

Application Number	13/0542/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	19th April 2013	Officer	Mr Tony Collins
Target Date	14th June 2013		
Ward	Arbury		
Site	5 Carlyle Road Cambridge CB4 3DN		
Proposal	Three storey rear extension		
Applicant	Dr Gillian Todd & Mr D Miller 5 Carlyle Road Cambridge CB4 3DN		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The design enhances the character and appearance of the conservation area by providing a successful contrast with the existing building
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site, on the south-west side of the street, forms part of a short terrace of houses sometimes referred to as Dalrymple Terrace. The land here falls sharply away from the street, and the nine houses have semi-basements opening on to rear garens, and three storeys above ground at street level, the uppermost of which is in the roof space and lighted by small dormer windows at the rear. The houses, dating from 1886, are constructed in buff brick with decorative courses in red brick, and slate roofs. A number of the houses have rear extensions; those at Nos 1 and 3, at the south end, extend up three storeys from ground level; those at 5, 9, 11, 13 and 17 only two. The house at No.15 has had a substantial array of steel balconies added to the rear, rising up to and beyond the eaves level of the main roof.

- 1.2 To the north-west, the terrace adjoins the park at Alexandra Gardens; to the south it is flanked by a distinctive house of contemporary design (1a Carlyle Road) dating from 2000, finished in render with a semi-circular section metal roof. The rear gardens of the application house and its neighbours abut the curtilage of the Arundel House Hotel on Chesterton Road. There is an extensive landscaped area to the rear of the main hotel building, which is used for car parking and servicing. There are also a number of outbuildings, including, in the centre of the hotel curtilage, and almost directly to the rear of the application site, the substantial Coach House building, used as hotel accommodation, which is finished in horizontal timber boarding with a series of pitched roofs clad in metal sheeting.
- 1.3 The site falls within the Castle and Victoria Road section of the City of Cambridge Conservation Area No.1 (Central). The terrace including the application site is identified as a building important to the character of the area, as are the majority of the nearby Victorian terraces, the contemporary house at 1a Carlyle Road, and the main hotel building. The hotel outbuildings, including the Coach House block, are not identified as contributing positively to the conservation area.
- 1.4 There are three large trees in the rear garden of No.1 Carlyle Road, and a somewhat smaller one in the rear garden of No. 9. Alexandra Gardens contains a large number of significant trees, including very large London planes.
- 1.5 The site falls within the controlled parking zone.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The application seeks consent for a part three-storey, part single-storey, rear extension to the existing dwelling. The proposed extension would replace in part, the existing rear wing and the existing conservatory. It would appear as two components: a three-storey element close to the boundary with No.7, essentially 2.3m wide by 2.8m deep, rising to a height of 8m with a flat roof, and a single-storey element with a lean-to glazed roof filling in the space between the three-story element and the boundary with No.3, and projecting 0.9m further to the rear. The three-storey element would mainly be clad in pre-patinated copper cladding but would be linked to the main house by a rendered section.

2.2 The application is accompanied by a Design and Access Statement.

2.3 The application is brought to Committee at the request of Councillor O'Reilly so that the potential impact of the proposal on the character of the conservation area that includes Carlyle Road can be subject to the extra scrutiny of members during a full committee discussion.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

3.1

Reference	Description	Outcome
07/0454/FUL	Three storey rear extension.	Approved with conditions
10/1164/EXP	Extension of time for implementation of planning permission 07/0454/FUL for three storey rear extension.	Approved with conditions

3.2 The above applications are the subject of an application for Judicial Review, because the Council failed to notify the occupier of a property immediately adjacent to the application site.

3.3 The present application is identical to the scheme submitted under 07/0454/FUL and 10/1164/EXP. It has been submitted because the earlier permission is likely to remain in the Judicial Review process for some time.

