

|                           |                                                                        |                    |                    |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| <b>Application Number</b> | 08/0799/FUL                                                            | <b>Agenda Item</b> | 11.1               |
| <b>Date Received</b>      | 30th May 2008                                                          | <b>Officer</b>     | Mr Marcus Shingler |
| <b>Target Date</b>        | 25th July 2008                                                         |                    |                    |
| <b>Ward</b>               | Castle                                                                 |                    |                    |
| <b>Site</b>               | 2 Stratfield Close Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB4 3NA                    |                    |                    |
| <b>Proposal</b>           | Single storey front extension.                                         |                    |                    |
| <b>Applicant</b>          | Dr & Mrs Thorpe<br>2 Stratfield Close Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB4 3NA |                    |                    |

---

## **1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT**

1.1 The subject site comprises a detached two-storey dwelling on the north western side of Stratfield Close, finished in red brick, white weatherboarding and tiles. The area is residential in character containing a mixture of terraced semi-detached and detached dwellings although this property is one of a group of 5 dwellings to the north western side of Stratfield Close which has a distinctive character created by similar design and a common building line at the front.

1.2 The site does not lie within a Conservation Area or the Controlled Parking Zone.

## **2.0 THE PROPOSAL**

2.1 The application follows the earlier refusal of an application for a single storey front extension (08/0118/FUL) and again seeks permission for a single storey front extension. The design has been amended since the earlier refusal, being slightly less wide at 4.88m (5.48m), of 1.2m depth (1.5m) and with a hipped and pitched roof of maximum height 3.1m.

2.2 The application is reported to Committee at the request of Councillor Hipkin on the grounds that previous concerns my have been addressed.

### 3.0 **SITE HISTORY**

| Reference   | Description                   | A/C,REF,W/D |
|-------------|-------------------------------|-------------|
| 08/0118/FUL | Single storey front extension | REF         |

### 4.0 **PUBLICITY**

- 4.1 Advertisement: No  
Adjoining Owners: Yes  
Site Notice Displayed: No

### 5.0 **POLICY**

#### 5.1 **Central Government Advice**

##### **PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development (2005):**

Paragraphs 7 and 8 state that national policies and regional and local development plans (regional spatial strategies and local development frameworks) provide the framework for planning for sustainable development and for development to be managed effectively. This plan-led system, and the certainty and predictability it aims to provide, is central to planning and plays the key role in integrating sustainable development objectives. Where the development plan contains relevant policies, applications for planning permission should be determined in line with the plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

#### 5.2 **Circular 11/95 – The Use of Conditions in Planning**

**Permissions:** Advises that conditions should be necessary, relevant to planning, relevant to the development permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects.

#### 5.3 **East of England Plan 2008**

ENV7 Quality in the built environment

#### 5.4 **Cambridge Local Plan 2006**

3/4 Responding to context  
3/14 Extending buildings

## 5.5 Supplementary Planning Documents

**Cambridge City Council (May 2007) – Sustainable Design and Construction:** Sets out essential and recommended design considerations of relevance to sustainable design and construction. Applicants for major developments are required to submit a sustainability checklist along with a corresponding sustainability statement that should set out information indicated in the checklist. Essential design considerations relate directly to specific policies in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. Recommended considerations are ones that the council would like to see in major developments. Essential design considerations are urban design, transport, movement and accessibility, sustainable drainage (urban extensions), energy, recycling and waste facilities, biodiversity and pollution. Recommended design considerations are climate change adaptation, water, materials and construction waste and historic environment.

## 6.0 CONSULTATIONS

### Cambridgeshire County Council (Engineering)

- 6.1 No Objection.
- 6.2 The above responses are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the consultation responses can be inspected on the application file.

## 7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

- 7.1 The owners of the following addresses have made representations:
- 1 Stratfield Close
- 7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:
1. The extension will be out of keeping with the area, with potential impact on drainage and with loss of light to No. 1.
- 7.3 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations can

be inspected on the application file.

## 8.0 **ASSESSMENT**

8.1 From the consultation responses and representations received and from my inspection of the site and the surroundings, I consider that the main issues are:

1. Context of site, design and external spaces
2. Residential amenity
3. Third party representations

### **Context of site, design and external spaces**

8.2 The proposed extension is sited to the front of the existing dwelling and will be clearly visible in the street scene and at a prominent location within it, being close to the junction with Tavistock Road. Careful assessment of its potential impact on the character and appearance of the locality is therefore required.

8.3 In this respect, I still have some concerns regarding the proposed development. The existing dwelling is one of a group of five dwellings to the north western side of Stratfield Close which has its own distinctive character in comparison with other sections of the locality. This character is of relatively spacious dwellings which currently share a similar design and a common building line at the frontage. I consider that the proposed front extension, even with its reduced width and depth, would still be visually intrusive in this context and would cause harm to this special character of the locality. I am not convinced that even an extension much reduced in width would avoid causing harm to the character of the locality, but an extension of the width proposed in this instance, would be unduly prominent in my view.

8.4 I consider that for these reasons the development is in conflict with policy ENV7 of the East of England Plan (2008) and with policies 3/4 and 3/14 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

### **Residential Amenity**

8.5 The proposed extension sits to the front of the existing dwelling and would be to the south west of the unattached neighbouring

property at No. 1 Stratfield Close. The extension would impact to some degree by way of loss of light but given that it is single storey only and of limited depth at 1.5m, I do not consider that the impact upon light would be so severe as to merit refusal for this reason. Additionally, I do not consider that outlook or privacy to this dwelling would be significantly impacted.

- 8.6 The extension will sit to the north east of the unattached neighbouring property at No. 3 and any impact on light or outlook to this property would be very limited and there will be no loss of privacy to this property. No other neighbouring dwellings are adversely affected by the development.
- 8.7 In my opinion the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours.

### **Third Party Representations**

- 8.8 The issues raised in third party correspondence are considered above.

### **9.0 CONCLUSION**

- 9.1 The proposals are considered to be unacceptable and refusal is thus recommended

### **10.0 RECOMMENDATION**

**REFUSE** for the following reason/s:

1. The proposed front extension would, by reason of its width, depth and prominent location, be unduly obtrusive and visually dominant in the street scene of the locality, to the detriment of its character and appearance, contrary to policy 3/14 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006). For these reasons the development fails to respond adequately to its context or to relate satisfactorily to its surroundings and is therefore also contrary to policy ENV7 of the East of England Plan (2008), to policy 3/4 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and to advice provided by PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development.

## **LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985**

Under Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972, the following are “background papers” for each report on a planning application:

1. The planning application and plans;
2. Any explanatory or accompanying letter or document from the applicant;
3. Comments of Council departments on the application;
4. Comments or representations by third parties on the application as referred to in the report plus any additional comments received before the meeting at which the application is considered; unless (in each case) the document discloses “exempt or confidential information”
5. Any Structure Plan, Local Plan or Council Policy Document referred to in individual reports.

These papers may be inspected by contacting John Summers (Ext.7103) in the Planning Department.



08/0799/FUL

2 Stratfield Close Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB4 3NA

11.1