

Application Number	16/0078/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	18th January 2016	Officer	Mr Sav Patel
Target Date	14th March 2016		
Ward	Market		
Site	19 Earl Street Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 1JR		
Proposal	Demolition of existing rear lean-to lobby, w.c. and porch, loft conversion including raising the main roof ridge with rear extension at second floor level, ground floor rear extension, first floor rear extension and insertion of new doorway to the front light well to provide access for bin storage		
Applicant	Mr Tim Bick 19 Earl Street Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 1JR United Kingdom		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed extensions are acceptable in terms of design, scale and appearance. - The proposed extensions would not have a detrimental impact on the character or appearance of the Conservation Area or Building of Local Interest status of the dwellinghouse. - The proposed extensions would not have a significant adverse impact on the residential amenity of the adjoining neighbours.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site consists of a two storey mid-terrace dwellinghouse located on the southern side of Earl Street.
- 1.2 The surrounding area is predominantly residential and the site is situated within City of Cambridge Conservation Area 1 (Central). The house is a Building of Local Interest and the site is located within a Controlled Parking Zone.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposal consists of a ground and first floor and roof extension to the rear of the dwellinghouse. The proposal also includes raising the ridge height of the roof and two roof lights in the front roof scape.
- 2.2 The ground floor extension would project 4.2 metres from the rear elevation. The eaves height would be 2.4 metres rising to a height of 3.6 metres.
- 2.3 The first floor extension would project 1.4 metres off the rear elevation. The roof extension would consist of a zinc clad dormer set behind a balcony that is contained within a mansard roof. The recessed balcony would be located above the first floor extension.
- 2.4 The proposed extension would require the demolition of the existing lean-to on the rear of the property.
- 2.5 The application is reported to planning committee for determination as the applicant is a Councillor.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

No relevant planning history.

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 3/14 4/11 4/12

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 Planning Guidance	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012)
Material Considerations	<u>City Wide Guidance</u> Roof Extensions Design Guide (2003) Buildings of Local Interest (2005)
	<u>Area Guidelines</u> Kite Area Conservation Area Appraisal (1996)

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 that should be taken into account.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

6.1 No implications on highway

Environmental Health

6.2 The proposal is acceptable in principle subject to construction hours condition.

Urban Design and Conservation Team

6.3 No comments have been received to date. Any comments will be reported to members in the Amendment or orally at Committee.

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:

- 12 Earl Street;
- 14 Earl Street;
- 18 Earl Street;

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Supportive of the proposal;
- The proposal would have no negative impact;
- The proposal would improve the appearance of the property;
- The raising of the ridge is reasonable and will make little difference to daylight/sunlight;
- Scaffolding should be kept to a reasonable height and only kept up whilst needed.

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 (and impact on heritage assets)

8.2 The proposal consists of four main parts, ground floor extension, first floor extension, roof extension and raising the ridge height. I set out below my assessment for each part and the overall proposal.

Ground floor

- 8.3 The proposed ground floor extension would replace the existing translucent corrugated roof lean-to structure and slate roof w/c lean-to extension, both of which project 1.8 metres. The proposed extension would be full width and project 4.2 metres from the rear elevation with a lean-to roof at an eaves height of 2.2 metres sloping to 3.6 metres. The extension would project a similar distance to the ground floor extension at no.17 and set back from the two storey rear extension at no.21. The existing lean-to projected 1.8 metres. The proposal is to use Cambridge Gault.
- 8.4 The proposed lean-to extension is considered to be a modest intervention which is of domestic scale and would enhance the existing appearance of the rear elevation of the property at ground floor level. Many of the properties within the street have been extended in a similar manner. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed ground extension is acceptable in this context in terms of its design and scale.

