

Application Number	16/0025/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	8th January 2016	Officer	Mr Sav Patel
Target Date	4th March 2016		
Ward	Newnham		
Site	24 Grantchester Street Cambridge CB3 9HY		
Proposal	Rear, side and loft extension involving raising the ridge to provide additional living area on the ground floor, a larger bedroom on the first floor and an additional bedroom in the loft. General internal and external refurbishment, complete replacement of existing sash windows with timber framed double-glazed units.		
Applicant	Mr Andrew Fiddian-Green 24 Grantchester Street Cambridge CB3 9HY		

<p>SUMMARY</p>	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The contemporary composition of the proposed extensions and use of modern materials represents an attractive and contrasting intervention which successfully integrates with the traditional form of the existing dwelling. - The proposed extensions would not appear intrusive or detract from the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. - The proposed extensions would not have a significantly detrimental impact on the residential amenity of the immediate and surrounding neighbours.
<p>RECOMMENDATION</p>	<p>APPROVAL</p>

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site consists of a two storey bay-windowed Edwardian end of terrace dwellinghouse in brick and slate roof construction. The terrace properties have small front gardens and two storey rear wings. The rear garden joins onto a side passage which runs alongside the side boundary of no.1 Chedworth Street.
- 1.2 The built form of the area is predominantly characterised by two storey terrace housing. To the south of the site is a 1980s housing development consisting of three staggered two storey properties. There is a gap between the application site and the modern terrace to the south. I understand this area was occupied by a substation before it was relocated. The land is now in split ownership with the applicant owning the rear half and the occupier of no.22 Grantchester Street owning the front half.
- 1.3 The application site is located within the Newnham Croft Conservation Area and an Air Quality Management Area. There are no listed buildings or buildings of local interest within close proximity to the site.
- 1.4 In the Newnham Croft Conservation Area Appraisal (June 2013) it states on page 26, *“nos. 24-32 (even) form a row of bay-windowed Edwardian houses, constructed in brick with slate roofs. These houses are symmetrical in design, and have original, attractive features.”*
- 1.5 The terrace within which the application site is located is also identified as “Buildings Important to Character” and also views north from the southern end and south from the northern end of Grantchester Street are identified as “Important Positive Views”

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposal consists of three elements; a single storey ground floor rear extension; a first floor side extension; and a roof extension. All three elements have been designed to appear as modern interventions through the use of zinc cladding and extensive glazing.

- 2.2 The single storey ground floor extension to the rear of the property would project 2.9 metres off the rear elevation of the rear wing and 5.85 metres off the main rear elevation. The extension would be set off the southern boundary by 0.67m and at a height of approx. 3 metres. The extension would have a sloped roof pitch which increases from approx 3 metres from south to 3.66 metres at the north point. The proposed extension would be 4.25 metres wide and set off the northern boundary by 200mm.
- 2.3 The proposed first floor side extension would project off the rear wing by 1.75 metres with a depth of 3.25 metres. The extension would be set off the rear elevation of the main dwelling by 1.94 metres to create a light well into the proposed conservatory and to allow the bathroom to have an external window. The extension would increase the size of the existing bedroom. The extension would have a sloping roof which is of a slightly shallower than the pitch of the existing roof of the wing. Again the frame of the extension would be of zinc cladding with a large window in the rear elevation facing the garden.
- 2.4 The proposed roof extension consists of a pitched roof rear dormer which slopes back from the main ridge. At the centre of the rear elevation would be a brick chimney which project 900mm above the ridgeline of the proposed dormer and 1.55 metres above the main ridgeline (excluding the pots). The proposed dormer would project 750mm above the main ridgeline of the dwelling. The slope of the dormer would continue at the same angle of the front roof pitch. The roof dormer would also be set in from the side gable by 300mm and set back from the eaves line. The proposal does not include any alteration to the main ridge or eaves line of the dwellinghouse.
- 2.5 The original proposal included a full height window but following concerns with appearance of full height glazing and potential overlooking issues the applicant introduced mullions and additional cladding which has mitigated my concerns to an acceptable level. The applicant was requested to mirror the triangular window on the south side of the roof extension to create a sense of symmetry. However, the applicant was not keen on this approach due to wanting to maximise light into the roof dormer.

