

Application Number	12/1342/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	24th October 2012	Officer	Ms Nanayaa Ampoma
Target Date	19th December 2012		
Ward	West Chesterton		
Site	73 Gilbert Road Cambridge CB4 3NZ		
Proposal	Single storey extension to side and rear of property replacing existing single storey side extension. First floor extension to side to enlarge bathroom. First floor extension to rear to enlarge bedroom.		
Applicant	Mr Richard Bailey 73 Gilbert Road Cambridge CB4 3NZ		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The design of the development is acceptable. 2. The impact of the development on the amenity space of its neighbours is reasonable. 3. The key objections raised in relation to No. 71 Gilbert Road are not enough to warrant an automatic refusal as the negative effects of the development are no more than would be expected for a development of this kind.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site sits within a long row of residential semi-detached properties to the west of Gilbert Road, closer to the junction that meets Courtney Way and near the Chesterton Sports Centre. The property is a semi-detached two storey house that has been extended previously to allow for a side

extension, a loft conversion and rear dormer extension. It shares a party wall with no.71 Gilbert Road, which has also been the subject of an extension.

- 1.2 The property is not within a Conservation Area and there are no protected trees on site.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 Permission is sought for the demolition of the side extension and the constructing of a single storey side and rear extension and a first floor extension to the side and rear of the property.
- 2.2 The extension to the side and rear of the property would replace the current bike store, pantry and utility area with a large kitchen, a cloak room and a smaller utility store room. This extension would abut the boundary line between no.73 Gilbert Road and no.75 Gilbert Road. The extension will extend from the main house by 2.4 metres to the side, at a height of 3.3 at its ridge, and extend from the rear of the main house by 4.4 metres at a height of 3.3 metres to the ridge.
- 2.3 At first floor, the property will be extended from the current bathroom to the side of the property by 1.2 metres and the 3rd bedroom to the rear will be extended further to the rear by 1.3 metres. This forms part of the two storey extension to the rear which also provides further space on the second floor.
- 2.4 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:
 1. Plans
 2. Permitted Development Diagram in relation to what is being proposed
- 2.5 The application is brought before Committee at the request of Councillor Max Boyce for the following reason:
 - Although the current application is substantially better than the previous, it does not address the main issue for refusing the previous application as it still has a two storey element.

2.6 Councillor Max Boyce has also declared a personal interest as he is acquainted with one of the architects responsible for drawing the plans for the application.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
C/03/0407	Loft conversion incorporating side and rear facing dormer windows.	Approved, conditions
10/0339/FUL	Single and two storey rear extension.	Refused
10/0795/FUL	Two storey and single storey rear extensions.	Refused
11/0401/CL2PD	Application for a certificate of lawfulness under Section 192 for a single storey side extension replacing existing structure and a two storey rear extension	Not determined

A full history of the site can be view on file.

3.1 The decisions for the previous refused applications, 10/0339/FUL and 10/0795/FUL, is attached to this report for ease under Appendix I.

4.0 PUBLICITY

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

5.0 POLICY

5.1 See Appendix 1 for full details of Central Government Guidance, 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
Cambridge Local Plan 2006	3/4, 3/7, 3/11 and 3/14

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework 2012
Material Planning Considerations	<u>Citywide:</u> Roof Extensions Design Guide

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways)

6.1 No comment.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

7.1 Councillor Max Boyce has objected on the grounds that the development still proposes a two storey element.

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

69 Gilbert Road
71 Gilbert Road

7.3 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Out of keeping with area
- Too large
- Would create negative precedent in area
- The present side extension has already reduced parking facilities

- Proximity to boundary wall would hinder access to fire services
- Similar developments by others in the area would change the character of the area.
- It would lead to over shadowing
- Would lead to building noise

7.4 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, 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 property benefits from a large garden and already has a side extension which has deemed consent under Permitted Development (PD). There is currently an undetermined Certificate of Lawfulness application under the reference of 11/0401/CLUPD for the side extension.

8.3 The side extension will be visual in the street scene. However, the site is not within a Conservation Area and the additional aspects of the new extension that would appear at street level (the front elevation of the proposed first floor section on the side, and a limited increase in ground floor roof height) would have a limited impact and are considered acceptable. At first floor, the windows to the new extension have been designed so that their position would mirror the current window positions. The materials to be used are also in keeping with the current property and would match what currently exists on site.

8.4 As part of the application, a drawing has been submitted that highlights the elements of the proposal that would benefit from general permission under the General Permitted Development Order (please see Appendix II). This diagram shows that most

of the proposal could be carried out without needing specific planning permission, including part of the two storey element that has been the subject of some objections. In my view, the diagram in Appendix II correctly represents the aspects of the scheme, which have general permission. It would not be reasonable to refuse permission for the application as a whole on this basis of features which have general permission.

