

<b>Application Number</b>	15/0241/FUL	<b>Agenda Item</b>	
<b>Date Received</b>	11th February 2015	<b>Officer</b>	Miss Catherine Linford
<b>Target Date</b>	8th April 2015		
<b>Ward</b>	Arbury		
<b>Site</b>	55 Roseford Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB4 2HA		
<b>Proposal</b>	Roof extension incorporating rear dormer, and conversion of existing house into five 1-bed flats and one 2-bed flat.		
<b>Applicant</b>	Mr R Dixon 55 Roseford Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB4 2HA		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Considering what could be done under permitted development the proposal could not be considered to have a significant detrimental visual impact on the street</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The proposal would not have a significant detrimental impact on neighbouring properties or highway safety</li> </ul>
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

**1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT**

1.1 55 Roseford Road is a two-storey detached house situated on the northern side of Roseford Road. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character. The site is not within a Conservation Area. The house has an existing two storey, flat roofed extension on the eastern side.

## **2.0 THE PROPOSAL**

- 2.1 Full planning permission is sought for a roof extension incorporating a rear dormer, and the conversion of the existing house into five 1-bed flats and one 2-bed flat.
- 2.2 The proposed dormer would extend across the width of the roof of the original house. Altering the design of the roof from hipped to gable. The house would be split into six flats, with three 1-bed flats located on the ground floor, two 1-bed flats located on the first floor, and one 2-bed flat located in the roof.
- 2.3 Four car parking spaces would be provided at the front of the house, and communal bin and cycle stores would be situated in the rear garden.

## **3.0 SITE HISTORY**

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
C/73/0243	Erection of two-storey and single storey extension to existing dwelling house	A/C
C/78/0259	Erection of two storey extension to existing dwelling house	A/C

## **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 5/1 5/2 8/6 8/10

## 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  Ministerial Statement (1 December 2014) by Brandon Lewis Minister of State for Housing and Planning (Department of Communities and Local Government)
Supplementary Planning Guidance	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007)
	<u>City Wide Guidance</u>  Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)

## 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 policy in the emerging Local Plan is of relevance:

- Policy 50: Residential space standards

## **6.0 CONSULTATIONS**

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

- 6.1 The proposal provides car parking at less than one space per dwelling unit. The development may therefore impose additional parking demands upon the on-street parking on the surrounding streets and, whilst this is unlikely to result in any significant adverse impact upon highway safety, there is potentially an impact upon residential amenity which the Planning Authority may wish to consider when assessing this application.

#### **Head of Refuse and Environment**

- 6.2 No objection subject to a condition restricting construction hours.
- 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:
- 45 Roseford Road
  - 50 Roseford Road
  - 51 Roseford Road

- 52 Roseford Road
- 53 Roseford Road
- 54 Roseford Road
- 57 Roseford Road
- 59 Roseford Road
- 5 St Albans Road
- 7 St Albans Road
- 9 St Albans Road

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

#### Context and character

- Out of character
- As an HMO it would seriously and adversely alter the character of the street and area
- Overdevelopment
- The plans do not indicate where refuse is to be stored
- The roof extension would create a three storey house which would be out of character

#### Residential amenity

- Noise
- Intensification
- Loss of privacy
- The location of the cycle and bin stores will have an impact on security as it would enable trespassers to climb over the fence
- The bin store could attract vermin
- Overlooking
- Bins would block the pavement on collection day
- Loss of light
- Overbearing
- The fence between No. 55 and 9 St Albans Road is not secure

#### Car parking and highway safety

- Insufficient car parking spaces
- Increase in vehicles and ad hoc parking would be dangerous
- The parking spaces are not disabled parking spaces

#### Other

- Will set a precedent
- Additional demand on sewage system

- There is no provision for a lift
- For Building Regulations approval the flats will require automatic openable vents to the roof which are not shown on the plans, also no provision has been made for openable windows. Is it a case of lets get planning first and then make minor amendments
- For Building Regulations the scheme will require emergency lighting which will have an impact on the streetscene
- The only neighbour consulted by the applicant was the applicant's sister at 11 St Albans Road. A fence has been erected to screen this property

7.3 Cllr Todd-Jones has requested that the application is determined by Committee and has made the following comments:

*The proposal relates to a family home at 55, Roseford Road, and its conversion in six flats.*

*The main element of the proposal comprises a loft conversion into a 2-bed flat, significantly altering and extending the roof configuration at the front elevation into a single expanse of mono-pitched roof extending to the side elevation with 53, Roseford Road. Together with the rear block effect of the loft conversion, this presents a visually dominating and overbearing side elevation at the boundary with 53, Roseford Road.*

*The impact of the mass and scale of the extension at the loft level adjacent to the boundary with no. 53 has an unacceptably overbearing effect on the amenity of no. 53 and contravenes the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 3/14: Extending buildings - b) the extension of existing buildings will be permitted if they do not unreasonably overlook, overshadow or visually dominate neighbouring properties.*

