

<b>Application Number</b>	14/0452/FUL	<b>Agenda Item</b>	
<b>Date Received</b>	24th March 2014	<b>Officer</b>	Mrs Angela Briggs
<b>Target Date</b>	19th May 2014		
<b>Ward</b>	Petersfield		
<b>Site</b>	80 Ainsworth Street Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 2PD		
<b>Proposal Applicant</b>	Two storey rear extension to dwelling house. Mr H Dolby Highfield Pidley Road Somersham PE28 3ES		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The proposed extension would not detract from the character of the area;</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The proposed extension would not harm the character or appearance of the Conservation Area;</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The proposed extension would not have a significant impact on the amenity of neighbours.</li> </ul>
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

## 1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 No. 80 Ainsworth Street is within the Petersfield ward of Cambridge, to the east of the city centre. The property is an end of terrace Victorian property. The site benefits from a side parking area which is adjacent to an open space area, not within the application site. The junction of Ainsworth Place sits adjacent to this open space area and is also access for the Virgin Media building to the rear of the site. This building is

commercial in character and style, contrary to the predominant Victorian architecture of Ainsworth Street.

- 1.2 The neighbour to the north, no.82, has a two-storey rear wing on the common boundary. The area is largely residential in character, containing mainly terraced two-storey dwellings.
- 1.3 The property falls within the Conservation Area and therefore the Mill Road Area Conservation Area Appraisal (2011) is relevant. It also falls within the Controlled Parking Zone.
- 1.4 The application has been requested to be referred to East Area Committee by Councillor Blencowe for the following reason:
  - Design and Planning issues.

## **2.0 THE PROPOSAL**

- 2.1 The full application seeks planning consent for a two storey rear extension. The extension would have a pitch roof and would measure 5.5m deep, 4m in width and at a height of 6.3m. The extension would accommodate an additional bedroom and bathroom at first floor level and a larger kitchen area at ground floor level. The side access would be opened up to enable two cars to be parked on-site, together with cycle and bin storage.
- 2.2 The application has been amended to alter the external finish of the extension from render to brick. This was requested by the case officer after considering that render was not appropriate.

## **3.0 SITE HISTORY**

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
10/1002/FUL	Part single storey rear extension and first floor rear extension.	Approved

## **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, 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  4/11

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework March 2012  National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014  Circular 11/95
	<u>Area Guidelines</u>  Mill Road Area Conservation Area Appraisal (2011)

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, there are no policies in the emerging Local Plan are of relevance/the following policies in the emerging Local Plan are of relevance:

## **6.0 CONSULTATIONS**

### **Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)**

6.1 No comment.

#### **Urban Design and Conservation team**

6.2 No objections to the amended plans.

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:

- 82 Ainsworth Street

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Concern about loss of light to kitchen, bathroom and patio area;
- The extension would be closer to the boundary;
- Object to the proposed materials. Render is not appropriate in this area.

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 and external spaces
2. Residential amenity
3. Impact on the Conservation Area
4. Third party representations

### **Context of site, design and external spaces**

8.2 The application follows a previously approved application for a similar proposal. The proposal subject of this application is identical in design and scale to the previous scheme, apart from some alterations to the fenestration details. It is therefore necessary to consider whether there have been any obvious physical changes to the site and its surroundings, since the previous approval. It appears that the site and surroundings remain the same and therefore the impact of this type of development is unlikely to be any greater. Secondly, I need to consider whether there has been any change in planning policy. The current Local Plan (2006) was relevant in 2010, and therefore, even with the deletion of some of our policies, none of those that are relevant to this proposed development, are affected and still stand.

8.3 The subject property is an end of terrace dwelling that sits close to the junction with Ainsworth Place and although the extension is to the rear, it will be publicly visible and I have given therefore given consideration as to its likely impact on the character and appearance of the locality. In this respect the extension replaces the existing part single and part two-storey rear wing and although significantly larger, I do not consider that it would be visually intrusive. The extension will still read a subsidiary rear wing as it has been set down from the main ridge and is much smaller than the main span of the dwelling. The extension will have a pitched roof and subject to the use of appropriate materials, will integrate well with the main dwelling. The rear garden to the property has a depth of approximately 27m and although the extension is quite deep, I do not consider that the rear garden environment will be harmed by the

development. The proposals are thus considered to be acceptable from visual perspective.

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

### **Residential Amenity**

#### Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.5 The neighbour at no.82 has objected. No.82 is to the north of the site. Their main concerns are that the proposed extension will be coming closer to the common boundary and would result in loss of light to the kitchen and ground floor bathroom. I agree that the extension would be coming closer to the boundary. However, the extension is set off the boundary by 1.2m and would be partly obscured behind the flank wall of no.82. I do not consider that the extension would unduly enclose no.82 and by setting the extension away from the boundary, helps to retain a spacious element between the properties. The ground floor bathroom is contained within a single storey wing element of no.82, which is positioned along the southern boundary and therefore much further away. Whilst the proposed two storey extension would over-shadow this area, it would not be significant to warrant refusal in this case, particularly because bathrooms are not living areas and do not necessarily need natural light in order for them to function as such.
- 8.6 I agree with the concern about the proposed render. Render is not a material that prevails in this area and as such I have asked the agent to remove this element from the proposal and suggested brick, to match the existing. Amended plans have been submitted and the external finish of the extension would be brick.
- 8.7 The extension includes a south facing first floor window that looks at the flank wall of no.82, but might also afford very oblique views over the rear garden of no.82; this window serves a bathroom and thus can be obscure glazed by condition.
- 8.8 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.

## **Impact on the Conservation Area**

- 8.9 The Conservation Officer was concerned about the render finish. Since the plans have been amended, they are supportive of the proposal and consider that it would not have a detrimental impact on the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. I concur with this view and consider that it would not detract from the historic setting, subject to appropriate materials, which are recommended as conditions.
- 8.10 In my opinion the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the character of appearance of the Conservation Area and I consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 4/11.

## **Third Party Representations**

- 8.11 I have carefully considered the neighbours' comments and conclude that it would be unreasonable to suggest that the extension should be reduced in size as I am satisfied that the proposal would not have a significant impact to warrant refusal in its current form.

## **9.0 CONCLUSION**

- 9.1 In conclusion, I consider that the proposed extension is acceptable and 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. All new joinery [window frames, etc.] shall be recessed at least 50mm back from the face of the wall / façade. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the specified recess.

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

3. No brickwork shall be erected until the choice of brick, bond, mortar mix design and pointing technique have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority by means of sample panels prepared on site. The approved panels are to be retained on site for the duration of the works for comparative purposes, and development must take place only 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. No roofs shall be constructed until full details of the type and source of roof covering materials and the ridge, eaves and hip details, if appropriate, have been submitted to the local planning authority as samples and approved in writing. Roofs shall thereafter be constructed only 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)

5. The window on the south elevation at first floor level, serving the bathroom, shall be obscure glazed to a minimum level of obscurity to conform to Pilkington Glass level 3 or equivalent prior to commencement of use (of the extension) and shall have restrictors to ensure that the window cannot be opened more than 45 degrees beyond the plane of the adjacent wall and shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 3/12 or 3/14).