

Application Number	14/0287/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	10th March 2014	Officer	Natalie Westgate
Target Date	5th May 2014		
Ward	Cherry Hinton		
Site	29 Fernlea Close Cambridge CB1 9LW		
Proposal	Single storey front extension, part single storey, part two storey rear extension and two storey side extension.		
Applicant	Mr ALI MASHUK 29 Fernlea Close Cambridge CB1 9LW		

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 extension will not detract from the character and appearance of the building or wider setting. 2) There would be no significant adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring residential properties. 3) The scheme is very similar to that approved in 2013.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

0.0 REASON FOR DEFERAL

0.1 The application was deferred at the previous South Area Committee on the grounds of concern on parking and the site potentially being a House for Multiple Occupation (HMO). Following the submission of drawing no.8971.1 dated 1.8.14, the Highways Officer has viewed the scheme as satisfactory and as such a condition is attached to ensure the parking layout is in place before occupation of the extension.

0.2 The agent has stated that the dwelling is and will not become a House for Multiple Occupation. However, under the current

regulations up to 6 unrelated people could occupy the building under Class C4 as an HMO. More than 6 would require specific planning permission. I attach an informative reminding the applicant that if there was to become more than 6 unrelated residents then an application for a sui-generis HMO must be submitted.

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 29 Fernlea Close is a two storey semi-detached dwelling. It stands on the south-western side of Fernlea Close. The area is entirely residential in character.
- 1.2 The site is not within a conservation area. 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 planning permission for a part single storey part two storey front, side and rear extension.
- 2.2 This is a revised application from a very similar scheme approved in 2013.
- 2.3 The proposed two storey extension projects 4.5m to the rear. The single storey extension projects 3.8m.
- 2.4 The application is brought before Committee at the request of Councillor Dryden for the following reason:
 - The application is an overdevelopment of the site.

Amended Plans

- 2.5 The application was originally submitted with very poor quality plans. The applicant has now submitted accurate drawings.
- 2.6 All residential properties have been reconsulted on the amended plans.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
11/1018/CLUPD	Side and rear dormer and front velux window	Certificate granted
11/1019/FUL	Part single storey part two storey rear extension.	Approved
13/0027/FUL	Part single storey part two storey rear extension.	Approved

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 Local Plan 2006	3/4 3/14

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
-----------------------------	---

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.

5.5 Supplementary Planning Documents

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

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Engineering)

- 6.1 Following submission of drawing no.8971.1 dated 1.8.14, the scheme is satisfactory.
- 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

27 Fernlea Close

The representation can be summarised as follows:

- The quality of the plans is very poor.
- The adjacent shed has not been drawn accurately.
- The extension would block light.

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 key design issue is the design and appearance of the extensions in relation to the existing building and their wider setting. A very similar extension was approved in 2013, which is a material consideration which carries significant weight.

8.3 The extension is proportionate to the plan form of the original house and in my view there has been no change in policy or circumstances, which might justify taking a different view from the approved scheme 13/0027/FUL in 2013.

8.4 The front porch is of an adequate design and scale for the character of the area so the proposed front extension would be in keeping with the character of the street scene. The proposed side and rear extension are appropriately designed and the form of the roof pitches are in keeping with the existing dwelling.

8.5 Brickwork is to match the existing building which can be ensured through the imposition of a suitable planning condition.

8.6 Adequate external space is retained for car parking off the street.

8.7 In my view, the proposal is harmonious in its context and the development accords with the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 3/14.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

8.8 The proposed rear extension at first floor level would have a similar visual impact to the approved scheme in 2013. In my

view the depth of the projection at 4.5m would not cause significant overshadowing for 25, 27 or 31 Fernlea Close.

- 8.9 The impact on the attached neighbouring property at No.31 is acceptable because the proposed development towards this side is still single storey and there is adequate boundary treatment.
- 8.10 The impact on the neighbouring property at No.27 is acceptable because there is a separation distance between the dwelling and the extension of approximately 3.5m, so there would not in my view be a harmful visual impact or sense of enclosure. 25 and 27 Fernlea Close are sited deeper into their garden plots as compared to 29 Fernlea Close, which reduces the impact of the extensions or the potential for a significant loss of light to its flank windows. There will be some shadow created to the side of 25 and 27 Fernlea Close in the afternoon, but I do not consider this to be significantly harmful.
- 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 the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 3/14.

Third Party Representations

The issues raised have been considered in the above report and are summarised below:

Issue	Report section/Officer comment
The quality of the plans is very poor	Accurate plans have been obtained and all neighbours were reconsulted on the proposed application.
The adjacent shed has not been drawn accurately.	The block plan does not identify garden outbuildings, but this does not in my view affect the assessment of the impact of the proposed extensions.
The extension impacts on light to 27 Fernlea Close	Paragraph 8.9

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 This amended scheme is very similar to the previous approval in 2013 and will not be harmful to the character and appearance of the existing property, or the amenities of neighbours. 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 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. 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)

4. Prior to occupation of the extension, the area identified on the approved plans for car parking should be in place in compliance with drawing no.8971.1 dated 1.8.14.

Reason: To avoid obstruction of the surrounding streets and in the interests of highway safety and convenience. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 8/2 and 8/10)

INFORMATIVE: The applicant is made aware that six or more unrelated residents would form a Sui Generis House for Multiple Occupation (HMO) and would therefore require a planning application.