

<b>Application Number</b>	14/1077/FUL	<b>Agenda Item</b>	
<b>Date Received</b>	24th July 2014	<b>Officer</b>	Ms Lorna Gilbert
<b>Target Date</b>	18th September 2014		
<b>Ward</b>	Romsey		
<b>Site</b>	218 - 220 Mill Road Cambridge CB1 3NF		
<b>Proposal</b>	Rendering external wall and painting in soft stone colour (retrospective)		
<b>Applicant</b>	Mr G S Pabla 218 - 220 Mill Road Cambridge CB1 3NF		

<b>EAST AREA COMMITTEE 11<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2014</b>	
<b>SUMMARY</b>	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>Nearby properties along Mill Road and Hope Street have been rendered. I consider the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.</p> <p>The render will not adversely affect residential amenity.</p>
<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>	<b>APPROVAL</b>

## **1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT**

- 1.1 218-220 Mill Road is a ground floor shop with first floor living accommodation above, situated on the southern side of Mill Road at the junction with Hope Street. The building has an existing part single and part two-storey flat roofed rear wing that abuts the common boundary with the attached neighbouring dwelling at 216 Mill Road. The site is in Mill Road East District Centre, which has a mixed character but is dominated by shops with residential accommodation above but with other commercial and religious building nearby; terraced dwellings dominate behind Mill Road.

1.2 The site lies within the Central Conservation Area.

## 2.0 THE PROPOSAL

2.1 The planning application is retrospective. It seeks planning permission for the render applied to the external walls of the property on the north, east and part of the south facing elevations. Render has also been applied to a wall (part of the site) on Hope Street. The building has been rendered in a soft stone colour which appears to be a peach colour. The render is 12mm thick.

2.2 The planning application has been called into the East Area Committee by Councillor Baigent.

## 3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
C/93/0761	Extension to ground floor shops (A1), alterations to provide 2 re-modelled flats (existing) at first floor with ancillary parking for 2 flats, with off-street.	Approved 16.12.1993

## 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 Local Plan 2006	3/4 3/7 3/14 3/15 4/11 4/13

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

<p>Central Government Guidance</p>	<p>National Planning Policy Framework March 2012</p> <p>National Planning Practice Guidance 2014</p> <p>Circular 11/95 – The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions (Annex A)</p> <p>Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010</p>
<p>Material Considerations</p>	<p><u>Central Government:</u></p> <p>Letter from Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (27 May 2010)</p> <p>Written Ministerial Statement: Planning for Growth (23 March 2011)</p> <p>Mill Road Area Conservation Area Appraisal (2011)</p>

5.4 The council submitted the Cambridge Local Plan 2014 to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government on 28 March 2014 for independent examination. Following submission of the local plan, an independent planning inspector has been appointed to hold an examination to consider the ‘soundness’ of the local plan. The Inspector has indicated that the hearings are not likely to start before mid October 2014.

**6.0 CONSULTATIONS**

**Cambridgeshire County Council (Engineering)**

6.1 No comment.

## **Urban Design and Conservation team**

- 6.2 The application is supported as it complies with Conservation policy.
- 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 Councillor Baigent has commented on this application. He considers there a need to maintain brick faced buildings and to send a message to shop keepers and residents that rendering a building is something that needs planning permission.

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

- 346 Cherry Hinton Road
- 1 Hobart Road
- 12, 17, 23 Romsey Road
- 56 St Barnabas Road
- 140 Argyle Street
- 23 Hope Street
- 5 Malta Road

7.3 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Render is harmful to the character of the conservation area.
- Existing rendered buildings should not be a precedent.
- Negative impact especially strong in Hope Street.
- Development should have been stopped earlier.

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, external spaces and impact on the Conservation Area
2. Residential amenity

### **Context of site, design, external spaces and impact on the Conservation Area**

- 8.2 Policy 3/4 (Responding to context) of the Local Plan (2006) explains how development will be permitted which demonstrates that they have responded to their context and drawn inspiration from the key characteristics of their surroundings to create distinctive places. Such developments will identify and respond positively to existing features of natural, historic or local character on and close to the proposed development site; be well connected to, and integrated with, the immediate locality and the wider City; and have used the characteristics of the locality to help inform the siting, massing, design and materials of the proposed development.
- 8.3 Policy 3/7 (Creating successful places) of the Local Plan (2006) refers to development being permitted which demonstrates that it is designed to provide attractive, high quality, accessible, stimulating, socially inclusive and safe living and working environments.
- 8.4 Policy 4/11 (Conservation areas) in the Local Plan (2006) explains how alterations of an existing building will only be permitted if it preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Conservation Area by faithfully reflecting its context or providing a successful contrast with it.
- 8.5 The Mill Road Conservation Area Appraisal (2011) covers the site. A section of the report refers to positive, negative and neutral issues. It explains residential properties have been well preserved but are threatened by the use of modern materials and details, including inappropriate windows and front doors. It also mentions painting of brickwork, and pressure for inappropriate extensions and alterations to residential properties and poor quality shopfronts, some using garnish colours and poor quality signage. I do not consider that the render would be at odds with the appraisal.
- 8.6 Planning permission is required to render the property as it is located within a conservation area. The application is

retrospective as the work has been carried out. The render has been applied to the front of the premises above the glazed shopfront that fronts Mill Road, to the eastern side elevation and on a wall that faces on to Hope Street. Render has been applied to part of the ground floor rear wall of the property. The render projects out 12mm from the original property walls.

- 8.7 Comments have been received from members of the public who have voiced their concerns over this retrospective application. The concerns centre around the appearance of the render, it being highly visible and the impact on traditional streetscapes and the impact on the Conservation Area.
- 8.8 The Conservation Officer supports the application as she considers it complies with Conservation policy.
- 8.9 There are examples of properties that have either been rendered or painted close to the application site along Mill Road. Examples include the Co-op at the corner of Catherine Street. This property has had white render applied to the front and side of the building. No.175 Mill Road (Cut Price Carpets) has been rendered cream on the front of the building. A number of other properties have had their brickwork painted including No's 169, 171, 173, 208, 210, 214-216 Mill Road.
- 8.10 Mill Road is characterised by a mixture of traditional brick, painted and rendered buildings in close proximity to the application site. The render is noticeable on No.218-220 Mill Road and is most prominent along Hope Street where it covers the greatest area. In my opinion, the render at the front of the property on Mill Road, would harmonise with the appearance of the streetscene due to the mixture of building treatments used along this street. I acknowledge the concerns raised over the render applied on Hope Street as the properties along this street are predominantly brick. However, render has been applied to a couple of properties along this street. I therefore consider the use of render at No.218-220 Mill Road to be acceptable as it would not be out of keeping with the appearance of the streetscene. A range of building materials have been used on properties within the Central Conservation Area in close proximity to the site. I therefore consider the render would preserve the existing character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

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

### **Residential Amenity**

#### Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

8.12 The render projects 12mm from the original building. I therefore consider there would be no loss of light to neighbours as a result of the proposal. There would also be no privacy issues. Due to the nature of the application, I consider that the proposal would not adversely harm outlook from nearby properties.

8.13 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 and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 3/7.

## **9.0 RECOMMENDATION**

**APPROVE**