3.3. No changes are proposed across the wider site, with the access and driveway arrangement being maintained, and all boundary and on-site trees being retained.

4. Planning Considerations

- 4.1. Whilst the site is located outside of the development envelope for Cottenham, the proposal constitutes an extension to an existing dwelling and thus policies relating to the uses permitted outside of defined development boundaries would not apply. It is acknowledged that the site is technically within the countryside, although directly borders the far more dense built up edge of Longstanton. The relevant local and national planning policies to this proposal are considered as thus:

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2021
- National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)
- **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018:**
 - H/12 Residential Space Standards
 - NH/4 Biodiversity
 - HQ/1 Design Principles
 - CC/4 Sustainable Design and Construction
 - CC/8 Sustainable Drainage Systems
 - SC/11 Contaminated Land
 - TI/3 Parking Provision
- **South Cambridgeshire Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):**
 - District Design Guide SPD – adopted March 2010
 - Trees and Development Sites SPD – adopted March 2010
 - Biodiversity SPD – adopted March 2010

- 4.2. The main considerations in this instance are the principle of development, visual impact and residential amenity impact.
- 4.3. The proposed extension will result in the property being only 1.6m higher than the existing bungalow. The overall increase in volume has been kept to a minimum by adhering to the existing dimensions of the property and utilising dormer windows to create roof space without needed excessive ridge heights. Furthermore, in terms of footprint the proposal remains largely the same as the current dwelling, as demonstrated in the submitted plans.
- 4.4. The proposed mass, scale and form that the proposed extensions would result in no additional impact on the character and appearance of the countryside. The site is well-screened from the public highway and surrounding farmland. The neighbouring two premises both contain large barns, storage buildings and two-storey office units and the presence of a 2-storey dwelling in this location would not appear incongruous or out of keeping. The site offers no views through to the countryside beyond and as the front boundary hedging is to be fully retained, the visual impact of the site remains widely unchanged. The dense, two-storey residential development immediately across Over Road (image below) provides sufficient context for a two-storey dwelling in this location.



- 4.5. The dwelling will be as set back as the existing property, be similar in depth and width, with a minor increase in height that will not be visible from all publicly accessible area of the surrounding countryside. For the reasons outlined above, it is considered that the proposal would therefore be compliant with the SCLP and relevant policies of the NPPF.

- 4.6. In terms of impact upon the neighbouring residents; it is acknowledged that increased the dwelling's height may offer additional overlooking opportunities on neighbouring amenity



spaces. However, there one single side-facing window which serves a small home office and is set in significantly from the boundary with the neighbouring depot. The extension avoids creating any direct views into neighbouring plots. Front and rear facing dormer windows offer little in terms of their overlooking impact yet provide each new room with sufficient natural light. The extended dwelling will not extend any further back than the existing dwelling and thus the increase in height will have a limited overbearing impact on neighbouring residents, which are substantially separated from the property to the north and south.

- 4.7. The parking/turning arrangement will be retained as operates currently and as there is no net increase in the number of dwellings on the site, there are no concerns regarding amenity disturbance from vehicular movements to and from the larger dwelling.
- 4.8. The site is located within Flood Zone 1, where residential development should be directed, and the proposal is for a domestic extension.
- 4.9. With regards to the garage conversion to ancillary annex accommodation, the works are internal and retain sufficient parking for the residents of the property, in as such they would not necessarily require formal planning permission.
- 4.10. The proposal has been designed to ensure that this annexe accommodation is solely provided as ancillary to the original dwelling and not as a new dwelling. The current building is used for ancillary storage, a shower room and garaging and represents an underutilised space within the plot which could provide the needed family accommodation for the applicant. Therefore, the proposal has been made for the conversion of half of this space

for the applicant's family member. The annexe shall presently and in the future be within the same ownership as and will be occupied in conjunction with Elm Cottage.

4.11. The annexe is not considered to constitute the creation of a new dwelling or separate planning unit, by virtue of its siting within the plot (and wholly clumsy arrangement that would arise from its use as a separate unit including an unacceptable relationship, in terms of overlooking, with the residents of the parent dwelling). This lack of any discernible curtilage would wholly prevent the annexe from becoming a separate planning unit in its own right. Whilst the annexe provides small scale living accommodation, a bathroom and kitchenette, in accordance with *Uttlesford D.C. v SSE & RJ White 1992*, it is not necessary for a relative of the occupier of the main dwelling to wholly rely upon facilities in the main dwellinghouse in order to occupy additional living accommodation in the same planning unit. The annexe is substantially subordinate in size and will share the access, garden and parking areas of the original dwelling. Furthermore, the services and utilities to the annexe will be provided via the original dwelling, the postal address and telephone line will also be subordinate, and it will demonstrate that it does not cause any other harm to amenity, highways local character.

5. Summary and Conclusion

5.1. The proposal seeks to provide a first-floor extension to Elm Cottage, including a single-storey side/rear extension. The scheme will have no discernible impact on the surrounding countryside and neighbouring premises which include a depot, farm and paddocks containing large structures.

5.2. The garage conversion to residential annexe maintains close connection with the parent property and would not represent the creation of a new residential unit by virtue of its dependence on the main dwelling for internal and external amenity space, access and parking.

5.3. This report and the accompanying drawings demonstrate the proposal's compliance with all local and national policies considered as part of the SCDC planning process as well as the relevant SPDs.