2.6 The planning application includes the following documents:

- o Design and Access Statement
- o Plans
- o Sun Study
- o Overlooking Assessment

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
C/03/0853	Erection of a garden shed and bike/bin storage.	APPROVED

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	3/11	3/12	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 Planning Guidance	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007)
Material Considerations	<u>City Wide Guidance</u> Roof Extensions Design Guide (2003)
	<u>Area Guidelines</u> Newnham Croft Conservation Area Appraisal (2013) Barton Road Suburbs and Approaches Study (March 2009)

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 The proposal is not considered to have any implications that merit comment.

Urban Design and Conservation Team

- 6.2 There are a number of proposed extensions to the building. Those on the ground floor and the first floor, are somewhat convoluted and lose the simplicity of the original design of the building. The first floor side extension does not marry well with the existing building, appearing as a bolt on to the side. The roof has a slope, but this is not the same pitch as the existing out-rigger. This does not work well from an aesthetic point of view. As there are no other roof extensions in the terrace, there is no immediate context for the proposal to respond to. The proposed roof extension is not supported as it does not comply with the Roof Extensions Design Guide. It visually dominates the rear roof slope and has a ridge which is higher than that of the main range of the building.
- 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:

Object:

- 22 Grantchester Street;
- 26 Grantchester Street;
- 1 Chedworth Street;
- 3 Chedworth Street;
- 7 Chedworth Street;
- 15 Chedworth Street;
- 37 Riverside Road, Norwich
- 1 local resident objected but withheld their address.

Support:

- 19 Merton Street, Cambridge
- 40 New Square, Cambridge;
- Churchill College, Storeys Way;
- 2nd Floor 69a Lensfield Road (Agent);
- Rookery Farm Barns, Frog End, Great Wilbraham
- 82 College Lane, Hatfield
- 40 Fentiman Road, London
- 44 Prebend Gardens, London

- Flat 1, 16 Comiston Gardens, Edinburgh;
- AUB Halls of Residence, Madiera Road, Bournemouth;

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Objections:

- The proposal would have a significantly adverse impact loss of privacy, loss of light, overbearing sense of enclosure and affect views and skyline from the surrounding streets;
- The proposal will unreasonably overlook, overshadow, and visually dominate neighbouring properties;
- Detrimental effect on the character of the Conservation Area and detract from the prevailing Victorian character and overall appearance of the area;
- Adversely affect the setting of neighbouring buildings and gardens;
- Prejudice the comprehensive development of the wider Conservation Area;
- The proposed design does not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and nor does it reflect or provide a successful contrast;
- The proposal is significantly taller than the neighbouring properties;
- The 1.7 metre high brick wall should be building in Cambridge brick as opposed to red brick
- Concerns with the ridge height, height of the rear extension and size of the windows that will cause overlooking and affect the use of the garden;
- The roof extension would be highly visible when approaching from the north and is not acceptable in this location;
- The proposed roof extension would encourage similar proposals which would ruin the appearance of this area;
- The scale and massing of the development is not in keeping with the rest of the terrace;
- Windows do not correlate with the traditional vernacular architecture;
- The additional chimney disrupts the rhythm of the terrace;
- Overdevelopment of the plot;
- The terrace is identified in the Conservation Area Appraisal as having symmetrical design and original, attractive features which the proposal would change;
- If this development is approved to a modest Victorian terrace house is approved it will pave the way for the degradation of the rest of the conservation area by setting a precedent;

- The chimney and new windows should be removed to mitigate the overlooking issue and to reduce the size of the extension;