4.0 PUBLICITY

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

5.0 POLICY

5.1 **Central Government Advice**

5.3 Cambridge Local Plan 2006

3/1 Sustainable development
3/4 Responding to context
3/7 Creating successful places
3/14 Extending buildings
4/11 Conservation Areas

5.4 Supplementary Planning Documents

Cambridge City Council (May 2007) – Sustainable Design and Construction:

5.5 Area Guidelines

Castle and Victoria Road Conservation Area Appraisal (2012)

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Engineering)

6.1 No comment.

Urban Design and Conservation Manager

6.2 The applicants propose to add a three storey-extension to the rear of their property. At basement level it is proposed to build a single storey garden room with a glazed roof across the width of the site. It is understood that this application is a resubmission of an approved permission from 2007 which was renewed in 2010. Since the previous applications were approved, the site has been included in the Central Conservation Area (June 2012).

6.3 Looking at the terrace as a whole, it would appear that these properties were originally flat on the rear elevation, with no projections. Over the years modest extensions have been added in mainly brick under a slate roof.

- 6.4 The principle of a three storey extension, with a full width, single storey extension at basement level would not be out of scale with existing additions to the terrace. The three storey projection is suitable in terms of the scale of the existing building. In the Design and Access Statement, it is stated that the external appearance is designed as a 'clearly separate contemporary addition'. It is agreed that it is an unusual choice of material, pre-patinated copper and render, which will be a contrast to the prevailing character of the conservation area. Its success would depend on the works being appropriately detailed, if it is to provide a reasonable addition to this mid-terraced building.
- 6.5 Conclusion: The proposed may not be out of scale to the main building. The proposed materials are unusual for the area, but provided that they are of a suitable quality, they could provide a reasonable contrast to the character of the area. Therefore the application complies with policy 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.
- 6.6 Conditions are recommended requiring submission of the details and samples of the wall cladding materials and samples of the roof material.
- 6.7 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 objecting to the application:

3B Carlyle Road
9 Carlyle Road
11 Carlyle Road

- 7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Materials inappropriate
- Roof form inappropriate
- Height excessive

- 7.3 Representations objecting to the application have also been received from Hewitsons on behalf of Arundel House Hotel.

This representation includes an eight-page report from Donald Insall Associates (Chartered Architects and Historic Building Consultants) in support of the objection, compiled by Matthew Seaborn, Senior Associate. I refer to this report in my assessment as 'Matthew Seaborn's report'.

7.4 This representation can be summarised as follows:

- Fails to reflect or successfully contrast with the form materials or detailing of the existing building
- Incongruous in its surroundings
- Contrasting materials not appropriate in a terraced context
- No justification for copper cladding and render
- Flat roof will appear to cut into the main roof
- Detrimental impact on visual amenity
- Highly visible from hotel car park (used by 35,000-40,000 guests annually)
- Fails to preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area
- Existing permission carries no weight because of flaws in the decision-making process, and designation of the area as a conservation area since the previous permission was granted.
- Application cannot be determined because the significance of the heritage asset is not described.

7.5 The owners/occupiers of the following address have made representations expressing no objection to the application:

15 Carlyle Road

7.6 The representation can be summarised as follows:

- Rear of terrace already an interesting and attractive mixture of different modifications

7.7 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 and design, including impact on the Conservation Area
2. Residential amenity
3. Third party representations

Context and design, including impact on the Conservation Area

- 8.2 Matthew Seaborn's report suggests that the application cannot be determined, and should not have been validated, because it fails to describe the significance of the heritage asset, and therefore fails to satisfy the requirements of Paragraph 128 of the Framework. I do not accept this view. The building concerned is a single house in a terrace which is identified in the conservation area appraisal as being important to the conservation area. It has no greater status than this. In general, the contribution of buildings to the character of the conservation area is principally made through those parts of the building visible from the street, and there is nothing in the Castle and Victoria Road appraisal to suggest that the rear of the application house is of more than normal significance. Paragraph 128 states that the level of detail provided about a heritage asset in an application should be proportionate to its significance, and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on its significance. In my view, the significance of the rear elevation of this house as a component of the conservation area is relatively low, and the level of description provided in the Design and Access Statement is adequate.
- 8.3 Rear extensions have previously been added to several of the houses in this terrace; it is clear that this principle does not in itself cause a conflict with policy nor cause harm to the conservation area. The elements of the proposal which have caused concern to objectors, and which require careful assessment, are the height of the extension, its roof form, and the choice of pre-patinated copper for the external surface. I deal with each of these issues separately below.