*Similarly, the proposal conflicts with the Cambridge Local Plan 2014: Proposed Submission (July 2013) Policy 58: Altering and extending existing buildings - e) which permits alterations and extensions if they do not unacceptably overlook, overshadow or visually dominate neighbouring properties. The supporting text notes that the design of alterations or extensions should avoid negatively impacting on the amenity of neighbouring properties or areas.*

*In addition, the mass and bulk of the loft extension and proposed reconfiguration of the roof conflicts with the Cambridge Local Plan 2014: Proposed Submission (July 2013) Policy 58: Altering and extending existing buildings - d) which permits alterations and extensions only if new roof profiles are sympathetic to the existing building and surrounding area and in keeping with the requirements of Appendix E (Roof extensions design guide). Appendix E - Massing and proportion (E.5) states: Roof extensions should relate well to the proportions, roof form and massing of the existing house and neighbouring properties. They must be appropriate in size, scale and proportion to the existing house and adjoining properties and must not be so large as to dominate the existing roof or overwhelm their immediate setting.*

*The overall proposal converting a family home into 6 flats and potential occupancy by 13 people is also in conflict with the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 5/7 where the development of properties for multiple occupation will be permitted subject to (a.) the potential impact on the residential amenity of the local area.*

*Roseford Road is characterised by family homes and there is no precedent for conversion of properties into a house in multiple occupation on this scale. The Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 5/7, supporting text 5.14 states that the location of such provision requires careful consideration to ensure that the proposals respect the character and residential amenity of the local area. This proposal is clearly out of character with the existing residential nature of Roseford Road and likely to have a detrimental impact on the locality.*

*Cambridgeshire Highways have also stated that the proposal provides car parking at less than one space per dwelling unit and that the development may therefore impose additional parking demands upon the on-street parking, with a potential impact upon residential amenity.*

- 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. Principle of development
2. Context of site, design and external spaces
3. Residential amenity
4. Refuse arrangements
5. Highway safety, car and cycle parking
6. Third party representations
7. Planning Obligation Strategy

### **Principle of Development**

8.2 Policy 5/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) states that proposals for housing development on windfall sites will be permitted subject to the existing land use and compatibility with adjoining uses. The surrounding area is predominantly residential and it is, therefore, my view that the proposal complies with policy 5/1 of the Local Plan.

8.3 Policy 5/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) states that the conversion of single residential properties into self-contained dwellings will be permitted except where: a) the property has a floorspace of less than 110 square metres; b) the likely impact on on-street parking would be unacceptable, c) the living accommodation provided would be unsatisfactory; d) the proposal would fail to provide for satisfactory refuse bin storage or cycle parking; and e) the location of the property or the nature of nearby land uses would not offer a satisfactory level of residential amenity. In my opinion the proposal meets the requirements of parts a) and e) of policy 5/2 of the Local Plan. Parts b), c) and d) relate to matters of detail and will be addressed later in this report.

8.4 In my opinion, the principle of the development is acceptable and in accordance with policy 5/1 and parts a) and e) of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

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

- 8.5 A roof extension is proposed, which would include a rear roof dormer and a hip to gable extension. The volume of the proposed roof extension is marginally larger than what would be considered to be permitted development. The character of Roseford Road changes at this point. No. 55 stands at the end of a row of detached and semi-detached houses built around the 1930s with hipped roofs. Beyond this are houses built around the 1960s with gables. In my opinion, due to the position of the house in the street the hip to gable extension would not appear out of character or have a detrimental impact on the streetscene. The proposed dormer would be set back from the eaves, set in from the sides of the roof and would not reach the ridge and it is my view that this would mean that the extended house would not be read as a three storey house. Considering that other houses on Roseford Road have rear dormers which are not dissimilar in scale or design to that proposed here it is my view that the proposed roof extension could not be considered to be out of character with its surroundings. I consider the proposed roof extension to be visually acceptable.
- 8.6 It is proposed that the house is converted into independent flats and not into a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) and, therefore, policy 5/7 of the Local Plan does not apply.
- 8.7 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/4.

## **Residential Amenity**

### **Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers**

#### Overlooking

- 8.8 Unlike the existing situation where only bedrooms and bathrooms are provided on the first floor, the conversion of the house will result in living rooms and kitchens also being provided on the first floor, and in the extended roof. This would mean that there would be increased activity on the upper floors of the house. On the first floor living rooms and kitchens are proposed at the front of the building with bedrooms and bathrooms at the rear. The front windows would overlook the

street and would not have a significant detriment impact on those living opposite in my view and it is my opinion that the impact from the rear windows would be no worse than the existing situation.

- 8.9 A dormer window of a similar scale with window at the rear as proposed could be built without the need for planning permission. For this reason it is my opinion that it would be unreasonable to refuse planning permission due to overlooking from these windows.

#### Dominance, enclosure and overshadowing

- 8.10 The proposed dormer window would cast shadow over the roofs of 53 and 57 Roseford Road but it is my opinion that this would not have a significant detrimental impact on neighbouring properties.