Support

- The proposal is of innovative and contemporary design which contrasts with the existing vernacular;
- The proposal would present a good benchmark for other projects;
- The proposal is a refreshing contemporary design that preserves the look of the area;
- The ground floor extension would not overlook any of the neighbours;
- Design is extremely clever as it manages to drastically change the house without affecting the view from the street.
- Refreshing to see an extension with such high design aesthetics;
- The proposed design incorporate tasteful modern home enhancements whilst in sympathy with the look and feel of the area;
- It is encouraging to see how homes can be enhanced by thoughtful design and uplift the local area rather than the many designs which detract from it.
- Not a repeat of something that has already been done;
- An effective fusion of traditional and modern design;
- Increase in ridge height would allow loft space to be used while not being immoderately visible from the street;

7.3 Councillor Cantrill has requested the application be presented to Planning Committee on the basis the proposals would be contrary to policies 3/14(a) and 4/11 as it would affect the character and appearance of the Conservation Area by the roof profile and visible hip, nature of the massing at the rear of the property, and the form of style of the rear extension of the property.

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. 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 three elements and I set out below my assessment of all three and an overall appraisal.

Single storey rear extension extension:

8.3 The rear extension is considered to be a proportionate, respectful, modern and high quality intervention to the existing dwellinghouse. The extension would include extensive glazing and the use of pre-weathered zinc on the western elevation and rooftop. The configuration of the extension in combination with the use of alternative materials would in my view contrast well with the traditional yellow brick dwelling. The use of glazing would also reduce the bulk of the extension by making it appear light weight. The eastern elevation of the extension would consist of a 2.64 metre high brick wall to match the existing. This would provide a material/visual connection to the existing dwelling. The combination of materials and scale of the extension would represent, in my view, a positive intervention which would successfully contrast with the existing dwellinghouse without having a detrimental impact on the character of the terrace. The extension would not be entirely visible from Grantchester Street but the elements that are would appear as a successful juxtaposition when viewed in context with the front and side elevation of existing dwelling. I am therefore satisfied the proposed single storey extension would not have a detrimental impact on the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

First floor side extension:

8.4 The first floor extension is considered to be a modest addition to the dwelling in terms of scale. The extension would sit on top of

the ground floor extension but appear as a subservient addition to the existing two storey rear wing. This element would be glazed on both the front and rear elevation. The side elevation would consist of zinc cladding to match the ground floor extension. This would again contrast well with the yellow brick base on which the extension would be located above. Unlike the roof of the ground floor extension, the applicant has proposed to use slate on the roof to match the existing material on the rear wing. This is considered to be visually acceptable as it would link to, and project from the existing rear wing. The extension would not be attached to the main rear elevation of the dwelling, which would create a small courtyard area, and so would appear as a separate element. The extension would be located 1.94 metres from the main rear elevation. From the side elevation the gap would create a visual break at first floor which would reduce the bulk of the extension. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed first floor extension would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Roof extension

- 8.5 The proposed roof extension would consist of a pitched dormer style addition with a chimney stack in the centre of the gable elevation. In order to make the loft space usable the applicant has proposed to slope the roof extension up off the main ridge so that it continues the angle of the front roof pitch and project above the ridgeline. The ridgeline of the roof extension would project 750mm above the existing but this would element would be set 1.25 metres back from the main ridgeline. Therefore, the roof extension would not be entirely visible from the street level, and would the bulk of it would partially hidden behind the existing chimney stack. Following concerns with the dominance of the roof extension, the applicant has stepped the side cheek of the extension in from the gable by 300mm to give the roof extension a more subservient appearance and to reveal more of the original roof slope.
- 8.6 The additional increase in the height above the main ridge would have an impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area when viewed from Grantchester Street, Lammis Fields and Chedworth Street where views of the terrace are visible. However, whilst it is accepted that the roof extension is likely to materially alter the appearance of the roof, it is important to assess the harm of this. From Grantchester

