

Application Number	12/0684/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	25th June 2012	Officer	Ms Lorna Gilbert
Target Date	20th August 2012		
Ward	Newnham		
Site	99 Grantchester Meadows Cambridge CB3 9JN		
Proposal	Demolition of existing single storey side extension and replacement with three storey side extension, third storey including loft conversion plus single storey rear extension.		
Applicant	Mr Jason Brown 99 Grantchester Meadows Newnham Cambridgeshire CB3 9JN		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is considered the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area - It is considered the proposal would not be detrimental to neighbours amenities - The proposal would comply with relevant policies
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

1.1 The property is an end of terrace house located on the northern side of Grantchester Meadows. It is bordered to the north-east by No.97 Grantchester Meadows. To the west is an access road leading to 103a Grantchester Meadows. The property of No.103 Grantchester Meadows also lies to the south-west beyond the access Road. The properties numbered 101, 101a

and 103a are located to the north-west of the property. There is a path to the north of the property and beyond this is No.22 Marlowe Road. No.92 Grantchester Meadows is located to the south-east on the opposite side of the street.

- 1.2 The site falls within Conservation Area No.8 (Newnham Croft Conservation Area).

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposal involves:

- The demolition of an existing single storey side extension.
- Erection of a two-storey side extension.
- Loft conversion.
- Single storey rear extension.

- 2.2 The materials proposed include brick walls to match the existing house and slate on the sloped roofs to match existing. Lead sheets would be applied to vertical faces on dormers and loft extension. The windows would be painted timber to match existing.

- 2.3 Amended plans have been received which show the following revisions:

- Rear ridge height amended.
- All flank windows have been labelled obscure glazed.

- 2.4 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:

1. Design and Access Statement
2. Drawings

- 2.5 The application is brought before Committee at the request of Councillor Sian Reid for the following reasons:

- The degree of the increased mass, doubts over the fit of its visual form with the street and nearby dwellings and overlooking.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
11/1500/FUL	Demolition of existing single storey side extension and replacement with three storey side extension, third storey including loft conversion plus single storey rear extension.	Withdrawn 29.3.12
11/0671/FUL	Demolition of existing single storey side extension and replace with three storey side extension, third storey including loft conversion plus single storey rear	Withdrawn 11.8.11

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, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 policies, Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
East of England Plan 2008	ENV6 ENV7
Cambridge Local Plan 2006	3/1 3/7 3/11 3/14 4/11

5.3 Relevant Central Government Guidance, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework March 2012 Circular 11/95 Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010
Supplementary Planning Documents	Sustainable Design and Construction
Material Considerations	<u>Central Government:</u> Letter from Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (27 May 2010) Written Ministerial Statement: Planning for Growth (23 March 2011)
	<u>Citywide:</u> Arboricultural Strategy Roof Extensions Design Guide
	<u>Area Guidelines:</u> Conservation Area Appraisal: Newnham Croft

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Engineering)

6.1 No comment.

Urban Design and Conservation Team

6.2 The proposed extensions are not detrimental to the character and appearance of the conservation area and therefore adhere to policy 4/11.

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 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations: 101 and 101a Grantchester Meadows.

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Technical points raised:
- The ridge on the rear extension of the property is shown significantly higher up the main than in reality it is. The result of this is that with the eastern elevations of the proposed second floor extension, the area of vertical lead side to this extension, will be 100-150% higher than illustrated.
- Whilst it is noted that the site plan is now correct at the northern end it is still not correct in the middle which affects the width of the extension.
- Objections:
- Proposal appears an extremely dominant mass when viewed from Grantchester Meadows.
- Vertical lead cladding of the flat roofed second floor extension is going to be very prominent from Grantchester Meadows and Marlow Road and remains an intrusive and out of character form in the street scene.
- The side elevation on to our driveway has a number of windows as well as an arched opening adjacent to the front door. All of these windows are borrowing light and space from our driveway rather than from the application site. These windows cannot be openable (unless they are totally inward opening windows), cannot be cleaned, let alone constructed.
- The Oriel window, which has been claimed to have obscure glass, nevertheless means that when the windows are open it will have a direct view along all the private amenity spaces of 103, 105, 107 and 109 Grantchester Meadows.
- Massive increase in internal floor area.

