

EAST AREA COMMITTEE MEETING – 29th OCTOBER 2009

Pre-Committee Amendment Sheet

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: 11.1 APPLICATION REF: **09/0701/FUL**

Location: 369 Cherry Hinton Road, Cambridge

Target Date: 24.09.09

To Note:

Further Representation

An email has been received from the new residents of 26 Kelvin Close: it reads:-
“We are writing to express our concerns regarding the extension of Cherry Hinton Nursing Home and the impact that the extension could have for the access of emergency vehicles, not just for the home but for the rest of the residents of Kelvin Close. Although we are new to the Close (as from 29th September) we have already required the services of two emergency vehicles to attend my 22-month-old daughter who has a heart condition. When she has a tachycardic episode, it is imperative that she is transported to Addenbrooke's for treatment without delay. In this situation, if emergency vehicles were to be delayed, it could have disastrous implications. We are now expecting our second child who may be prone to the same condition, so our concerns could be well be further intensified.
We are extremely concerned about the lack of thought and planning for this issue and would like reassurance of how these concerns will be addressed.”

Minutes from the 2 Development Control Forums

The 12 November 08 DCF related to the previous application 08/1233/FUL

.

CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL

Notes of a Development Control Forum 369 Cherry Hinton Road, Cambridge

12 November 2008

10.00am – 11.25pm

Application No: 08/1233/FUL

Site Address: 369 Cherry Hinton Road, Cambridge

Description: Extension of care home for the Elderly and demolition of 2 houses

Applicant: Mr John O’Kane

Agent: **Mike Bunyan, Progress Business Park, Whittle Parkway, Bath Road**

Lead Petitioner: Andrew Glass, 34 Kelvin Close, Cambridge

Case Officer: John Evans

Present:

For Applicant

Doris Bater

John O’Kane

Mike Bunyan

For Petitioners

Andrew Glass

Tariq Sadiq

Members of North Area Committee

Councillors Blencowe, Smart and Walker

Declarations of Interest by Members

None

Officers

Peter Carter (Chair), John Evans (Case Officer) and Glenn Burgess (Committee Manager)

Text of Petition

The text of the petition was as follows:

No access to Cherry Hinton Road. Traffic would have to use Kelvin Close. Car park is awkward to get to, which would result in more cars parking on-street. This will increase the occasional closing off of Kelvin Close to access and egress. A new plan with full access from Cherry Hinton Road (the address of the establishment) would therefore make more sense from our point of view.

Case by Applicants

Mr O’Kane made the following points:

1. We would be looking at an increase of 20 beds
2. There is a need to increase the capacity of the home in order to meet demand for beds
3. A previous application has already been withdrawn so that further work could be undertaken with Planning Officers and residents and their views could be taken on board
4. The care home was built in 1996 and at the time we were not allowed to have access off Cherry Hinton Road
5. Relatives visiting the home use the car parking facilities and do not park on the road
6. The car park is clearly marked and we encourage our deliveries to use the facilities
7. We have worked closely with the Councils Tree Officer and she is keen on keeping the existing trees and shrubbery
8. The project would not be viable if the increase was less than 20 beds
9. We will continue to welcome ongoing discussion with residents

Ms Bater made the following points:

10. The care home has a very good reputation in the area and we are continually asked to provide respite beds

11. Palliative and respite care need to have separate units – 10 of the proposed extra beds would be for palliative and 10 for respite (set over a 2 storey extension)

Mr Bunyan made the following points:

12. Has worked as an architect on many care home projects
13. The size and available space in the proposed extension has to meet certain standards and this is in accordance with and exceeds all the relevant current care standards
14. A 7-day survey has been undertaken to monitor car park usage at the home. Of the available 12 spaces a maximum of 7 were used at any one time
15. We are proposing to increase car parking spaces to 14 and also include 2 additional drop off spaces
16. Lots of discussion with residents has taken place in the pre-application stage
17. The trees on Cherry Hinton Road are an important part of the street scape and valuable to the care home and residents
18. We intend to put up posters on site to encourage visitors to only use the on-site parking facilities and also provide information leaflets to new or prospective residents
19. Shift changes for staff are outside of peak hours so do not contribute to traffic issues
20. More traffic would be generated from the 2 houses (proposed to be demolished) than the addition of 20 care home beds