Height

- 8.4 The proposed extension would rise to 8m from ground level at the rear of the building, 350mm below the eaves line of the

main building. I accept the contention of Matthew Seaborn's report that at this height, the extension would obscure the eaves-level decorative brickwork, and would appear, when seen from ground level at the rear, to cut into the main roof slope at the rear of the building. I do not, however consider that this would cause significant harm to the character of the conservation area. I do not consider the role played by these elements on the rear elevation of the building to be important. Furthermore, the existing rear extensions at N^{os}. 1 and 3 Carlyle Road, and the balconies at N^o.15 all have a similar impact to what is proposed here, and the large dormer at N^o. 3 also interrupts the rear roof slope.

- 8.5 I also accept that the carrying through of the extension to eaves level will interrupt the pattern of stepped stair landing windows on the rear elevation, but this pattern has already been interrupted by the extensions at N^o.1 and N^o.3, and partially masked by the balconies at N^o.15. The proposed extension would mimic this pattern in a slightly different form, which I regard as a positive allusion to the character of the existing building. I do not consider that any significant harm to the conservation area would be caused.
- 8.6 In summary, I accept the description of the impacts of the height of the proposal on the rear elevation of the building set out in Matthew Seaborn's report, but I do not accept Mr Seaborn's assessment of their importance. The rear elevation of this terrace is not uniform, nor does it retain an unaltered character. (Mr Seaborn suggests that the terrace is 'largely unaltered', but in fact only Nos. 7, 13 and 17 do not have a significant rear alteration. I also differ from his judgement that the metalwork at the rear of No.15 can be described as 'three small balconies'.) I accept that the site is visible from the hotel car park, and, at an oblique angle, from Alexandra Gardens, but I do not accept that the interruption of brickwork patterning, the breaking of the rhythm of fenestration, or the visibility of the roof slope, on the rear elevation of this terrace, which has already been significantly and irregularly altered, would have any significant impact on the character of the conservation area. In my view, an extension of this height creates no conflict with policies 3/4 and 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006, nor with Section 12 of the Framework.

Roof form

- 8.7 I do not consider that a small flat roof such as is proposed here will have a harmful impact on the character of the building. If, as I contend, a well-designed extension of contemporary form is acceptable at the rear of this terrace within the conservation area, a flat roof is also acceptable as part of such a design. From a ground-level viewpoint, the difference between a flat roof and a shallowly sloping lean-to or hipped roof at this level is slight, and would be of little visual significance in my view. The flat roof proposed for this extension would be of a similar size and in a similar position to that on the existing extension to No.1. I accept that the latter extension is screened from the car park at Arundel House hotel by trees, but notwithstanding this, I do not consider it reasonable to refuse permission for a small area of flat roof when two similar such roofs already exist on the terrace.

Copper cladding

- 8.8 The application proposes the use of pre-patinated copper for the main part of the three-storey extension. This material is not used to any significant extent in this section of the conservation area, and the material would thus contrast with the existing character of the building and the area. Objectors take the view that this material, and particularly its colouring, would cause significant harm to the conservation area.
- 8.9 I disagree with this view for three reasons: I do not accept that a contrasting material, even a dramatically contrasting material, will necessarily cause harm to the conservation area; I do not accept that the area is presently so homogeneous in character, or remains so unmodified, that a well-designed contemporary addition on this scale would cause significant harm; I do not consider that an extension of this scale at the rear of this terrace would have great visual significance in the conservation area.

