

Application Number	13/1478/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	9th October 2013	Officer	Mr Amit Patel
Target Date	4th December 2013		
Ward	East Chesterton		
Site	99 Green End Road Cambridge CB4 1RS		
Proposal	Two storey rear extension to existing semi-detached house		
Applicant	Mr Leon Waldock 24a Sedley Taylor Rd Cambridge CB2 8PN		

SUMMARY	<p>The development does not accord with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>The size and position of the extension, hard up against the common boundary with 97 Green End Road will have an adverse impact on the light, outlook and sense of enclosure of the neighbouring occupiers.</p>
RECOMMENDATION	REFUSAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application premises comprise a two storey, semi-detached house located on the west side of Green End Road. Green End Road is a residential street of mixed character and is neither within nor near to a conservation area.
- 1.2 The application property itself is finished in grey pebble dashed render and concrete tiles set beneath a hipped roof.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The application seeks approval for a rear extension to the property, partly of a single storey, and partly two storeys.

2.2 There is already a single-storey conservatory/sun room extension to the rear.

2.3 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:

1. Plans

2.4 This is a re-submission of an application which was withdrawn following concerns raised by officers. The application has not changed in size or scale.

2.5 The application is brought before Committee at the request of Councillor Bird

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
13/1166/FUL	Two storey rear extension to existing semi-detached house.	Withdrawn

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, Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN		POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Plan 2006	Local	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) National Planning Practice Consultation

5.4 Status of Proposed Submission – Cambridge Local Plan

Planning applications should be determined in accordance with policies in the adopted Development Plan and advice set out in the NPPF. However, after consideration of adopted plans and the NPPF, policies in emerging plans can also be given some weight when determining applications. For Cambridge, therefore, the emerging revised Local Plan as published for consultation on 19 July 2013 can be taken into account, especially those policies where there are no or limited objections to it. However it is likely, in the vast majority of instances, that the adopted development plan and the NPPF will have considerably more weight than emerging policies in the revised Local Plan.

For the application considered in this report, the following policies in the emerging Local Plan are of relevance:

Policy 55, Policy 56, Policy 58 (section b and e)

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

- 6.1 No comment on behalf of the highway authority.
- 6.2 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 Bird has commented on this application. Her comments are as follows:

“The reason is that this family have set up a family home in East Chesterton, where their near Schools, shops and GP are very much part of the community. They brought this home to bring the family up but now they would like to have this extension done as the family is growing and also so they carry on living as part of this community.”

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

- 91 Green End Road;
- 93 Green End Road;
- 97 Green End Road;
- 101 Green End Road
- 103 Green End Road;

- 7.3 The representations support the application because of the following reasons:

- 91: plans allow for a decent family home;
- 93: would improve the living standards of the occupiers;
- 97: proposal will not be a concern as they are considering doing something similar;
- 101: understands the issue of precedent but will not have a negative impact;
- 103: no impact in terms of outlook and light to 103 due to the large trees;

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 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

Context of site, design and external spaces

8.2 The proposal is to the rear of the property and will not be visible in the street. There are other extensions in the area and therefore, subject to the use of matching materials the proposal is acceptable.

8.3 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/14.

Residential Amenity

8.4 The house currently has a single-storey conservatory / sun room extension, 4.2m wide, which extends 6m from the rear elevation of the original house, 3m further than the single-storey flat roofed extension to No.97, which forms the other half of the semi-detached pair. The conservatory is hard up against the boundary with No. 97, and between 1.4m and 1.8m from the common boundary with the unattached neighbor, No.101. The proposal would replace the 6m deep conservatory with a two-storey pitched-roof extension covering the same footprint, and add an additional single-storey pitched-roof element extending a further 3m to the rear. The total depth of the resulting rear extension would be 9m. The two-storey section would extend 6m back from the upper storey of No. 97, and 3m beyond the single storey extension at that house. The new single-storey element would have eaves at 2.5m above ground, but rise to a ridge at 3.9m, compared to the 3.3m ridge height of the current conservatory.

Impact on No. 97

- 8.5 The proposed extension would be south of No.97. In my view the depth, height, and position of the proposal would have a detrimental impact on sunlight and outlook for occupiers of No.97, and lead to an unacceptable sense of enclosure. the proposal will have a impact upon the windows in the rear elevation of number 97 in terms of loss of light and outlook and adding to this the raising of the height of the proposal from 3.3m to 3.9m will add to the impact.
- 8.6 I note that the occupiers of No.97 have expressed their support for the proposal, and indicated their intention to carry out similar work. However, I cannot be certain that this view or these intentions will be sustained into the future; I must assess the proposal on its merits, and on the basis of the existing configuration of the neighbouring house, and notwithstanding the neighbours' expressed views, it is my opinion that the impact on neighbour amenity is unacceptable.

Impact on No. 101

- 8.7 The proposal is located north of this neighbour. No. 101 already has a large single-storey extension. Given the distance between the two houses, and the intervening fence, I do not consider the ground floor element will have any significant impact upon this neighbour.
- 8.8 The two-storey element will be of similar depth to the single-storey extension at 101. Only high-level windows are proposed in the elevation facing No.101. The proposed elevation would be visible from 101, but I do not consider that it would have any impact in this direction which would warrant refusal of permission.
- 8.9 In my opinion the proposal does not respect the residential amenity of the occupiers of No.97 and is contrary with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/14.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The height, depth and position of the proposed extension will have a detrimental impact on neighbour amenity at No. 97

through overshadowing, loss of outlook and increased sense of enclosure. I recommend REFUSAL.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE, for the following reason:

1. Because of its height, its depth, its proximity to the common boundary and its position south of the attached neighbouring property, 97 Green End Road, the proposed extension would cause a loss of sunlight to that house and its garden area, restrict the outlook and create an undue sense of enclosure, contrary to policies 3/4 and 3/14 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and to guidance provided by the National Planning Policy Framework.