Case By Petitioners

Mr Glass made the following points:

21. Highlighted ongoing problems with delivery vehicles blocking the street and the potential for emergency vehicles to be held up
22. Produced a diagram of the site, pinpointing the problem areas, and offered suggestions to alleviate access/traffic issues. Stressed that maintaining the existing access would be really dangerous and result in additional deliveries and additional blockages
23. It was proposed that the current main access to the building be changed to an emergency/fire exit and a foyer/delivery point area replace two of the proposed bedrooms (therefore encouraging delivery drivers to drive into the site instead of parking on the road)
24. Extra garden and extra amenity space for residents of the home could also be incorporated into the new design

Mr Sadiq made the following points:

25. Members of the Council need to consider the impact of the proposed development on the residents of Kelvin Close before making a decision
26. Kelvin Close is made up of family houses on a small street
27. There is a shortage of family homes in Cambridge and we are proising to demolition
2
28. The extension will alter the scale and character of the street
29. Congestion is already an issue and the proposal will only increase this
30. Double yellow lines are desperately needed in order to solve the problem

The Case Officer's comments:

Mr Evens made the following points:

31. The application will be determined at the East Area Committee on 20th November 2008

32. Responses have been received from:

- County Highways: no objection in principle
- Trees and Landscaping: no objections
- Environmental Health: no objections
- Disability Panel: Satisfied with proposal (subject to detail)

8 residents have responded in writing with objections including:

- objection to the demolition of family homes
- no shortage of care home beds in Cambridge
- proposal will be out of place and is imposing
- risk of overshadowing
- no amenity space provided for care home residents
- concerns over refuse collection
- ongoing traffic issues and concerns

Member's questions and comments:

33. At the request of members the applicant showed on the plans how the proposed changes to car parking would work

34. Would there be a rear access point into the building from the car park?

It is a controlled site and for security reasons the site can only have 1 access point for deliveries and visitors

35. How many deliveries come in per day?

A maximum of 2 per day – consisting of medical supplies and food. We would also be happy to ask the delivery companies to use smaller vehicles and would support yellow lines being installed

36. What are the current bed and staff numbers?

At present we have 40 beds with 35 on the waiting list. We have 9 nurses working from 7.30am – 8pm and then the number drops to 4. We have 2 staff in the kitchen, 1 in the laundry and 3 domestics. With the new proposal we would require 4 additional nurses

37. Would providing respite care result in a change to the type of traffic movements?

Respite care would normally be in 2-3 week blocks and would not have an affect on traffic movements

38. Would extra deliveries be required with the addition of 20 more beds?

No. It would be just more supplies coming in the current delivery vehicles

39. Would visitor numbers increase?

No. We have an open visiting policy but visitor numbers are generally very low

40. What about the increase in staff – would that have an impact?

As many of the staff are local and part time they don't tend travel to work by car

41. How do you know that the traffic movements generated by the proposal would have been offset by that lost by the demolition of 2 houses?

Nationally a system called the TRICS Database demonstrates this

Summing Up by the Petitioners – against the application

Mr Glass made the following points:

- 42. Residents of Kelvin Close have signed a petition to express their views
- 43. We are interested in what we have to live with – not the theory of how it might work
- 44. The problem will continue as long as the entrance to the site is situated on Kelvin Close
- 45. We will work with the applicant but want to ensure that our street is a safe place to live

Summing Up by the Applicant

Mr Bunyan made the following points:

- 46. The suggestion of having an entrance/foyer area near bedrooms is impractical
- 47. We will ask our delivery drivers to follow set procedures by parking on site
- 48. Increasing bed space by 40 at the care home would actually free up homes in the City
- 49. The applicant is happy to continue to work with local residents to tackle the issues
- 50. There are 44 houses in the street but only 25 signed have the petition which shows that not all residents are in opposition

CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL

Notes of a Development Control
Forum – East Area Committee

369 Cherry Hinton Road

23 September 2009

11.50am – 12:30pm

Application No: 09/0701/FUL

Site Address: 369 Cherry Hinton Road

Description: Extension of care home for the elderly and demolition of 2 houses

Applicant: Mr John O'Kane

Agent: Mike Bunyan

Lead Petitioner: Andrew Glass

Case Officer: John Evans

Present:

For Applicant	For Petitioners
Helen Melhuish – Applicants	Gordon Thorburn
Doris Baker – Applicant	
Mike Bunyan - Agent	

Members of the East Area Committee

Councillors Blencowe, Herbert, Howell and Walker

Other Members in attendance

None

Declarations of Interest by Members

None

Officers

John Summers (Chair), John Evans (Case Officer) and Martin Whelan (Committee Manager)

Text of Petition

09/0701/FUL

The letter requesting the forum is attached at annex 1.

Introduction

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained the role and purpose of a Development Control Forum. The Chair provided a short summary of the application and stressed that this was not a formal meeting and that although notes would be circulated they would be picking up on the main points of the discussion and not be formal minutes.

Case by Applicants

The applicant made the following points:

- 1) Addressing a recognised deficiency in care home accommodation within the city.
- 2) Addressed issues raised at the previous objection including alteration to the access arrangements for the home and the carp parking.
- 3) Current levels of car parking and mechanism for managing illegal or inappropriate parking were explained. The robust policies with regards to deliveries were outlined.

Case by Petitioners

The Petitioners made the following points:

- 4) Difficulties with existing car parking arrangement contributing to problems with access and parking on Kelvin Close.
- 5) Concern that deliveries would not enter the site and increase the problems on Kelvin Close, due to the complexity of the access arrangements.
- 6) The results of a survey undertaken by local residents in the vicinity of Kelvin Close were explained, and photographs were circulated.

- 7) The refuse collection would create additional traffic problems by not being able to collect on site. Health and Safety implications of relocating the bin collection point nearer to residential properties were highlighted.
- 8) Road width insufficient to support two way traffic and insufficient uplift on the parking provision to accommodate the additional development.

The Case Officer's comments:

John Evans made the following points:

- 9) 2nd revised application.
- 10) Cambridgeshire County Council Highways don't consider scheme to create additional danger.
- 11) Disability Panel have expressed support for the scheme
- 12) 9 letters of representation including 56 signatures raising;
 - a. Objection to the principle of design
 - b. Objection to the built form of design
 - c. Traffic congestion/refuse storage issues

Members' questions and comments:

13) Is the bin facility on the perimeter of the site for storage or collection only ?

The applicant confirmed that the bins would be sited at the storage point, and it was agreed to clarify the arrangements in the committee report.

14) How have the access and the car park altered since the previous application?

The applicant demonstrated the revised access arrangements using the site plan. The applicant explained that the car park and access arrangements were designed in accordance with the relevant planning policies.

15) What is the process for ambulance access?

The applicant confirmed that the access arrangements were designed to allow ambulance access at the front of the site, and that the site access was designed to prevent vehicles blocking the front of the site.

17) Is there any access from the car park to the rear of building?

No, the applicant explained that the primary access is at the front of the building in order to maintain the security of the site.

18) Has the applicant prepared a travel plan for the site?

It was agreed that a statement about access, management of car parking and associated issues would be submitted to the Planning Authority for consideration at committee.

19) How many additional staff will be required?

The applicant explained that 5 additional day staff and 2 additional night staff would be required.

20) How many additional car parking spaces will be offered?

The applicant explained that 12 + 2 (disabled) spaces would be provided in the scheme. In further questioning it was agreed that the exact nature of the addition car park provision was not clear and the applicant agreed to clarify the car park arrangements prior to the committee.

21) How will vehicles turn in the site?

The applicant explained the two possible turning methods, and also explained that it was intention for delivery and refuse vehicles to fully access the site.