- Can appreciate the applicant wishes to expand the property, however these continuous attempts at tinkering with the design are not overcoming the issue of a building of too much mass and volume.
- It is clearly a significant over development and will seriously impact on the Conservation Area and its neighbours.
- I have understood from officers that extensions to buildings, should be subordinate to the original volume.
- The comparison which the Conservation Officer makes between the proposals and the tall flank wall in Victorian brickwork is worrying. The older wall – which pre-dates the Edwardian terraced house by some 80 or more years is only 7m or so long. The wall proposed under this application extends 11.7m along the boundary – nearly 70% longer and a further 4.8m as a single storey extension.

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, external spaces and impact on the conservation area
2. Residential amenity
3. Third party representations

Context of site, design, external spaces and impact on the conservation area

8.2 There have been two previous proposals to extend the property of No.99 Grantchester Meadows which were both withdrawn.

8.3 This application relates to an end of terrace house located within the Newnham Croft Conservation Area. The Newnham Croft Conservation Area Appraisal is relevant to this application. The concern is the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the conservation area.

- 8.4 The Newnham Croft Conservation Area Appraisal explains how proposals for the alteration and extension of buildings in the conservation area should respect the character and appearance of the building and the impact on neighbouring properties.
- 8.5 Comments were received from the Council's Conservation team. They are supportive of the scheme subject to conditions. They explain how the proposed elevation will create a long west elevation to the access drive, however this will be broken up on the first floor by the small side return where the existing two storey element will meet the new extension. This will not be out of character in this part of the conservation area as the existing side elevation of no.103, although not as long as the proposed for no.99, is a three storey blank façade. An objection received disputes the comparison to this nearby property.
- 8.6 In my opinion, the western elevation would be broken up by the set back of the two storey extension. This helps to lessen its mass and reduce its visual impact when viewed along the nearby streets. The majority of the single storey rear extension would be screened by the existing boundary treatment and shrubs growing along the boundary. The roof additions are located behind the front roof ridge and are set in from the western elevation. The vertical lead cladding is set in from the western elevation and would only be obliquely visible from ground level. The proposal also includes a two storey side extension. I am conscious that the property is part of a row of terraced houses that are relatively uniform in design. The proposed side addition includes a new door. This is set in from the front elevation under a first floor overhang, which I consider would help to minimise the impact of this element. The side extension has been designed to complement the appearance of the house.
- 8.7 The proposal does involve a number of extensions and does increase the mass of the property, however, it is considered that the broken form and the position of the extensions help to reduce the impact of the proposal and would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- 8.8 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7, 3/11, 3/14 and 4/11.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.9 The eastern facing main wall at No.103 Grantchester Meadows contains no windows. There is a first floor flank window on the rear projection. This rear projection is set back from the boundary. All side windows on the proposal would be obscure glazed. These windows serve bathrooms, a hall, utility room and a bedroom. The bedroom has a second window also at the rear. All the windows are capable of being non-opening, however, in my opinion this would not be necessary as they do not directly face neighbours windows. The flank window at this neighbouring property would not be directly opposite the Oriel window and is located towards the rear wall of the two storey rear projection. There would be a gap of 8.5m between the Oriel window and flank window at No.103 Grantchester Meadows. The orientation of this neighbour to the west of the proposal avoids it from resulting in an unreasonable loss of light to this property and the distance between these properties I consider avoids there being any detrimental harm to its outlook. I do not consider there to be an issue with the windows overlooking the access road that runs along side the property.
- 8.10 No.97 Grantchester Meadows is a mid-terraced house to the east of the proposal. The single storey extension extends out 4.1m along this boundary and up to 2.2m at the eaves with a hipped roof by this neighbour. No flank windows are proposed facing this neighbour. The roof light proposed is in a sloped roof and would be too high to lead to a loss of privacy to this neighbour. This neighbouring property has not been extended at the rear. The orientation of this neighbour to the east avoids it from experiencing an unreasonable loss of light from the proposal. It is considered outlook from this neighbour would not be detrimentally affected because of the low height of the proposal along the boundary.
- 8.11 There is an access drive to properties behind Grantchester Meadows. No.103a Grantchester Meadows is 11m away from the end of the single storey rear extension. In my opinion, the position and distance of this property from the proposal would avoid detrimental harm to their amenity.