Street, due to the gap between the application site and no.22, the extension would not be entirely visible from street level i.e. one would not be able to appreciate the roof extension in its plan form. The applicant has produced useful CGIs which illustrate what elements of the roof extension would be visible. The roof slope is likely to be partially visible but as the bulk of the extension would be hidden behind the chimney stack it would not be fully appreciated. Part of the side cheek is also likely to be visible from Grantchester Street. However, as this element has been stepped in from the gable in order to maintain the appearance of the end gable which is an important feature from the street scene, the visible part of the roof extension would not appear visual dominant or bulky.

- 8.7 I am therefore satisfied that the composition of the roof extension when viewed from Grantchester Street would not be significant such that it would upset or conflict with the traditional rhythm and architectural vernacular of the existing dwelling and terrace. The roof extension is unlikely to be visible from Chedworth Street due to the location of the application being the further away and the roof would be hidden by the adjoining properties. Views from Lammas Fields, which is a private car parking area, of the roofscape are partially screened by the existing trees and so the proposed roof extension would not be entirely visible. However, my view is that the roof extension would represent a successful and contemporary contrast which is of high quality in terms of design and scale. Therefore the appearance of the roof extension from public vantage points would be positive ones.
- 8.8 There are other roof extensions on the properties in Chedworth Street. This ranges from small pitched roof dormers, a flat roof box dormer and an interesting curved roof dormer, which also extends over part of the rear wing. Therefore, in terms of context, whilst none of the other properties within the terrace have extended the roof or raised the ridge, this should not represent a restriction on any roof extension on the terrace. It should be possible ensuring that any proposed roof extension is sympathetic to the existing dwelling and surroundings but also is of a high quality design. The applicant has proposed a modern design which contrasts with the traditional Edwardian architecture whilst maintaining the original form of the existing dwelling. In my view, the proposed roof extension is an innovative and successful addition to the roofscape of this

dwelling which would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. It would not in my view appear inappropriate in or disrespectful to the existing terrace or wider setting.

- 8.9 Overall, the proposed extensions would contrast successfully with the traditional Edwardian form by introducing a modern composition which respect the form of the host dwelling whilst maintain its overall appearance and form. The proposed extensions in their entirety would, in my view, appear as proportionate and subservient additions to the main dwelling. They would also provide variation and architectural interest from the street scene when passing the site particularly heading south along Grantchester Road. There would not be prolonged views of the proposed extensions when passing the site at street level or from Chedworth Street. The views of the elements that would be visible would be short lived due to the size of the gap between no.22 and application site.
- 8.10 Concerns have been raised by local residents regarding the modernistic approach and its suitability in this conservation area setting and assimilation with the host dwelling. I believe the extensions would represent an intervention that is successful juxtaposition between two architectural languages. The articulation of the fenestration between both forms would be distinct but sit comfortably side by side. Both forms have their own individual character that would not jar against each other. The proposed extensions have also been carefully designed to minimise their appearance and impact on the street scene and the public realm. Whilst they do not hide away, the parts that would visible would add architectural interest into this context.
- 8.11 I note the concerns of the Conservation Officer regarding the impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area which is a Heritage Asset. The rear roofscape of Grantchester Street is not a vista which is highlighted as significant within the Newnham Croft Conservation Area Appraisal. It is the front street scene which is of far greater importance. Whilst parts of the extensions would be visible from the street, they would not be unattractive views such that it would have a harmful impact on the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The extensions will improve the living accommodation of the property without causing significant harm to the surrounding environment.

8.12 In terms of external space, the rear garden of the property would be reduced due to the single storey rear extension but the property would still benefit from sufficient size garden areas. The rear garden would be reduced to a depth of between 5.8 metres and 8 metres due to the existing shed. This does not include the side garden area adjacent no.22 which would provide additional outdoor space. I am therefore satisfied that the extensions to the property would not result in overdevelopment of the plot as sufficient outdoor would be provided for the existing/future occupier.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

8.13 Concerns have been raised regarding the potential adverse impact on the residential amenity of the adjoining and surrounding residents in terms of loss of privacy, overbearing/visual dominance, overshadowing and loss of view. I set out below my response to each of these issues.

