

Application Number	16/0315/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	19th February 2016	Officer	Rob Brereton
Target Date	15th April 2016		
Ward	Arbury		
Site	55 Roseford Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB4 2HA		
Proposal	Roof extension incorporating rear dormer, first floor extension to the rear and convert the dwelling to form 5 x 2 bed flats.		
Applicant	Mr R Dixon 55 Roseford Road Cambridge CB4 2HA United Kingdom		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The development would not have a significant detrimental visual impact on the street. <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed extensions would not have a significant detrimental impact on neighbouring properties or highway safety
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

1.1 The subject two storey detached property is located on the northern side of Roseford Road. The dwelling is not Listed, A Building of Local Interest or within a Conservation Area.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

2.1 Planning permission is sought for a roof extension incorporating rear dormer, first floor extension to the rear and convert the dwelling to form 5 x 2 bed flats.

Exterior works proposed in this application that were previously permitted in 15/0241/FUL include two hip to gable conversions and a rear facing flat roofed dormer window. Additional exterior works proposed in this application include a first floor rear extension with a dual hipped roof.

The current proposal originally included a pitched roof with a rear dormer over the two storey flat roofed element; this has since been removed from the scheme.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
15/0241/FUL	Roof extension incorporating rear dormer, and conversion of existing house into five 1-bed flats and one 2-bed flat.	Approved

4.0 PUBLICITY

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

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 3/7 3/14 5/1 5/2 8/6 8/10

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) Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)

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, the following policies in the emerging Local Plan are of relevance:

Policy 50: Residential space standards

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

6.1 No objection subject to conditions

The proposal does not include the alteration of the existing access, however one of the parking spaces would be accessed over a full face kerb.

The developer must, by condition of any permission that the Planning Authority may be minded to issue in regard to this proposal, strengthen the footway for vehicular overrun and lower the kerb to create an appropriate vehicular crossing of the footway.

Off street car parking provision is made at a level of less than one space per dwelling unit.

The development may therefore impose additional parking demands upon the on-street parking on the surrounding streets and, whilst this is unlikely to result in any significant adverse impact upon highway safety, there is potentially an impact upon residential amenity which the Planning Authority may wish to consider when assessing this application.

Environmental Health

6.2 No objection subject to condition on construction hours.

Refuse and Recycling

6.3 There would not appear to be sufficient space to put 10 wheelie bins to the front of the dwelling on bin collection day. Communal bins are located too far away to collect by City Council crews.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

6.4 No objection

Clarification is needed of the proposals on the block plan in respect of hard and soft landscape. A 1.5m high hit and miss fence has been proposed to disguise the bin storage area but

the arrows suggest that it also contains an area of grass? Please clarify where the fence actually is. Show 18 bins (to scale with the drawing) along the hardstanding to verify that they fit in the area allotted to them. Again, the drawing is not clear in respect of where arrows and notes are pointing.

- 6.5 Further clarification has been given in amended plans JPT/BD/0715/001 Rev. P4 and JPT/BD/0715/003 Rev. P1. However, a management plan condition will be added for further details of the arrangements of these services.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

- 7.1 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations on the original scheme:

- 9 St Albans Road
- 52 Roseford Road
- 54 Roseford Road
- 57 Roseford Road

- 7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- The additional occupancy of the proposal is out of character with the area.
- The proposal extra roof accommodation will overshadow the patio of No. 57 and give this area a sense of enclosure.
- Design of bicycle store is an eye sore.
- Potential of up to 19 people in one dwelling.
- 10 cars could park outside and drive can only accommodate 4.
- This increase in on street parking will create a traffic hazard.
- The 2014 Local Plan Policy 50 gives minimum space standards for apartments, which the proposed units don't meet.
- Capacity for bin storage, as well as the access to the front of the property through a narrow passageway is inadequate.
- Four off-street car parking space are provided at the front of the property as part of the proposal, less than the maximum parking standard indicated in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Appendix C.
- There will be issues with wheelie bins especially on refuse collection day.

7.3 Two councillors also commented on this application.

Councillor Todd-Jones raised the following concerns in his letter of representation:

- Proposal is out of character with family homes on this street and over development of site.
- Potential for rear dormer and roof extension to overshadow/overlook rear of No. 57.
- The two proposed gable ends give a terrace effect.
- Room sizes are not in line with policy 5/2.
- Bin storage is not sufficient.
- Four off street parking spaces is not sufficient.