- 8.5 Overall, the design of the new extension reflects that of the original house and given its proximity to the neighbour at no.75 and no.71 Gilbert Road it is acceptable. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.6 The main issues regarding amenity space relate to overbearing, over looking and over shadowing. All these aspects have been the subject of the objections received.
- 8.7 Overbearing: The proposed extension would have a visual impact on both neighbours at either side of the property. It will have a greater visual impact on no.75 Gilbert Road because the first floor extension will close the distance between the properties. Given the distance of the extension from both neighbours however, it will not create an unacceptable sense of enclosure at either property. Although the development would create many additions to the original house, I do not consider that it is over bearing or unduly dominant.
- 8.8 Overlooking: I have received an objection from the owner/occupier at No.71 Gilbert Road on the grounds that the first floor rear extension in bedroom 3 would allow for views directly into their bedroom and overlook their conservatory. However, the extension to bedroom 3 would see the window in a similar position facing the garden. So I cannot agree that it will lead to a loss of privacy for No.71 Gilbert Road.
- 8.9 On the side of No. 75, although the first floor bathroom extension would extend by a further 1.2m, there would remain a distance of over a metre from the first floor extension to the common boundary with no.75 Gilbert Road and a further gap of

almost 3m from the boundary line to the main house at No.75 Gilbert Road. There has been no objection from No.75 Gilbert Road and I do not consider that the proposed extension would have any overseeing or overlooking impact here.

- 8.10 Overshadowing: I have also received an objection from the owner/occupier of No.71 Gilbert Road on the grounds that the first floor extension would create overshadowing and enclose their house and conservatory. While I do not agree that given its distance it will create a greater sense of enclosure, the introduction of the first floor rear extension will probably cause some overshadowing of the conservatory at no.71 Gilbert Road. However, as the proposal lies northwest of No.71, such overshadowing could only take place in the later part of the day during the summer months and would be of a limited duration. The level of this over shadowing is considered acceptable, especially in light of the fact that the two-storey rear element, as discussed earlier, can be built without needing specific planning permission. It would not be reasonable to refuse permission on the basis of the impact of this section, and were the permission to be refused, the applicant could still erect this section without a further application.
- 8.11 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.

Third Party Representations

- 8.12 In addition to what has been discussed above I have also received a number of other objections on the grounds that it is:
- Out of keeping with area
 - Would create negative precedent in area
 - Similar developments by others in the area would change the character of the area.
 - The present side extension has already reduced parking facilities
 - Proximity to boundary wall would hinder access to fire services
 - Would lead to building noise

8.13 Whilst this property may have experienced more development than some in the area, it does not follow that a further extension is unacceptable. The development is in keeping with other extensions along this road of which there are many. I emphasise again that a large part of proposal (as shown in Appendix II), enjoys general permission under the General Permission Development Order and could be erected without needing a planning application.

8.14 In terms of parking the property currently has off street parking and will not be making any changes to current parking arrangements. The area is not within a controlled parking zone.

8.15 Fire service access is controlled by the building regulations. The requirements do not preclude building extensions up to the common boundary, which is a very common pattern of development in the city. I do not consider that this raises issues which merit refusal of the application. Lastly, the building of the extension will undoubtedly lead to noise. Therefore, construction time limits will be placed on the application by condition so that building works are not carried out during unsociable hours.

9.0 CONCLUSION

The development has been assessed and deemed acceptable. Approval is recommended.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

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. The extension hereby permitted shall be constructed in external materials to match the existing building in type, colour and texture.

Reason: To ensure that the extension is in keeping with the existing building. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 3/14)

3. Except with the prior written agreement of the local planning authority in writing no construction work or demolition shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours to 1800 hours Monday to Friday, 0800 hours to 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

INFORMATIVE: New development can sometimes cause inconvenience, disturbance and disruption to local residents, businesses and passers by. As a result the City Council runs a Considerate Contractor Scheme aimed at promoting high standards of care during construction. The City Council encourages the developer of the site, through its building contractor, to join the scheme and agree to comply with the model Code of Good Practice, in the interests of good neighbourliness. Information about the scheme can be obtained from The Considerate Contractor Project Officer in the Planning Department (Tel: 01223 457121).

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:

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/4, 3/7, 3/11 and 3/4

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.

3. In reaching this decision the local planning authority has acted on guidance provided by the National Planning Policy Framework, specifically paragraphs 186 and 187. The local planning authority has worked proactively with the applicant to bring forward a high quality development that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area.

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.