First floor

- 8.5 Many of the dwellings within the street have been extended at first floor, particularly both neighbouring properties either side. The proposed first floor extension would project 1.4 metres which would be in line with the first floor extension at no.21 but beyond the rear elevation of no.17. The extension would contain three symmetrical windows.
- 8.6 The proposed extension is considered to be modest and would be in keeping with the range of first floor extensions within the terrace. The proposed extension would also improve appearance of the rear elevation.

Roof extension and raising the ridge height

- 8.7 This element of the proposal is the most elaborate as it would consist of a flat roof zinc-clad dormer which connects to a zinc mansard roof element over the first floor extension which incorporates a recessed balcony with rail guard. Having assessed the extensions to the adjoining properties and the others within the terrace, the proposed extension and materials would not appear out of character. It would instead add to the

eclectic mix of contemporary and traditional extensions. The proposal to use a different material for the roof extension and different roof shape for the balcony helps to reduce the dominance and mass of the extension. I am therefore satisfied with the proposed design, scale and materials of the roof extension and consider it to be acceptable in this context.

- 8.8 The proposed raising of the ridge would increase the height of the roof from 2.2 metres to 2.85 metres (from eaves to ridge). The ridge line of the properties along Earl Street is inconsistent. The ridgeline of no.21 is higher and the ridgeline of no.17 is lower than no.19. This position would be maintained and so would not have a material impact on the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The two rooflights in the front roof scape would not appear out of character as there are many similar roof lights within the terrace.
- 8.9 I am still awaiting a response from the Urban Design and Conservation Team. Any comments and recommended conditions will be reported to Members in the amendment sheet or at Committee. Overall I consider the proposed extension would be an acceptable intervention to the existing dwelling that would add to the eclectic mix of extensions within the rear range of these terrace properties. It must also be noted that the rear elevation is not visible from the public realm. I also consider the proposed extensions would not have a detrimental impact on the character or status of the property as a Building of Local Interest.
- 8.10 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/14, 4/11 and 4/12.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.11 The proposed extensions would not have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of the adjoining neighbours in terms of overlooking, overbearing and overshadowing.
- 8.12 There are no windows that would directly overlook the neighbouring gardens. The recessed roof balcony would be contained within a mansard roof and restricted by railings. I therefore do not consider the balcony to be any different to a

window. The neighbouring properties have windows which overlook the site and so I do not consider the proposed balcony would result in a significant loss of privacy.

- 8.13 The proposed ground floor extension is considered to be an acceptable depth and height such that it would not appear overbearing. Both neighbours have extended and so I do not consider the ground floor extension would have a significantly adverse impact on their amenity in terms of outlook or enclosure.
- 8.14 The first floor extension is considered to be modest with a 1.4 metre depth. Both neighbours have extended at two storey and so the proposed extension would not appear out of character or result in any direct overlooking issues. In terms of overbearing, the proposed extension would project the same distance as the glazed vaulted extension at no.17 and so would not significantly impact their amenity. With regards to no.21 the extension would project beyond the rear elevation but not the first floor element as it is stepped off the boundary. There are two small windows in the original rear elevation but given the restricted depth of the proposed first floor, I do not consider the degree of impact would be significant enough to warrant refusal. None of the other windows at first floor would be affected by the proposal.
- 8.15 The rear garden of the application site and adjoining properties is south-west facing. Therefore, in view of the existing extensions to the neighbouring properties and south-west facing gardens, I do not consider the proposed extension would result in significant loss of light or cause adverse levels of overshadowing.
- 8.16 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, 3/7 and 3/14.

Third Party Representations

- 8.17 The responses received support the proposal which accords with the recommendation. One of the comments refers to the height of the scaffolding and the length of time it will be kept up for. This is a civil rather than planning matter and not an issue that can be controlled by way of condition.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The proposal is for ground, first and roof extensions to the existing dwellinghouse. The proposed extensions are acceptable in design and scale and would not harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area or Building of Local Interest. There would also be no significant harm to the amenities of the adjoining residents.

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. No construction work or demolition work shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours and 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. No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/14 and 4/11)