Loss of privacy

8.14 The ground floor extension would not result in any overlooking issue due to the existing boundary treatment.

8.15 The proposed first floor extension would include a new window facing into the rear garden. This window would be set adjacent to the existing window and both would serve a bedroom. The proposed first floor window was originally shown as an entirely glazed aperture but in order to reduce the appearance of clutter and extent of glazing, a mullion was been introduced to break up the amount of glazing and introduce visual interest. The window would not cause any significant overlooking issues in my view. In terms of no.22 Grantchester Street, the first floor window would not directly overlook the private amenity space. It would offer more or less the same angled views as the existing first floor window, albeit at a closer distance to the boundary, of the rear garden of no.22. The rear elevation of no.22 is also set back from the rear elevation of the first floor extension by approx. 2.3 metres. Therefore any view of the garden would be from oblique angles of the rear half of the rear garden and similar to the views obtainable from the existing first floor

window. I am therefore satisfied that there would not be any direct or adverse levels of overlooking of the rear garden of no.22 such that it would have a significant detrimental impact on the residential amenity of the existing occupier.

8.16 With regards to the rear gardens of Chedworth Street, the first floor window would be located at the furthest point down the garden facing the rear most part of the rear garden of no.1 Chedworth Street. There is also an outbuilding adjacent to the rear boundary no.1 Chedworth Street. The window would also be located approx. 13 metres from the side boundary of no.1 Chedworth Street, the same distance as the existing first floor window. There are also the first floor windows of the other properties in the terrace that face the rear garden of no.1 Chedworth Street. In this context, the rear gardens of properties in Chedworth Street and Grantchester Street are all mutually overlooked from the windows of the existing residential properties. I therefore do not consider the proposed first floor window would cause any adverse overlooking issues over and above that which already exist.

8.17 The proposed roof extension would provide an additional bedroom and include two windows in the rear elevation. The original proposed roof extension included a window in the side (north) cheek and a floor to ceiling window in the rear elevation. Following concerns with the potential overlooking from the window in the side cheek and appearance of a full glazed aperture at roof level, the applicant agreed to remove the side window and reduced the window aperture and amount of glazing in the full height window by introducing transoms and mullions. These alterations have, in my view, addressed the overlooking impact on no.22 Grantchester Street.

8.18 With regards to Chedworth Street, the windows would be located a distance of 17.6 metres from the side boundary of no.1 Chedworth Street. As with the first floor window, the main window in the roof extension window would be located at the furthest end of the terrace away from the main private amenity space of the Chedworth Street properties. The views of the gardens from the secondary window in the roof extension would be partially screened by the existing rear wing. View of the roof extension would be most prominent when standing against the rear elevation of the rear gardens of the Chedworth Street properties and the rear garden of no.22 Grantchester Street. In

the context of rear gardens being mutually overlooked by existing windows, I do not consider the addition of a roof extension would cause adverse levels of overlooking over and above that which already exists.

