

<b>Application Number</b>	10/0927/FUL	<b>Agenda Item</b>	
<b>Date Received</b>	17th September 2010	<b>Officer</b>	Mr Marcus Shingler
<b>Target Date</b>	12th November 2010		
<b>Ward</b>	Petersfield		
<b>Site</b>	19 Perowne Street Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 2AY		
<b>Proposal Applicant</b>	Single storey rear and first floor rear extensions. Dr Emanuele Di Angelantonio 19 Perowne Street Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 2AY		

---

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

- 1.1 19 Perowne Street is a relatively narrow (4.2m) mid-terrace, two-storey dwelling and its rear garden, situated on the west side of the road about 120 metres north of the junction with Mill Road. The area is predominantly residential in character, containing mainly two-storey, terrace dwellings. The subject dwelling has a part width (2.75m), two-storey, lean-to rear wing with a single storey lean-to behind, which is a characteristic feature of many of the properties in the locality. The house is finished in Cambridge stock brickwork under a slate roof.
- 1.2 The adjacent property to the south (18) has been extended at ground floor level by the addition of 3.8m deep, flat-roof (though with a mock-pitch to north and west), almost full width rear extension site, which replaces/surrounds (at greater depth) the original single storey lean-to. This leaves a small courtyard in the pace between, the original rear wall of the house, the original side wall of the two-storey lean-to rear wing, the new rear extension, and the wall on the common boundary between 18 and 19 Perowne Street. That wall is shown on the plans as being 1.8m high adjacent to the rear wall of the main house, stepping down to 1.5 metres before it abuts the rear extension, but I think it is rather lower. The adjacent property to the north (20) has not been extended.

- 1.3 The site is within City of Cambridge Conservation Area 1 (Central) and the Controlled Parking Zone.

## **2.0 THE PROPOSAL**

- 2.1 The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a part two-storey, part single -storey rear extension to the existing dwelling. The proposed first floor element will extend two metres beyond the rear of the existing two-storey, lean-to and be the same 2.8m wide. The greater length necessitates a different roof form and that shown is a conventional pitch, with the heights being 4.6m to eaves and 5.5m to the ridge.
- 2.2 At ground floor level, a full width, single-storey projection is shown to the rear of the extended two-storey form. It is 4.4m wide and 3.55m deep and has a conventional pitch rising to a maximum height of 3.9 metres, from 2.6m high eaves; it will have a glazed west wall facing the garden. This single storey extension will project 1.8m deeper into the garden than the extension to 18 (about 3.9m beyond 20). Between the rear wall of the original house, the proposed to be extended south flank wall of the two-storey rear wing, the east facing wall of the proposed ground floor rear extension, and the common boundary with 18, it is intended that a lean-to be added, with a glazed roof, which will be about 2.5m to eaves and 3.9m to the top of the lean-to.
- 2.2 The application is reported to Area Committee for determination at the request of Councillor Walker.

## **3.0 SITE HISTORY**

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
None.		

## **4.0 PUBLICITY**

- |     |                        |     |
|-----|------------------------|-----|
| 4.1 | Advertisement:         | No  |
|     | Adjoining Owners:      | Yes |
|     | Site Notice Displayed: | No  |

## **5.0 POLICY**

### **5.1 Central Government Advice**

Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development (2005)

Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment

Planning Policy Guidance 13: Transport (2001)

Circular 11/95 – The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions

### **5.2 East of England Plan 2008**

ENV6 Historic Environment

ENV7 Quality in the built environment

### **5.3 Cambridge Local Plan 2006**

3/4 Responding to context

3/14 Extending buildings

4/11 Conservation Areas

### **5.3 Supplementary Planning Documents**

Cambridge City Council (May 2007) – Sustainable Design and Construction:

### **5.4 Material Considerations**

#### **City Wide Guidance**

Roof Extensions Design Guide (2003)

**Cambridge Historic Core – Conservation Area Appraisal (2005):** Provides an appraisal of the Historic Core of Cambridge.

**Mill Road and St Matthews Conservation Area Appraisal (1999)**

## **6.0 CONSULTATIONS**

### **Cambridgeshire County Council (Engineering)**

6.1 No objections.

#### **Conservation Officer**

6.2 Considers the ground floor extension to be too bulky and that the design of gabled first floor is out of keeping with the locality and recommends refusal.

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 In total 3 representations and a petition signed by 25 persons has been received. The issues raised can be summarised as follows: -

- Overdevelopment of the site;
- Loss of light to No's 18 and 20 Perowne Street;
- 18 will be hemmed in by the development;
- The extension is beyond others carried out in the locality and will set a precedent;
- The proposals do not take into account the Party Wall Act.

7.2 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 issues raised, where pertinent to planning are considered below. Party Wall issues are not planning matters and cannot be addressed here.

