

Application Number	15/1014/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	28th May 2015	Officer	Mr Amit Patel
Target Date	23rd July 2015		
Ward	Romsey		
Site	74 Catharine Street Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3AR		
Proposal Applicant	Rear roof extension Miss N Woodbine 74 Catharine Street Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3AR		

SUMMARY	<p>The development does not accord with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The proposal is highly visible in the street and therefore will have a detrimental impact on the Conservation Area <input type="checkbox"/> The design of the proposal is a near full width and full height roof extension which will dominate the roof
RECOMMENDATION	REFUSAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site, no.74 Catharine Street, is situated on the east side of Catharine Street and is comprised of a two storey terraced property with a small rear garden. The surrounding area is predominantly residential and is formed of similar sized terraced properties.
- 1.2 The site falls within the Central Cambridge Conservation Area (2011).

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

2.1 The application seeks full planning permission for a rear roof extension designed in slate and timber. A previous application was refused for the same design under planning reference 15/0377/FUL.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
15/0377/FUL	Rear roof extension.	Refused

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	3/1 3/4 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
Supplementary	Sustainable Design and Construction (May

Planning Guidance	2007)
Material Considerations	<u>City Wide Guidance</u> Roof Extensions Design Guide (2003)
	<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.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Engineering)

6.1 No comment on this application.

Urban Design and Conservation team

6.2 The application is not supported. The dormer is nearly full width and height and therefore the extension reads as a third storey extension rather than a subservient roof extension.

- 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.

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 Cllr Smart has requested this application be determined at Planning Committee due to the conflicting advice of officers and what is visible from the public realm and the impact on the appearance in a Conservation Area needs further discussion.

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

- 27 Ferry Path

- 7.3 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- The proposal is similar in size and scale to the previously refused application. This application has not addressed the concerns raised with regards to the size and scale and therefore the refusal still stands.
- Conditions to control working hours, skips etc should be conditioned if planning permission should be granted.
- The proposal will have a harmful impact on the character and context of the site

- 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

Context of site, design and external spaces and Impact on Conservation Area

- 8.1 The key consideration in terms of the design of the rear roof extension is the impact on the character of the Conservation Area. A representation has been received regarding the

proposal fitting into the context and consideration given to other approved schemes.

- 8.2 I note that a dormer very similar to this design and scale has been approved 5 doors down at number 84 Catharine Street. The Conservation Officer supported that scheme but has commented that this scheme is not acceptable. I have compared the two schemes and have come to the view that this site is different in context to the approved scheme and therefore agree with the conservation advice. The main issue is that number 74 is highly visible from St Phillips Road whereas number 84 is not and is obscured by a traditional two-storey wing on the adjoining property. The roof design on the immediate neighbours to number 74 are cat slide roofs over the two-storey wing and this makes the roof scape more visible.
- 8.3 The Roof Design Guide allows greater flexibility in situations where the rear parts of the roofs are not visible in the street; this is not the case here. The roof design guide states that scale and massing should be appropriate to the roof, these are narrow roofs and by having a nearly full width and height roof extension here would be detriment to the character of the area.
- 8.4 I also note that there are other roof extensions that are highly visible from St Phillip's Road but these appear to have been carried out prior to the Conservation Area designation and therefore have little weight in the assessment. I consider that the proposed rear roof extension is not acceptable in the context of the site and would result in harm to the character of the Conservation Area. I also consider that this scheme differs significantly from the approval given at number 84.
- 8.5 In my opinion the proposal is not compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/14 and 4/11.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.6 There would inevitably be views into the rear gardens of neighbouring properties as a result of the proposed rear roof extension. However given the compactness of the terraced properties, the outlook from these proposals would be no worse

than the existing situation, such as views from first floor windows, and is this acceptable.

- 8.7 The compact nature of the site also means that there are no concerns regarding visual dominance or enclosure caused by this proposed rear roof extension.
- 8.8 There will also be no issues regarding overshadowing at neighbouring properties as the proposed roof extension will have a minimal impact in comparison to the existing situation and no significant loss of light will occur.
- 8.9 Concerns have been raised regarding construction activity, relating to dust, parking etc. I consider that this could be overcome by suitable conditions.
- 8.10 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.

Third Party Representations

- 8.11 Third party comments have been addressed in the main body of the report above.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 It is my view that the site context is different here as the views of the proposal will be afforded from the public realm, notably St Phillips Road. Considering that other properties have not been extended in a similar way from 74 to the junction with St Phillips Road the proposal will have a harmful impact upon the character of the Conservation Area.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE for the following reasons:

1. The proposed dormers being nearly full width and height would visually dominate the roof scape and appear incongruous, particularly as the immediate properties have not been extended at this level. The proposal would be highly visible in the street. As such the proposals would be out of character and would neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the aims and objectives of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/14 and 4/11.