Contrast

- 8.10 The local plan makes it clear in policy 3/14 that development may be acceptable if it provides a successful contrast with the existing context. Objectors argue that the contrast created with the existing building here would not be successful, but I fail to

see why this would be the case. The expression of a clear distinction between an addition to a historic building and the original structure is a principle which is widely regarded as desirable in such developments, and this is often successfully achieved by using entirely different materials. I do not believe this principle is any less applicable to a terraced situation; although the terrace has some degree of unity, the individual houses are distinct visual units, and some of the character of the area arises from the differentiation between different houses within a terrace. In my view, properly detailed, a sharply contrasting material is likely to enhance the character of the building and the conservation area more than, for example the 'piebald' effect of recycled bricks used in extensions elsewhere (including on this terrace), where the failure to eliminate soot, paint and other coatings from the recycled materials can create an appearance which is neither fully integrated with the original building nor a successful contrast.

8.11 Matthew Seaborn's report suggests that the proposal fails to create a successful contrast with the existing building because it is not sensitive to the existing character of the building, and does not form a 'sympathetic counterpoint'. I do not accept this assertion. In my view, the proposal respects the existing character of the building and the terrace by retaining a strong verticality, adhering to the pattern of narrow, part-width extensions which characterise the terrace as a whole, respecting the main roof eaves line, and mimicking the stepped window pattern of the other houses. The counterpoint is introduced by a number of contemporary qualities, including the contrasting materials.

8.12 I am of the view that even if the bright blue-green patina is selected for the copper cladding, a successful contrast can be achieved. I do not consider that this coloration on its own is unacceptable. There are many materials in the immediate environs of the application site which do not fall within the traditional palette of the area, including white, cream and grey render, galvanized metalwork, metal sheet roofing, and black-stained horizontal timber boarding. I do not consider any of these materials detract in any significant manner from the character of the area, and I do not consider that copper would either. The applicants have in fact said that they do not wish to use the bright blue-green patina, and would seek a more muted colour. The precise nature of the copper can be controlled by

condition, but I do not consider that the condition needs to be prescriptive as to colour.

Character of the area

- 8.13 I am of the view that Matthew Seaborn's report overestimates the extent to which the immediate vicinity of the proposed extension has a uniform and distinctive character which is important to the conservation area.
- 8.14 The terrace containing the application site has a number of recent rear extensions of different types, which use different materials, including recycled brick, render, and galvanized steelwork. No.1a Carlyle Road relates well to the terrace, but uses entirely different materials and has an entirely different roof form and fenestration. The area to the rear of the Arundel House Hotel has been carefully and generously landscaped, but the hard landscaping and the massing, roof profile and materials of the Coach House building are of a wholly different character to the Carlyle Road terrace or the hotel's main building. I do not consider that any of these components of the immediate context are inappropriate, or that they detract in any way from the conservation area, but I do consider that they create an environment which is heterogeneous and varied in character, into which additional built elements of contrasting forms and in contrasting materials may be inserted without detrimental impact.

Visual prominence of the site

- 8.15 Objections assert that the prominence of the proposal would be very high, pointing to the visibility of the rear of the terrace from the hotel car park and from some hotel windows, the large number of guests using the car park in a year, and the visibility of the rear of the terrace from Alexandra Gardens. I am not convinced by this argument.
- 8.16 I accept that the hotel car park is a semi-public space, and that large numbers of guests see the rear of the terrace. I also accept that the rear of the terrace is visible from points in Alexandra Gardens even when trees there are in leaf, and is more visible in winter. However, I do not accept the view that the hotel car park and Alexandra Gardens should be regarded together as an open space within this section of the

conservation area; unlike Mr Seaborn, I do not believe they are experienced in this way. The rear of the Arundel House Hotel and other buildings in the blocks to the east and west of the hotel curtilage are not hidden from Alexandra Gardens, but neither are they fully exposed, even in winter. The conservation area appraisal, which is very recent, does not define the two areas as a single space. In fact it makes no reference to the hotel car park, the buildings in the rear of the hotel curtilage, or the backland on either side of it. There are no references to views into this area from Alexandra Gardens. What are noted in the appraisal are the positive views into the Gardens from its northern corner opposite Fisher Street, and from its eastern corner adjacent to 17 Carlyle Road. I do not consider that the proposed extension would have any significant impact on either of these views, even when the trees are not in leaf.

