

<b>Application Number</b>	15/0962/FUL	<b>Agenda Item</b>	
<b>Date Received</b>	19th May 2015	<b>Officer</b>	Miss Alison Twyford
<b>Target Date</b>	14th July 2015		
<b>Ward</b>	Romsey		
<b>Site</b>	218A - 220 Mill Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3NF		
<b>Proposal</b>	Rendering external wall and painting in soft stone colour (retrospective)		
<b>Applicant</b>	Mr Pabla 218A - 220 Mill Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3NF		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The proposal will not adversely affect residential amenity.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The proposal is similar to other properties in the immediate area and is therefore considered to preserve the character of the conservation area.</p>
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

**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. Residential properties on Hope Street are adjacent to the rear of the site.

- 1.2 The site lies within the Central Conservation Area.
- 1.3 The properties in the area are a mixture of brick and render, most of which are painted white or cream in colour.

## **2.0 THE PROPOSAL**

- 2.1 The proposal seeks retrospective planning permission for the rendering of the front elevation and part of the side elevation wall of the property. The render is 12mm thick.
- 2.2 An application for the works was previously made under planning reference 14/1077/FUL. Officers recommended approval of the scheme but the recommendation was overturned at the East Area Committee on 11 September 2014. The decision was dismissed at appeal on the basis that the Inspector did not consider that application of the render to the scale it had been applied, enhanced or preserved the character of the conservation area, which he noted was traditional exposed brickwork.
- 2.3 The applicant has tried to address the previous applications concerns by removing a 9m wide section of the render from the side elevation which faces onto Hope Street. The rest of the render has been retained and forms this application.
- 2.4 The application has been called in Committee by Councillor Baigent.

## **3.0 SITE HISTORY**

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
14/1077/FUL	Rendering external wall and painting in soft stone colour (retrospective)	REFUSED
08/0178/FUL	Extension to first floor flat.	PERMITTED
07/0996/FUL	Erection of a first floor extension and pitched roof to replace existing flat roof to rear.	REFUSED



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.

## **6.0 CONSULTATIONS**

### **6.1 Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways)**

No comment on behalf of the Highway Authority

### **6.2 Conservation Team**

The works are not detrimental to the character or appearance of the conservation area. Therefore this application is supported as it complies with policy 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

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:

- 96 Cavendish Road
- 17 Romsey Road
- 23 Hope Street
- 29 Tenison Road

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- This rendering was the subject of an appeal and the inspector turned down the appeal. Nothing has changed and this should not be allowed for all the reasons stated last time.
- The render has already been refused planning permission and the Inspectors decision should be applied.
- the information on the application doesn't make clear what is proposed.
- a second application should not have been made and the previous decision should have been final.
- the works are a "visual mess" and an "eyesore" which damage the whole concept of the Conservation Area.
- Nothing has changed since the Inspector reached this view: the applicant wants to keep the same ugly render with the same negative impact on the appearance of a building that visually dominates part of the Mill Road conservation area.
- The works could set a precedent in the street

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. Third Party representations

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

8.2 The proposal seeks to retain render that has been applied to the front elevation of the property which faces Mill Road and part of the side elevation which faces Hope Street. A 9m two storey stretch of render has been removed from the side elevation of Hope Street which has revealed the exposed brick behind.

8.3 The site is situated within a Conservation Area and both the Inspectors appeal decision on the previous application and third party comments have drawn attention to the importance of this.

- 8.4 The Conservation Officers comments state that the use of render within the Conservation Area is not completely out of character with the section of Mill Road and consider that the works are not detrimental to the character or appearance of the conservation area and comply with policy 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.
- 8.5 The area has a mixture of traditional brick, painted and rendered buildings in close proximity to the application site.
- 8.6 I consider that the removal of a large section of render on the Hope Street elevation has improved the previously refused scheme and in particular addresses paragraph 6 of the Inspectors decision. The inspector noted in this paragraph of the appeal decision that the rendering applied to the front elevation does not cause significant harm, and the reason for dismissal of the appeal related to the impact of the Hope Street elevation
- 8.7 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, and 4/11.

### **Residential Amenity**

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.8 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.
- 8.9 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.

### **Third Party Representations**

- 8.10 A number of representations commented that they did not consider a further application should be considered. The planning process however allows applications to be made at any time and the Council has a duty to consider them unless they are the subject of an existing enforcement notice.

8.11 Some comments have stated that nothing has changed since the previous application, or that the plans are not clear. I consider however that the plans differ from the previous application significantly due to the removal of the render from the side (Hope Street) elevation.

8.12 Concern has also been raised that the approval of this application could result in the setting of a precedent in the street. All applications are considered on their own merits and in accordance with national and local plan policies.

## **10.0 RECOMMENDATION**

**APPROVE** subject to the following condition:

1. 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.