Overbearing/visual dominance

8.19 The proposed extensions are not considered to be of such a scale or mass that they would cause an adverse sense of enclosure on any of the adjoining and surrounding properties. The ground floor extension is set off the boundary with no.26 by 670mm and would project 2.9 metres from the rear wing. The combination of this set back and depth would not appear overbearing on the adjoining neighbour such that it would have an adverse impact on their residential amenity. With regards to no.22 Grantchester Street, the ground floor extension would be located behind an existing single storey structure in the rear garden no.22 and therefore the visual bulk of the extension would not be entirely visible or prominent from the rear garden. The proposed extension would project 5.4 metre beyond the rear elevation but set away from the rear elevation by 4.6 metres and so, in this context, would not in my view appear visually overbearing such that it would cause an adverse sense of enclosure of the occupier's residential amenity. The first floor extension would be located on the boundary and above the ground floor extension. This element would have a lower eaves line than the existing rear wing and would not project any further east into the garden than the rear wing. The extension would also not conflict with the 45 degree rule from the neighbour's windows at no.22. The first extension would not impact the other properties within the adjoining terrace. In these terms, therefore, I do not consider the first floor extension would appear significantly overbearing such that it would cause an adverse sense of enclosure on the occupier of no.22 Grantchester Street.

8.20 With regards to the properties in Chedworth Street, the proposed ground floor and first floor extensions would not have any adverse impact on the occupiers in terms of appearing overbearing or visual dominance due to the level of separation and scale of extension. The proposed first floor extension would be in line with the existing rear wing.

- 8.21 The proposed roof extension would not appear overbearing or visually dominant from any of the surrounding properties, in my view. Whilst the roof extension would represent a new form within the roofscape of the property and terrace, it is of a design and scale that would not appear visual intrusive or overbearing on the neighbouring properties. View of the roof extension would be most visible from standing in the rear garden no.22 Grantchester Street. However it would not represent a form that appears overbearing or visually intrusive from this location due to the level of separation and design of the roof extension.
- 8.22 Overall therefore, I do not consider the proposed extensions would appear overbearing or visually intrusive/dominant on the surrounding neighbouring properties.

Overshadowing/loss of light

- 8.23 The applicant has submitted a shadow study which assesses the potential impact of overshadowing during June, September and December at 9am, noon, 3pm and 6pm. Whilst the BRE guide recommends March is tested for shadowing, it is acknowledged that September provides a similar reading. The studies show that the proposed extensions would not cause significant levels of overshadowing on the neighbour at no.22 Grantchester Street (which is north of the application site). There would be some additional shadowing over the middle part of the rear garden of no.22 but this would not be considered significant to adverse impact on the neighbour's residential amenity. The rear garden of no.22 would receive more than 2 hours of daylight during times tested in the sun study. The proposed extensions would also not result in any significant levels of overshadowing of the properties in the Chedworth Street due to the orientation of the sites and level of separation and would be compliant with BRE guidance.

Loss of view

- 8.24 The proposed extension would not cause have any adverse impact on the outlook from the rear gardens of the properties in Chedworth Street and Grantchester Street such that it would warrant refusal. The extensions would be most visible from the rear garden of no.22 but due to the level of separation between the properties, I do not consider the outlook would be significantly impacted.

8.25 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

8.26 I set out below my response to the third party objections/representation received.

Representations	Response
Residential amenity	
The proposal would have a significantly adverse impact loss of privacy, loss of light, overbearing sense of enclosure and affect views and skyline from the surrounding streets;	See para 8.12 to 8.23
The proposal will unreasonably overlook, overshadow, and visually dominate neighbouring properties;	As above
Adversely affect the setting of neighbouring buildings and gardens;	The setting of neighbouring buildings and gardens would not be adversely affected by the proposed extensions. The proposed extensions have been designed specially to contrast with the traditional form of the area due introducing modern compositions of forms and materials, which in my work works successfully in this context.
Character, design and scale	
Detrimental effect on the character of the Conservation Area and detract from the prevailing Victorian character and overall appearance of the area;	See para 8.3 to 8.11