Summing Up by the Applicant

22) Welcomed the opportunity to participate in the process.

Summing Up by the Petitioners

23) Reiterated concerns previously raised in the presentation and highlighted the strength of local opposition to the scheme.

Final Comments of the Chair

The Chair felt that it had been a useful discussion and that several issues had been raised to follow through.

The Meeting concluded at 12.25pm

Amendments To Text: None.

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: 11.2 APPLICATION REF: **09/0616/FUL**

Location: 84 Beche Road, Cambridge

Target Date: 10.09.09

To Note: Apologies must be offered for the failure to update the report comprehensively since the last meeting. Below is further elaboration on the arguments rehearsed by the neighbour who has objected, and the applicant.

OBJECTOR

Attached in full to this amendment sheet as Appendix A, is the letter of objection from the neighbours at 86 Beche Road (east of 84), dated 8 August 2009. (The accompanying photographs will be displayed at Committee.)

The reasons for objecting can be summarised as:

- i) the creation of an permanent access directly onto the side passageway which gives rear access to both 84 and 86;
- ii) the design approach does not reflect the character of existing buildings and extensions;
- iii) that far from minimising the impact on neighbouring property, the 2.4m height and proximity (960mm) to 86 will overlook and overshadow this neighbouring property;
- iv) that the justification for extending beyond the existing rear wing (an extension to 74) is disingenuous because that property is an end of terrace house;
- v) this will exacerbate issues of overshadowing for the rear garden which already suffers because of the Council garages at the end of the gardens
- vi) Implications for a flowering cherry tree in the rear of 86.

These can be a summary only

The specific objections rehearsed, together with policy justification are:

- “1. The height of the proposed wall on the boundary line between 84 and 86 Beche Road and its impact on the visual amenity from within the property at ground floor level. **Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/14b – do not unreasonably overlook, overshadow, or visually dominate neighbouring properties.**
2. The extending of the existing ground floor projection by 2.4 metres will result in the loss of visual amenity by virtue of overshadowing of the garden and impact on the garden amenity at 86. **Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/14b – do not unreasonably overlook, overshadow, or visually dominate neighbouring properties.**
3. The proposed extension will harm the amenities of the neighbouring properties by virtue of its size, and does not respect or enhance the surrounding area. **Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/14b – do not unreasonably overlook, overshadow, or visually dominate neighbouring properties.**
4. The design and materials proposed are unsympathetic to the surrounding properties and make no attempt to reflect architectural features that are present e.g. Cambridge bricks, brick arches, wood materials etc. **Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/3 Safeguarding Environmental Character. Development will be permitted if it respects and enhances the distinctive character and quality of areas identified in the Cambridge Landscape Character Assessment. 3/14 Extending Buildings. The extension of existing buildings will be permitted if they: a – reflect or successfully contrast with its form, use of materials and architectural detailing.”**

There are criticisms too of the Design and Access Statement.

--

APPLICANT

Following the last Committee meeting the applicant has made further comment, seeking

to explain issues about the design and the implications for the neighbour at 86 who has objected to the proposal.

With regard to design the point is made that all has been done to minimise the impact on the neighbours to either side and that the extension proposed does not extend further out into the garden than an existing vine covered pergola, which is taller than what is proposed. The height of the proposed wall on the common boundary with the passageway between the two properties is, at 2.35m, as low as possible and lower than the eaves line of the extension to 86, which also abuts the passageway. The point is made that the cherry tree in the garden will have bigger implications for loss of light (through the rear doors) than the application. It is also noted that the previous report and the oral report to Committee both referred to the fact that because a considerable proportion of the roof of the rear extension to 86 is glazed, the kitchen will still receive a very considerable amount of natural light; the windows below the gutter line are secondary windows.

The introduction of a door to the passageway merely replaces the garden gate that currently gives access to that passageway

The applicant has specifically addressed matters of daylight and Based on two recommendations from the *Building Research Establishment Digest 209: Site planning for Daylight and Sunlight* paper, makes the following points:

“1. Sunlight Availability to windows: the paper recommends that main windows should receive at least 25% of the total annual probable sunlight hours and 5% of the probable sunlight in the winter months. Our application is so situated and designed that there is no adverse impact on these figures.

