

---

<b>Application Number</b>	12/0626/FUL	<b>Agenda Item</b>	
<b>Date Received</b>	17th May 2012	<b>Officer</b>	Natalie Westgate
<b>Target Date</b>	12th July 2012		
<b>Ward</b>	Arbury		
<b>Site</b>	1 Searle Street Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB4 3DB		
<b>Proposal</b>	Alterations and additions to ground floor accommodation following part demolition of existing garage/store and existing extension.		
<b>Applicant</b>	Dr And Mrs Arthur Hibble 1 Searle Street Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB4 3DB		

---

SUMMARY	The development will have an adverse effect on the visual amenity of the Conservation Area.
RECOMMENDATION	REFUSAL

## 1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The site comprises a two-storey, end of terrace dwelling located on the south-eastern side of Searle Street, on the junction of Searle Street and Fisher Street. The property has a garage at the end of the rear garden, which fronts onto Carlyle Road. The area is residential in character, mainly consisting of terrace dwellings. The application dwelling is finished in Cambridge stock bricks and slated roof.
- 1.2 The houses on Searle Street have two-storey projecting wings to the rear. The rear projecting wings of 1 and 3 Searle Street, which adjoin one another are the same depth. 1 Searle Street has a single storey extension at the end of the projecting wing (which steps down from a mono-pitched roof to a flat roof), which brings the house 1.6m from the rear of the garage.

1.3 The site falls within the Castle and Victoria Road Conservation Area. The site is not a listed building and there are no tree preservation orders on the site. The site falls within the controlled parking zone.

## **2.0 THE PROPOSAL**

2.1 It is proposed to remove the existing flat roof garage/store and incorporate the existing rear lean to extension into a single storey part pitched and part flat roof extension. The application follows on from an earlier application that was refused under delegated powers in August 2011.

2.2 The pitched roof part would project 6.1m from the existing two-storey projecting wing, at the same width (3.3m). The side wall of the existing lean to extension would be incorporated into the extension. This side wall projects 2.5m along the boundary with 3 Searle Street and the roof of the new extension will be 2.6m to eaves and 4m to ridge. The flat roof extension extends to the Carlyle Road frontage 1.2m beyond the existing garage and runs along the Fisher Street frontage for 8.5m. A small yard area is retained which measures 5.5m by 2.5m (average width). The extension accommodates living space and a workshop/refuse store/cycle parking space.

2.3 The application is accompanied by a Planning Statement and photographs of walls in the area.

2.4 Both Councillor Ward and Councillor Todd-Jones have requested that the application be considered by Committee. Councillor Todd-Jones' comments are set out in paragraph 7.2. Councillor Ward's request is based on the fact that the Conservation Area has recently been extended and the Committee should have the opportunity to debate the merits of the application.

### 3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
11/1163/FUL	Part single storey, part one and a half storey rear/side extension, including roof terrace following demolition of existing store/garage and existing extension.	REFUSED
C/04/1034	Roof Extension and two dormer windows to existing dwelling house.	WITHDRAWN
C/00/0151	Extension to existing boundary wall around dwelling.	APPROVED

3.1 A copy of the Decision Notice for the previous refusal (11/1163) is attached to this report.

### 4.0 PUBLICITY

4.1 Advertisement:	Yes
Adjoining Owners:	Yes
Site Notice Displayed:	Yes

### 5.0 POLICY

5.1 See Appendix 1 for full details of Central Government Guidance, East of England Plan 2008 policies, Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies and Supplementary Planning Documents.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
East of England Plan 2008	ENV6, ENV7
Cambridge Local Plan 2006	3/4, 3/14, 4/11

5.3 Relevant Central Government Guidance and Supplementary Planning Documents

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework March 2012 Circular 11/95
Supplementary Planning Documents	Sustainable Design and Construction Castle and Victoria Road Conservation Area Appraisal 2012

## 6.0 CONSULTATIONS

### Cambridgeshire County Council (Engineering)

- 6.1 The proposals results in the loss of parking provision within the site. Demand for car parking will be decanted onto the street, increasing competition with other residents. Conditions are recommended relating to encroachment onto the highway and works to a highway requiring highways consent.

#### Historic Environment Manager

- 6.2 The application is not supported due to the boundary wall detailing. This is a very visible location within a Conservation Area and the proposal will have a detrimental impact and there is no justification for this. The proposed extensions are acceptable.
- 6.3 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 Councillor Ward has commented on this application and notes that it is within a recent conservation area where there is many existing extensions and modern garages.
- 7.2 Councillor Todd-Jones has commented on this application and notes that the proposal further develops an already very constrained site, with a structure and walls to a height of at least one storey running the complete length of the boundary with the neighbouring property (3, Searle Street) and causing loss of light in the rear garden. The height, scale and massing along the entire length of the boundary wall within such a constrained site results in domination of the rear and rear garden of the

neighbouring property and leads to a significant sense of enclosure and loss of amenity. In addition, the proposal removes an existing garage resulting in the decanting of a parking space within the curtilage of the property into the nearby street where the existing Residents Parking Scheme is already under severe pressure from current use. In conjunction with the loss of rear garden and amenity space as a result of over-developing such a constrained site. Overall, the proposal unreasonably dominates the rear of the neighbouring property resulting in a heightened sense of enclosure in a very restricted site and causing significant loss of residential amenity to the neighbouring property.