#### Noise and disturbance

- 8.11 The proposal would result in an intensification of use of the site. In my opinion, the impact this would have on neighbours largely depends on how the development is managed, and to ensure that the development is well managed I recommend a condition requiring details of a management plan (5).

#### Security

- 8.12 I understand the concern raised that the positioning of the bin and cycle store adjacent to the boundary fence with 57 Roseford Road could enable trespassers to climb the fence more easily. However, as a shed could be erected adjacent to the fence, in the rear garden of the existing dwelling it is my opinion that it would be unreasonable to refuse the application for this reason.
- 8.13 The fence along the common boundary with 9 St Albans Road is not secure. In order to avoid insecurity I recommend a condition requiring details of boundary treatment (6).
- 8.14 Building works are disruptive and in order to minimise this I recommend that construction hours are restricted by condition (3), along with the hours of collections and deliveries (4).

- 8.15 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.

### **Amenity for future occupiers of the site**

- 8.16 The proposed flats would share a large communal garden, which is considered to be acceptable.
- 8.17 In my opinion the proposal provides an appropriate standard of residential amenity for future occupiers, and I consider that in this respect it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/7 and part c) of policy 5/2.

### **Refuse Arrangements**

- 8.18 It is proposed that a communal bin store is provided in the rear garden. Environmental Health have raised no concerns and I therefore consider the provision to be acceptable. To ensure that bins are not left at the front of the property I recommend a condition requiring a Management Plan (5). The prevention of vermin is a matter for Environmental Health.
- 8.19 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

### **Highway Safety, Car and Cycle Parking**

- 8.20 The Highway Authority have raised no concerns regarding the impact on highway safety. It is proposed that four off-street car parking spaces are provided at the front of the property. This is less than the maximum parking standards outlined in Appendix C of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006). The City Council promotes lower levels of private car parking particularly where good transport accessibility exists. There are bus stops on Histon Road and the city is within walking distance or cycling distance of shops on Arbury Court and the City Centre. It is, therefore, my view that it would be unreasonable to refuse the application for this reason. No disabled parking spaces are proposed but due to the layout of the frontage it would be possible for either of the two central spaces to be marked out as disabled spaces if required in the future.

8.21 A communal cycle store is proposed in the rear garden. Twelve cycle parking spaces would be provided. This exceeds the requirements of Appendix D of the Cambridge Local Plan and is acceptable.

8.22 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10 and parts b) and d) of policy 5/2.

### **Third Party Representations**

Will set a precedent

8.23 Each application is assessed on its own merits.

Additional demand on sewage system

8.24 This is not a planning consideration.

There is no provision for a lift

8.25 This is a matter for Building Control.

For Building Regulations approval the flats will require automatic openable vents to the roof which are not shown on the plans, also no provision has been made for openable windows. Is it a case of lets get planning first and then make minor amendments

For Building Regulations the scheme will require emergency lighting which will have an impact on the streetscene

8.26 If amendments needed to be made to the application the applicant would need to apply for a non-material amendment if the changes were considered to be minor or they would need to submit another planning application if the changes were considered to be major. In either circumstance the acceptability of the amendments would need to be assessed.

The only neighbour consulted by the applicant was the applicant's sister at 11 St Albans Road. A fence has been erected to screen this property

8.27 The applicant is not obliged to notify neighbours.

## **Planning Obligation Strategy**

### **Planning Obligations**

8.28 As a result of the Ministerial Statement (1 December 2014) by Brandon Lewis Minister of State for Housing and Planning (Department of Communities and Local Government) developer contributions on small-scale developers, for sites of 10-units or less, and which have a maximum combined gross floor space of 1,000 square metres, affordable housing and tariff style contributions should not be sought. This also applies to all residential annexes and extensions. The proposed development falls below this threshold therefore it is not possible to seek planning obligations to secure community infrastructure in this case.

### **9.0 CONCLUSION**

9.1 In my opinion, considering what could be done under permitted development the proposal could not be considered to have a significant detrimental visual impact on the street. It is also my opinion that the proposal would not have a significant detrimental impact on neighbouring properties or highway safety. I recommend that the application is approved subject to conditions.

### **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. Except with the prior written agreement of the local planning authority no construction work or demolition shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours to 1800 hours Monday to Friday, 0800 hours to 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

4. Except with the prior written agreement of the local planning authority, there should be no collection or deliveries to the site during the demolition and construction stages outside the hours of 0700 hrs and 1900 hrs on Monday - Saturday and there should be no collections or deliveries on Sundays or Bank and public holidays.

Reason: Due to the proximity of residential properties to this premises and that extensive refurbishment will be required, the above conditions are recommended to protect the amenity of these residential properties throughout the redevelopment in accordance with policies 4/13 and 6/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006)

5. Prior to the occupation of the flats hereby approved a Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The property shall be managed in accordance with the approved Management Plan unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To minimise the impact on neighbouring properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 3/7)

6. No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected. The boundary treatment shall be completed in accordance with a timetable agreed in writing with the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure an appropriate boundary treatment is implemented. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12)