<p>The proposed design does not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and nor does it reflect or provide a successful contrast;</p>	<p>The proposed would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Whilst the Conservation Officer's concerns are recognised, I feel that the modern approach taken works well in this context. There are some roof extension and rear extension with the surrounding area, many of which are uninspiring and unassuming such as the flat roof box dormers which unduly dominate the roof and rear extension. The proposed extension pushes the boundaries of design and scale without appearing intrusive or incongruous.</p>
<p>The proposal is significantly taller than the neighbouring properties;</p>	<p>The proposed roof extension would be 0.75m above the main ridgeline. The roof extension would be sloped back from the main ridge and the main bulk of the dormer would be hidden behind the chimney stack. It is unlikely that the appearance of the roof slope would be entirely noticeable from street level.</p>
<p>The 1.7 metre high brick wall should be building in Cambridge brick as opposed to red brick</p>	<p>The applicant has changed the originally proposed red brick on the eastern elevation of the ground floor extension to yellow brick.</p>
<p>Concerns with the ridge height, height of the rear extension and size of the windows that will cause overlooking and affect the use of the garden;</p>	<p>See paras 8.5 to 8.7 and 8.13 to 8.20 The proposed extension would not have any impact on the use of the rear garden. There are existing windows that are much closer to the rear elevation of the properties in</p>

	Chedworth Street and overlook more sensitive parts of the garden than the proposed extensions.
The roof extension would be highly visible when approaching from the north and is not acceptable in this location;	The proposed roof extension would not be entirely visible from the north. I therefore do not consider the proposal would have any visual adverse impact on the area.
The proposed roof extension would encourage similar proposals which would ruin the appearance of this area;	Each planning application is considered on its own merits. In my view, the proposed extension would set a high quality benchmark for others to follow.
The scale and massing of the development is not in keeping with the rest of the terrace;	See para 8.3 to 8.9
Windows do not correlate with the traditional vernacular architecture;	This is because the proposed extensions are not trying to correlate. The extensions are trying to contrast with the existing architectural vernacular. In my view the contrast is successful.
The additional chimney disrupts the rhythm of the terrace;	The proposed chimney feature is a prominent character of the terrace and would be a bold and positive feature in my view.
Overdevelopment of the plot;	See para 8.11
The terrace is identified in the Conservation Area Appraisal as having symmetrical design and original, attractive features which the proposal would change;	The proposed extensions would change part of the terrace. However, the change is considered to be a positive change that would not detrimentally affect the traditional form of the terrace.
If this development is approved to a modest Victorian terrace house is approved it will pave the way for the degradation of	Each application is considered on its own merits.

the rest of the conservation area by setting a precedent;	
The chimney and new windows should be removed to mitigate the overlooking issue and to reduce the size of the extension;	See para 8.13 to 8.17

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The proposal consists of a ground floor extension, first floor side extension and roof extension. All three elements have been carefully assessed during pre-application stage and during the application process. Amendments have been made during both stages to refine the proposed development.
- 9.2 The proposed extensions would introduce a modern intervention into a traditional Edwardian property in a Conservation Area. The composition of extensions and use of alternative materials would contrast well with the traditional form of the brick and slate building. Whilst views of the extension would be visible from the public realm, particularly Grantchester Street, I do not consider this to be a reason to refuse the application. The ground and first floor extensions would be set well back from the road and only partly visible. The roof extension would also not be entirely visible. Whilst this element would introduce a new form at roof level, it is considered to have been sympathetically design and detailed to avoid it appearing as a dominant and intrusive form. The proposed extensions are of high quality design and would not in my view have a significantly detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- 9.3 The Conservation Officer is not supportive of the proposed extensions, particularly the roof extension. However, whilst I acknowledge their concerns, I feel the harm of the proposed extensions is outweighed by the high quality design and visual interest the extensions would introduce to the existing dwelling and character of the terrace. The proposed extensions would in my view represent a successfully contrast with the traditional architecture of the existing without appear as visually intrusive or unduly dominant.
- 9.4 The proposed extension have been carefully designed and detailed to ensure they do not have an adverse impact on the

residential amenity of the neighbouring properties in terms of overlooking, overshadowing and overbearing.

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 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, 3/12 and 3/14)

4. 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)

5. No windows or openings of any kind shall be installed in the north elevation of the approved first floor extension.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 3/12 or 3/14).