7.3 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations:

### **Objection**

- 3 Hale Avenue
- 3 Searle Street
- 5 Searle Street
- 7 Searle Street
- 2 The Chilterns, Gloucester Green, Oxford (Purchasers of 3 Searle Street)

The representations can be summarised as follows:

- This area is relatively open in character and the proposal will enclose this due to the amount of extensions proposed;
- The proposal is an over development of the site;
- Design is unsympathetic to the existing Victorian building because the roof pitch is steeper than the existing and therefore the ridgeline is too long and high.
- The glazed hipped element is at odds with the character of the area;
- Design of the foundation needs to be considered carefully as this development has the potential to affect nearby trees;
- The proposal will be enclosing and dominant in neighbouring gardens;
- The design has failed to take the opportunity to reduce crime and improve safety;
- Design of the boundary adjoining house and garage;
- High wall lead to loss of light and enjoyment of the home and garden;

- Design of the roof will create a tunnel effect;
- The cycle parking is not adequate;
- Loss of the off street car parking will lead to more competition for on street car parking;

### **Support**

- 2 Searle Street
- 4 Fisher Street

The representations can be summarised as follows:

- The proposal will not have a detrimental view into Fisher Street.
- The impact of the proposal will not be detrimental as this is a ground floor extension only;

7.5 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. Planning History
2. Context of site, design and external spaces and impact on the Conservation Area
3. Residential amenity
4. Highway safety
5. Car and cycle parking
6. Third party representations

### **Planning History**

8.2 The previous refusal on the site is a significant material consideration. This application was refused for the following reasons:

1) There are no existing roof terraces on houses in the surrounding area. The proposed roof terrace would therefore be out of character with its surroundings and incongruous in the street scene. For these reasons the proposal is contrary to

policies 3/4 and 3/14 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and to advice provided by Planning Policy Statement 1 - Delivering Sustainable Development (2005).

2) Due to its height, scale, and proximity to the common boundary with 3 Searle Street, the proposed extension would have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of the occupiers of 3 Searle Street. It would reduce the outlook from this dwelling and would dominate the rear aspect and garden of that property in an unreasonable manner, causing the neighbouring occupiers to suffer an unacceptable sense of enclosure, to the detriment of the level of amenity they should reasonably expect to enjoy. For these reasons the proposal is contrary to policies 3/7 and 3/14 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and to advice provided by Planning Policy Statement 1 - Delivering Sustainable Development (2005).

8.3 The current scheme has been amended to address these reasons for refusal as follows:

1) the proposed roof terrace which was on top of the flat roof part of the extension has been removed and the relationship of the extension with the boundary wall to Fisher Street has changed. This boundary wall was previously to be extended from 1.7m high to 2.6m high with the roof terrace railing adding a further 0.8m. The boundary wall is now to be increased in height to 2m and the extension set back behind it by 0.1m. The extension will be 2.5m to eaves and will therefore project 0.5m above the wall.

2) the pitched roof extension has been reduced in height from 5.2m to ridge to 4m and now incorporates a hipped end.

8.4 Since the earlier application two significant events have occurred, the site now falls into a Conservation Area and the National Planning Policy Framework has been produced. I have addressed these as part of my Assessment.

### **Context of site, design and external spaces and impact on the Conservation Area**

8.5 The site is located on a prominent corner at the junction with Fisher Street and Carlyle Road within the Conservation Area. The roof terrace element of the earlier scheme has been

removed and the visual impact of the extension has been reduced. However the proposals still include an increase in height to boundary wall to Fisher Street. The view of the Conservation Officer is that the proposed height and the additional impact arising from the view of the extension behind the wall will be imposing in the streetscene and would be harmful to the visual amenities of the Conservation Area.

- 8.6 The ground floor plan of the extension, the combination of pitched roof and flat roof elements and the amount to external space that is retained is no different than the previous scheme. These matters were not regarded as contentious previously and I do not consider that they have an adverse impact on the Conservation Area. I do not share the view that has been expressed by third parties that the extensions will be visually enclosing or amount to overdevelopment.
- 8.7 In my opinion the proposal is contrary with East of England Plan (2008) policies ENV6 and ENV7 and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/14 and 4/11.

### **Residential Amenity**

#### Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.8 The occupiers and future occupiers of 3 Searle Street are most affected by the development. In my view the reduction in height of the pitched roof extension from 5.2m to ridge to 4m and the incorporation of a hipped end reduces the impact of the extension significantly. The extension would enclose the garden to 3 Searle Street and there would be a change to the outlook from the house and garden. However in my view these impacts would not have a significant impact on the level of amenity currently experienced by the occupiers of 3 Searle Street.
- 8.9 The removal of off street car parking provision which results from the loss of the garage was not a contentious issue in relation to the earlier application. There have been no changes in policy or site circumstances that would justify a change in this assessment for the current application. I do not consider that the impact on residential amenity arising from increased competition for on street parking will be significant.



8.10 In my opinion the current proposal overcomes the second reason for refusal of the earlier scheme and adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and I consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 3/7.

### **Third Party Representations**

8.11 I have addressed the issues raised by residents in my Assessment. It should be noted that there is some support for the application.

## **9.0 CONCLUSION**

9.1 The proposed extension will be highly visible in the street and the Conservation Area. The extension will be higher than the existing boundary wall and out of context with the character of the Conservation Area. Refusal is recommended.

## **10.0 RECOMMENDATION**

### **FOR RECOMMENDATIONS OF REFUSAL**

#### **REFUSE for the following reasons:**

1. The proposed development includes an increase in the height of the boundary wall to Fisher Street and the projection of the side elevation of the proposed extension above the new boundary wall which would have a dominant and enclosing effect on the streetscene. In so doing the extension would be out of character with the area and detrimental to the visual amenities of the streetscene. The development is contrary to East of England Plan (2008) policies ENV6 and ENV7 and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/14 and 4/11 and to guidance provided by the National Planning Policy Framework.

## **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 on the City Council website at:  
[www.cambridge.gov.uk/planningpublicaccess](http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/planningpublicaccess)  
or by visiting the Customer Service Centre at Mandela House.