

Application Number	13/0681/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	16th May 2013	Officer	Mr Amit Patel
Target Date	11th July 2013		
Ward	Queen Ediths		
Site	4 Topcliffe Way Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 8SH		
Proposal Applicant	Part two storey part single storey front extensions Mr And Mrs M. Munnelly 4 Topcliffe Way Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 8SH		

SUMMARY	<p>The development does not accord with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>Dominating the property of number 6 creating an undue sense of enclosure to the front</p> <p>Impact on the street would not be in keeping with the character of the immediate area</p>
RECOMMENDATION	REFUSAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 4 Topcliffe Way is a detached two-storey dwelling, which is linked to No.2 to the North West by two single storey garages. It is situated on the south side of Topcliffe Way, close to the junction with Nightingale Avenue. The area is entirely residential in character. The house is finished in light brown brickwork, with brown cladding to the first floor and under a tiled roof.
- 1.2 The site is not allocated within the Cambridge Local Plan (2006). The site is not within a conservation area. The house is not listed. There are no protected trees on the application site. The site falls outside the controlled parking zone.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The application seeks a full width two storey front extension with a projecting bay in the north east corner close to number 6. The two storey element projects 4.5m towards the road.
- 2.2 The proposed development will be finished in materials to match the existing.
- 2.3 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:
1. Planning Statement
 2. Plans
- 2.4 The application is brought before Committee at the request of Councillor Birtles for examining policy 3/4 and 3/14 as they are subjective.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
11/1535/FUL	Extensions to existing house.	WDN

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, 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
Cambridge Local Plan 2006	3/1 3/4 3/7 3/11 3/14

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework March 2012 Circular 11/95
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)

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Engineering)

6.1 No comment to make on this application.

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 Birtles has commented on this application. Her comments are that this application needs to test policy 3/4 and 3/14.

7.2 The owner/occupier of the following addresses has made a representation:

- 6 Topcliffe Way (2 representations)

7.3 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- The proposal severely overwhelms, overbears and dominates no.6 having regard to its size extent and proximity. The existing siting of 4 Topcliffe Way is already considerably ahead of 6 Topcliffe Way
- The proposal imposes and impacts on the living accommodation side of 6 Topcliffe Way
- The proposal affects severely the existing visual relationship externally between No 4 and No 6 Topcliffe Way
- The proposal would severely affect the light to the neighbouring property No 6 Topcliffe Way
- The proposal is out of keeping with the character and amenities of the location
- The proposal would lead to a large encroachment over the building line of neighbouring property causing in addition loss of visual amenity along Topcliffe Way both to and from the recreation ground
- None of the submitted photographs are comparable.

7.4 The applicants have submitted further information regarding a property at Maners Way but this is already shown on the plan which looks at other front extensions.

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

Context of site, design and external spaces

- 8.2 The properties in Topcliffe Way have been minimally altered on the front elevations, save for a few porch extensions. As such, this proposed two storey front extension would be a significant alteration to the appearance of the property and to the surrounding context.
- 8.3 The proposed development would result in a projection of 4.5m, where the projecting bay would be located. On the North West corner, the depth increases by 3 m. In my view this would result in a significant incursion into the street scene of Topcliffe Way and would result in the property sitting forward of the adjoining neighbours. No.2 and No.4 already sit forward on the southern side of the street. To push this building line further forward into the street would result in an uncomfortable relationship with the street and would not respond positively to the features of the local character. In addition the proposed flank wall will be 8.5m beyond the building line of number 6 and by having this large expanse close to the junction with Nightingale Avenue at the end of a curve in the road will add to the visual impact.
- 8.4 In my opinion the proposal would appear unduly prominent within the street and is contrary to Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/14.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.5 The adjoining neighbour No.2 is separated from the application property by two interlinking single storey garages. As such, this provides a separation distance of approximately 6 m, which mitigates any potential overbearing impact. Furthermore, given the orientation of No.2 to the west of No.4, I do not consider that there will be any significant loss of light to the front elevation of the neighbouring property.
- 8.6 No.6, to the east is set behind the application site on a different building line, which is already 4m back of the existing building line with number 4. There is some landscaping, situated within the front garden of number 6 but this would only partially screen what would otherwise be a dominant 2 storey projection.

- 8.7 The two-storey bay is located in close proximity to the boundary with No.6 approximately 1.8m from the common boundary with number 4. Number 4 sits forward of number 6 by 4m currently and with the proposed extension being a further 4.5m deep the total depth would be 8.5m close to the common boundary. My main concern is the sheer mass and scale of a blank wall close to the common boundary which will give rise to a sense of enclosure to number 6 to the detriment of their amenity to the front area immediately adjacent to the proposed two storey bay. I do not consider there would be any loss of light issues.
- 8.8 In my opinion the proposal does not adequately respect the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and I consider that it is contrary with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 3/14

Third Party Representations

- 8.9 The comments received have been addressed in the main body of the report above.

9.0 CONCLUSION

The proposed front extension will have a detrimental impact upon the street scene and neighbouring occupier number 6 and therefore I recommend REFUSAL.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

FOR RECOMMENDATIONS OF REFUSAL

- 1. REFUSE for the following reason/s:**

1. The proposal would result in a projection of 4.5 m in the north east corner of the property, resulting in a significant incursion into the street scene of Topcliffe Way and a resultant footprint at odds with the adjoining neighbour, No.2. The depth of the extension to the frontage, beyond the existing building line towards the street, would therefore result in an uncomfortable visual incursion into the streetscene and a visually prominent development out of character with its surroundings. For this reason, the proposal fails to respond positively to the architectural style of the existing property. The proposal does not comply with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 3/14.

2. Due to the size and scale of the proposed front extension close to the common boundary with number 6 the proposal will have a dominating and enclosing impact upon the front garden of number 6 Topcliffe Way to the detriment of the occupiers and therefore contrary to policy 3/14 and guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).