## **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

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

- 8.2 The proposed ground and first floor extension will be sited to the rear of the existing dwelling and, therefore, will not be visible in the public domain from Perowne Street. Distant views of the proposal may be possible from the south, from Emery Road, but any such views afforded would be relatively oblique and I consider that the impact on the street scene would be minimal and that no harm would be done to the character and appearance of even the Mill Road element of the Conservation Area as a whole, which would overall be preserved.
- 8.3 The proposals will, however, be visible within the rear garden environment and I have given consideration as to their acceptability. In this regard the Conservation Officer has expressed concern but while noting what has been said, I do not share those concerns. The proposed development is undoubtedly of quite significant scale, given the size of the original house, but this alone does not lead me to conclude that it is unacceptable. Inspection of the locality reveals a number of varied styles of extension including flat roofed two-storey extensions. It is noted that a gabled two storey extension with single storey additions has been added at 4 Perowne Street, having been approved under the reference C/00/1036. There are several larger pitch and gable and flat roof two storey additions on the rear of houses in Emery Street, immediately to the west. Given this variety in the locality and the fact that the building is neither on the Statutory list or local list of Buildings of Local Interest, I do not consider that permission could reasonably be refused on visual grounds. The development is of an acceptable design that will integrate satisfactorily with the existing property, subject to the use of appropriate materials. I note concerns raised by neighbouring representations regarding the development setting a precedent, but all planning applications are considered on their individual planning merits and in line with adopted policy and again, I do not consider permission could reasonably be withheld for this reason.
- 8.4 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with East of England Plan (2008) policies ENV6 and ENV7 and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/14 and 4/11.

## **Residential Amenity**

- 8.5 The proposed extension is not insignificant in scale and I have therefore given consideration to the potential impact on neighbouring residential amenity. In this respect, the properties that will be most affected are those either side, at 18 and 20 Perowne Street. 18 Perowne Street, to the south has its own two-storey rear wing and has been extended at the rear with a single storey rear extension that wraps around where the old lean-to stood coming very close to the common boundary with 19, but leaving a 'gap' of a little less than three metres along that boundary, between the rear wall of the original house and the new addition. The proposed ground floor extension will abut the common boundary, filling in 19 the area left as a 'gap' in 18. Although this has been kept to scale that would not of itself need permission were it to be built separately, it will undoubtedly impact on the amount of light to and the outlook from the ground floor level windows in the original rear wall and the side wall of 18. That said it must be recognized that the addition is north of 18 and I am therefore of the view, on balance, that with the extension sitting north of 18, the level of impact would not be harmful enough to warrant refusal. The ground floor extension will also project beyond the end of the rear extension to No. 18, but as that is only by 1.8m and is to the north, I do not consider that would have an unreasonable impact. The ground floor extension will also abut the common boundary with 20 Perowne Street, projecting about 4m beyond its rear wing, on the south side. That rear wing to 20, however, has no main windows at ground floor and although there will inevitably be some impact on light and outlook, most particularly on the rear garden area, I do not consider that it would be of a degree to merit refusal. The ground floor extension will have no impact on privacy of neighbouring properties.
- 8.6 The first floor extension projects only 2 metres beyond the existing and would be about 1.5m off the common boundary and north of 18. I do not consider that this would impact unduly on light to or the outlook from 18 or that the privacy of that property will be materially affected. The first floor element will abut the common boundary with No. 20 and given that it is set to the south, there will inevitably be a degree of impact on the light to and outlook from this property. However, the depth and height proposed is not excessive and on balance I consider that the proposals would not cause undue harm. No other

neighbouring properties will be significantly affected by the proposals.

- 8.7 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 East of England Plan (2008) policy ENV7 and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 3/14.

#### Third Party Comments

- 8.8 All the matters raised have been addressed through the report above. That said it must be recognised that there is a great deal of concern, from both neighbours, particularly about the closing of the 'gap' to the rear of 18 and the loss of light from the south and west to 20. Photographs have been submitted showing the outlook from the properties. Notwithstanding those objections, I am of the opinion, on balance that the impacts are not so severe that the proposal should be refused.

### 9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 That the proposals are acceptable and approval is recommended.

### 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 extension hereby permitted shall be constructed in external materials to match the existing building in type, colour and texture.

Reason: To ensure that the extension is in keeping with the existing building. (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV7 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 3/14)

## **LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985**

Under Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972, the following are “background papers” for each report on a planning application:

1. The planning application and plans;
2. Any explanatory or accompanying letter or document from the applicant;
3. Comments of Council departments on the application;
4. Comments or representations by third parties on the application as referred to in the report plus any additional comments received before the meeting at which the application is considered; unless (in each case) the document discloses “exempt or confidential information”
5. Any Structure Plan, Local Plan or Council Policy Document referred to in individual reports.

These papers may be inspected by contacting John Summers (Ext.7103) in the Planning Department.