- 8.12 An objector referred to how the Oriel window if opened could overlook amenity space at No.103, 105, 107 and 109 Grantchester Meadows. No.103 Grantchester Meadows is the nearest neighbour. The proposed flank windows would be obscure glazed which would help to lessen the impact on neighbouring residents. The Oriel window serves bedroom 2. This room also has a rear window, which I consider to be the main window for the room. The rear garden at No.103 Grantchester Meadows is located 5m from the Oriel window. I consider that this distance would not be detrimental to the privacy of its neighbours because the property is in an urban area where properties can be in relatively close proximity to one another. The access road also helps to separate the property from its nearest neighbour to the west, No.103 Grantchester Meadows. The rear gardens of No.105, 107 and 109 Grantchester Meadows are beyond No.103 Grantchester Meadows and it is considered their privacy would not be compromised by the proposal because of the distance between them.
- 8.13 In my opinion the proposal 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.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

- 8.14 In my opinion the proposal provides a high-quality living environment and an appropriate standard of residential amenity for future occupiers, and I consider that in this respect it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/14.

Third Party Representations

- 8.15 A couple of technical points were raised by a third party. The agent was contacted with regard to these comments. Amended drawing number GA –DCDB99GRA.7 Rev.F was received that addressed the point about the appearance of the vertical lead cladding on the east elevations. The agent has confirmed by email that the site plan is correct. They acknowledged that they had in the past altered the northern boundary.

- 8.16 The workability of the proposed flank windows has been questioned. They refer to how the windows are borrowing light and space from the adjacent driveway and that the windows cannot be openable (unless inward opening), cannot be cleaned or constructed. The windows would be capable of being constructed on the application site. Issues of maintenance are not for planning and are for the applicant to resolve. I do not consider there to be any issue with windows on the western elevation receiving light.

9.0 RECOMMENDATION

1. APPROVE subject to the following conditions and reasons for approval:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. No roofs or walls shall be constructed until full details of the type and source of roof covering materials and the ridge, eaves and hip details, if appropriate, and bricks to be used, have been submitted to the local planning authority as samples and approved in writing. Roofs and walls shall thereafter be constructed only in accordance with the approved details. All new brickwork shall match exactly the historic work nearby in terms of bond, mortar mix design, joint thickness, pointing technique, brick dimension, colour and texture, etc.

Reason: To avoid harm to the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policies 4/11)

3. All new joinery [window frames, etc.] shall be recessed at least 50 / 75mm back from the face of the wall / facade. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/11)

4. All new joinery is to be of timber and not metal or plastic.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/11)

Reasons for Approval

1. This development has been approved, conditionally, because subject to those requirements it is considered to conform to the Development Plan as a whole, particularly the following policies:

East of England plan 2008: ENV6 ENV7

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/1 3/7 3/11 3/14 4/11

2. The decision has been made having had regard to all other material planning considerations, none of which was considered to have been of such significance as to justify doing other than grant planning permission.

These reasons for approval can be a summary of the reasons for grant of planning permission only. For further details on the decision please see the officer report online at www.cambridge.gov.uk/planningpublicaccess or visit our Customer Service Centre, Mandela House, 4 Regent Street, Cambridge, CB2 1BY between 8am to 6pm Monday to Friday.

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
or by visiting the Customer Service Centre at Mandela House.