- 8.17 I do not consider the rear elevation of this building to be of great significance in the conservation area, and there is nothing in the conservation area appraisal to cause me to alter this view. It is my opinion that the impact of an extension in this position on the character of the conservation area would be very limited, regardless of the materials used.
- 8.18 In summary, it is my view that the rear elevation of Dalrymple Terrace (1-17 Carlyle Road) is an area whose contribution to the character of the conservation area is relatively minor. It is also my view that the immediate environment of the application site is a heterogeneous area where the original characteristic elements of the conservation area have been modified and added to. In this context, and bearing in mind the advice in paragraphs 129, 132 and 135 of the Framework, it is my view that a contrasting contemporary design can enhance the character of the conservation area. In my opinion, what is proposed here would achieve that result, and I consider it to be in accordance with policies 3/4, 3/14 and 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006, and government advice in Section 12 of the Framework.

Residential Amenity

- 8.19 The extension covers the full width of the curtilage at rear ground-floor level but the full-width section essentially replicates the volume of the existing conservatory, and I do not consider this will be perceptibly different. The first- and second-floor

elements of the extension are set 2.8m away to the north-west from the common boundary with No. 3 and will not impact on light to or outlook from this dwelling to any significant degree. The first and second floor elements contain flank southeast facing windows but these will serve new bathrooms and can be obscure glazed by condition to protect the privacy of occupiers at No. 3.

8.20 The extension will be close to the boundary with No. 7 at first and second floor level (on the boundary for the first 1.7m of its depth, and 250mm from the boundary for the remaining 1.1m of depth). However, at first floor level the proposed extension would be largely screened from No.7 by that house's own extension, notwithstanding its smaller size. At second floor level, the proposed extension would impinge to some degree on sunlight to and outlook from, the stairwell window at No.7, but this impact would be limited, and not sufficient in my view to merit refusal. There would be no windows on this side of the extension. The development would not adversely affect the residential amenity of the occupiers of any other properties.

8.21 In my opinion the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and I consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 3/14.

Third Party Representations

8.22 I have addressed the issues raised in the paragraphs indicated.

materials	8.8-8.17
roof form	8.7
height	8.4-8.6
harm to conservation area	8.2, 8.3, 8.6, 8.9, 8.10, 8.12, 8.13, 8.14, 8.16, 8.17
visibility	8.4, 8.6, 8.9, 8.15-8.17
no weight to be given to previous application	I have given no weight to the previous applications, nor referred to them, because the matter is currently subject to Judicial Review
inadequate description of heritage asset	8.2

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 I acknowledge that objectors adhere very strongly to the view that this proposal would be harmful to the character of the conservation area, principally because of the proposed materials. I have considered the arguments put forward in Matthew Seaborn's report very carefully, but it is my view that that report overstates both the significance of this site to the character of the conservation area and the 'unmodified' quality of the terrace. I also disagree with the report's conclusions that the height, roof form and materials of the proposed extension would be harmful to the conservation area. In my view, subject to conditions, the proposal would not be harmful to the conservation area, and I recommend approval.

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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as listed on this decision notice.

Reason: In the interests of good planning, for the avoidance of doubt and to facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

3. No development shall take place until full details of all the external materials (including samples of roof surface, metal cladding and render), have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall proceed only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the appearance of the building is appropriate to the context (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/14 and 4/11)

4. Those elements of the first and second floor windows proposed which face towards No.3 Carlyle Road shall be obscure glazed to a minimum level of obscurity to conform to Pilkington Glass level 3 or equivalent and fixed shut prior to occupation and shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 3/12).