2. Diffuse Daylight to Windows: The BRE recommends that after development the sky visible from the centre of each main window should not be less than 27%. Notwithstanding the fact that the windows in question are not the main windows of the kitchen of No.86, after development 77 degrees or 86% of the sky will still be visible from these secondary windows. In fact the only real impact of the proposed wall is that it will replace their view of my existing kitchen roof! To put it into context a 6’ tall person would have to stand well over 1m or a 1/4 of the way into the kitchen of No.86 before they could even see the very top of our extension, so for anyone shorter they would have to stand much further into the kitchen.”

Two computer images showing more accurately the proposal and its relationship to the neighbour, with and without the tree to the rear of 86, accompanied the additional comments. (The computer images will be displayed on boards at Committee).

==

OFFICER RESPONSE

I will refer to the reasons 1-4 cited by the applicants in reverse order.

4. I do not consider that policy 3/3 which is particularly about Cambridge Landscape Character Assessment is immediately relevant, and has never to my knowledge been cited in a proposal for an extension. Policy 3/14 of the Local Plan requires that extensions to existing buildings, “reflect or successfully contrast with the form, use of materials and architectural detailing;”. As rehearsed in paragraph 8.2 of the report I am

of the view that what is proposed will provide a distinct modern solution, which will successfully contrast with what exists, subject to the use of appropriate materials. The application indicates the use of a matching brick for the walls, which will be the most 'public' (to neighbours) element of the building. The use of materials other than wood in the glazing to the roof and the end glass wall does not cause me concern and I note that, externally, timber has not been used in the glazing of the roof to the extension to 86.

3 &1. I do not share the view that the proposal will do material harm to the amenity of neighbours. The proposal is single storey only and given the two blank walls there cannot, in my opinion be any material harm through overlooking. As rehearsed at paragraph 8.2 of the report, the proposed extension is 2.4 m longer than the existing building, but, given the relative positions, any impact on 82 will only be at the beginning of the day and will not be materially more severe than the existing pergola of the same depth. Given the light available to the rear extension to 86 from the glazed roof and rooflights and the rear doors, I do not think there will be a diminution in light to 86 of a level that would justify refusal. Given that 84 is slightly south of west of 86, there will be some loss of light through the windows under the eaves in the south west wall of 86 at the end of the day; I do not however consider that this can be of a degree to warrant refusal.

The north east flank wall of the extension will have a certain 'presence' as seen through the high-level windows in the flank of 86 (and from the rear windows), for the occupiers of that property. However, given the height of the wall at 2.35m (lower than the eaves of the extension to 86) and the 960mm distance between the two, although the wall will be visible from some positions (but not from others), I do not consider that the 'presence' would be untoward or unreasonable. I do not think that at this height and distance the wall will dominate or unreasonably enclose the neighbour. A matching brick is the correct material to use.

2. Given the presence of a tree in the rear garden just to the rear of the extension to 86, and a trellis fence of about 1.8m height on the common boundary, I do not consider that the 2.4 metre projection beyond the existing extension to 86 is going to have such a bearing as to make the proposal unreasonable in terms of overshadowing. That is not to say that there will be no overshadowing, as there will be some towards the end of the day, but bearing in mind the fence and distances involved, I do not consider the degree of overshadowing that will occur would warrant refusal.

Given the relative positions of the two buildings, the overshadowing of the garden will be very limited.

Amendments To Text:

Paragraph 8.6 – the number in the first line should be 86, not 80.

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

That an additional condition is attached to safeguard the tree to the rear of 86, by requiring details of foundations before development commences.

3. No development works shall commence until such time as the foundations for

the proposed extension have been submitted to and been agreed in writing by the City Council. The development may only proceed in accordance with the foundation details agreed.

Reason: To safeguard the tree in the adjoining property (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 – policy 4/4).

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: 11.3 APPLICATION REF: **09/0743/FUL**

Location: 20 Occupation Road, Cambridge

Target Date: 12.10.09

To Note: Nothing

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: 11.4 APPLICATION REF: **09/0777/OUT**

Location: 163 Coleridge Road, Cambridge

Target Date: 20.10.09

To Note: Nothing

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:

09/0616/FUL

86 Beche Road
Cambridge CB5 8HU

August 8, 2009

Marcus Shingler
Senior Planning Officer
Development Control
Environment and Planning
Cambridge City Council
The Guildhall
Cambridge CB2 3QJ

Dear Mr Shingler,

Objection to planning application for single storey extension at rear of 84 Beche Road, Cambridge.

Reference 09/0616/FUL
Application Single storey rear extension
84 Beche Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire

We are writing in submission of our objection to the above proposal.

We have based our response on the Design Statement and other documents provided by the applicant.

There are a number of inaccuracies in the following documents:

- The Design Statement
- Block Plan: Ordnance Survey
- Householder Application for Planning Permission for works or extension to a dwelling and conservation area consent. Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act) 1990.

All the numbers e.g. 84, 72 refer to Beche Road unless otherwise stated.

Our responses to statements within any of the document are in *italics*.

Response the Design Statement

Introduction

1 84 Beche Road is a mid-terraced property sitting within a street of similar properties. It affords two bedrooms and a bathroom on the first floor, and a loft conversion provides a further bedroom

1.1 *The four properties from 84 to 90 were all built with accommodation in the second floor/roof space and not as stated in the applicant's statement as a loft conversion.*

Site analysis and evaluation

- 2 No 84 and No 86 differ from the remainder of the properties that form their terrace by having rear gardens that are considerably longer than the adjacent properties at around twice the length of the others
 - 2.1 *84 and 86 have longer gardens than 88 and 90 as part of the original 1897 development.*
- 3 Access to the rear garden of No 84 Beche Road is achieved through a passageway beneath No 86 Beche Road. This has a right of way that enables gated access to the rear garden of No 84.
 - 3.1 *This right of way offers reasonable access. We are concerned about the future use of the right of way by placing a permanent door in the proposed extension*
- 4 The elevations are broken up at ground level by rear additions that project to various distances into the rear gardens.
 - 4.1 *Nos 88 and 90 had rear ground floor extensions as part of the original build. In recent years these have been further extended until they are now the same length as the original ground floor extensions of 84 and 86.*
 - 4.2 *At the present time all rear extensions from 84 to 90 are the same length. This is not reflected in the ordnance survey plans submitted with the application.*
 - 4.3 *The submitted ordnance survey plans do not show a side extension to the rear extension of No 86 and therefore do not demonstrate the proximity of the proposed extension wall of 84 to the side extension at 86.*
 - 4.4 *The Design Statement makes no mention of Nos 76 to 82 all having short, two storey rear projections. No 82 has at some stage had a small, ground floor extension. All these extensions are approximately half the length of the present rear extension of No 84.*
5. No 74 has a rear single storey projection that extends the furthest into the rear garden removing almost all of the available amenity space for the property.
 - 5.1 *No 74 is at the end of the terrace. It has an original two storey projection into the rear garden which is approximately twice the length of all rear projections of No 84 and 90. The rest of the amenity space is occupied by a single garage built well before any current planning legislation.*

Identifying the design principles

- 6 Provide an increase to the ground floor living accommodation to provide a flexible family space of a size to balance
 - 6.1 *The house has always been a three storey, three bed roomed house and was bought as such by the present owners*
- 7 Be of construction to compliment the existing architecture
 - 7.1 *Within the site analysis and evaluation it is stated that 'the rear elevations are generally quite bland with no architectural features to note' the proposed*

design appears to reflect this statement as it makes no attempt to incorporate existing features of local character and is poorly integrated into the surrounding buildings.

8 To minimise impact to neighbouring properties.

8.1 *Because of the height (2400mm) and proximity (960mm) of the proposed side wall this will overlook and overshadow the neighbouring property No 86.*

Creating the design solution

9 Currently both sides have an 1800mm high fence as boundary definition, the fence appearing wholly placed within the land ownership of no 84.

9.1 *The section of the high fence referred to is directly on the boundary with 84 and 86 and was erected and paid for jointly with a previous occupant of 84.*

10 It is very hard to match existing brick work to these properties due to their age....

10.1 *It is very easy to match existing brickwork. Light coloured Cambridge Stocks are readily available in the Cambridge area. Matching brickwork has been used in all of the additional extensions at 86 to 90.*

11 The wrap around extension is to be formed with a sloping glass roof and the rear of the property is to be formed in a wall of glass doors. This provides a very contemporary extension that compliments the existing architecture.

11.1 *As previously stated the applicant has indicated that in his opinion there are no architectural features to note at the rear of the properties. The design appears to contain no architectural reference to the surround buildings.*

12 The extension is projecting to the rear of the kitchen by 2.4m. Looking along the line of the rear of the terrace this is commensurate with the rear projection from No 74; however No 84 has the garden depth to accommodate this without any loss of amenity

12.1 *The use of the rear storey projection at no 74 as a precedent for extending beyond the current rear projection at 84 is disingenuous. No 74 is at the end of the terrace, whilst no 84 is situated 4 houses away in the middle of the terrace.*

12.2 *Whilst there may be little loss of amenity to no 84 the 2.4m extension beyond the current rear projection will impact on the garden amenity at no 86 because of its height and bulk. The garden at 86 is already overshadowed along much of its length by the rear walls of the council garages accessed from River Lane.*

Conclusion

13 This proposal provides a sympathetic extension to afford the property with appropriate living accommodation.

13.1 *As stated in the Design Statement 'the rear elevations are generally quite bland with no architectural features to note'. In this design there has been no effort to produce an extension which would be sympathetic to the Victorian buildings and their surroundings.*

Response to: Householder Application for Planning permission for works or extension to a dwelling and conservation area consent. Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act) 1990 used in the application.

Q 7. Trees and Hedges. Are there trees and hedges on your own or on adjoining properties which are within falling distance of your own boundary?

The applicant has answered No. However, there is an established flowering cherry tree, approximately 8m tall in the garden of No 86. This tree is 370mm from the boundary of 84 and 86 and the proposed extension.

Response to Block Plan: Ordnance Survey.

Attached is a plan amended by us to show the current outline of the properties at 86 to 90 (see appendix 86\16).

Our objections to the proposed extension:

1. *The height of the proposed wall on the boundary line between 84 and 86 Beche Rd and its impact on the visual amenity from within the property at ground floor level. Cambridge Local Plan (2006) 3/14 b - do not unreasonably overlook, overshadow or visually dominate neighbouring properties.*
2. *The extending of the existing ground floor projection by 2.4m will result in loss of visual amenity by virtue of overshadowing of the garden and impact on the garden amenity at 86. Cambridge Local Plan (2006) 3/14 b - do not unreasonably overlook, overshadow or visually dominate neighbouring properties.*
3. *The proposed extension will harm the amenities of the neighbouring properties by virtue of its size, and does not respect or enhance the surrounding area. Cambridge Local Plan (2006) 3/4 Responding to Context a - identify and respond positively to existing features of natural, historic or local character on and close to the proposed development site;*
4. *The design and materials proposed are unsympathetic to the surrounding properties and make no attempt to reflect architectural features that are present e.g. Cambridge bricks, brick arches, wood materials etc. Cambridge Local Plan (2006) 3/3 Safeguarding Environmental Character. Development will be permitted if it respects and enhances the distinctive character and quality of areas identified in the Cambridge Landscape Character Assessment. 3/14 Extending Buildings. The extension of existing buildings will be permitted if they: a - reflect or successfully contrast with its form, use of materials and architectural detailing.*
5. *We note that a previous application to extend no 84 at the rear was refused in 1988. Application reference C/88/0553*