Councillor Townsend raised the following issues in his letter of representation:

- The proposal is out of scale with neighbouring properties and would no longer appear a normal residential home.
- Five two bed units is an overdevelopment of this site.

7.4 One letter of representation was received from No. 57 regarding the amended proposal and plans. It reiterates the above issues with bins, parking and the cycle store. This letter also has queries the lack of detail of the boundary treatment between No. 55 and No. 57

7.5 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. Principle of development
2. Context of site, design and external spaces
3. Residential amenity
4. Refuse arrangements
5. Highway safety, car and cycle parking
6. Third party representations

Principle of Development

- 8.2 Policy 5/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) states that proposals for housing development on windfall sites will be permitted subject to the existing land use and compatibility with adjoining uses. The surrounding area is predominantly residential and it is, therefore, my view that the proposal complies with policy 5/1 of the Local Plan.
- 8.3 Policy 5/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) states that the conversion of single residential properties into self-contained dwellings will be permitted except where: a) the property has a floorspace of less than 110 square metres; b) the likely impact on on-street parking would be unacceptable, c) the living accommodation provided would be unsatisfactory; d) the proposal would fail to provide for satisfactory refuse bin storage or cycle parking; and e) the location of the property or the nature of nearby land uses would not offer a satisfactory level of residential amenity. In my opinion the proposal meets the requirements of parts a) and e) of policy 5/2 of the Local Plan. Parts b), c) and d) relate to matters of detail and will be addressed later in this report.
- 8.4 Permission has previously been granted via reference 15/0241/FUL for a roof extension incorporating rear dormer, and conversion of existing house into five 1-bed and one 2-bed flats. The current application seeks permission for a dormer and first floor extension to the rear and to convert the dwelling into 5x 2 bed flats. The roof extension including the hip-gable enlargement and rear dormer has previously been approved and this application differs from the previous scheme in that it proposes to add a first floor extension to the rear, and proposes 5 instead of 6 flats.
- 8.5 In my opinion, the principle of the development is acceptable and in accordance with policy 5/1 and parts a) and e) of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

Context of site, design and external spaces

- 8.6 The proposed roof extension was assessed as part of the previous application and considered acceptable. The additional first floor extension will not be visible from the streetscene. The proposed

design with a dual hipped roof and use of matching materials is considered in keeping with the character of the property.

- 8.7 While the cycle store is not exemplary in design an outbuilding of its size could be built using permitted development rights and it would not be prominent in the streetscene and is therefore acceptable.
- 8.8 It is proposed that the house is converted into independent flats and not into a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) and, therefore, policy 5/7 of the Local Plan does not apply.
- 8.9 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/4.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

Overlooking

- 8.10 Unlike the existing situation where only bedrooms and bathrooms are provided on the first floor, the conversion of the house will result in living rooms and kitchens also being provided on the first floor, and in the extended roof. This would mean that there would be increased activity on the upper floors of the house. On the first floor living rooms and kitchens are proposed at the front of the building with bedrooms and bathrooms at the rear. The front windows would overlook the street and would not have a significant detriment impact on those living opposite in my view and it is my opinion that the impact from the rear windows would be no worse than the existing situation.
- 8.11 A dormer window of a similar scale with window at the rear as proposed could be built without the need for planning permission. For this reason it is my opinion that it would be unreasonable to refuse planning permission due to overlooking from these windows.
- 8.12 The dormer was previously assed as acceptable for the above reasons. None of the three windows proposed in the first floor extension will directly overlook neighbours. It is therefore

considered that this proposal will not detrimentally overlook neighbours.

Dominance, enclosure and overshadowing

- 8.13 The original proposal contained a roof and dormer extension over the current flat roof of the two storey side extension. After some discussion with the applicant this was removed from the application as it had too severe an enclosure impact on the rear patio of No. 57. This element is now unchanged from the previously approved scheme.
- 8.14 The proposed first floor rear extension would not extend beyond the rear two storey extension of No. 53 Roseford Road. Therefore in my opinion the proposed extension will not detrimentally enclose or overshadow this neighbouring property. The other nearest neighbour No. 57 is located approximately 10 metres away from the proposed extension. This is considered a sufficient distance to dispel any potential detrimental visual dominance, enclosure or overshadowing impacts.

Noise and disturbance

- 8.15 The proposal would result in an intensification of use of the site. In my opinion, the impact this would have on neighbours largely depends on how the development is managed, and to ensure that the development is well managed I recommend a condition requiring details of a management plan.

Security

- 8.16 I understand the concern raised that the positioning of the bin and cycle store adjacent to the boundary fence with 57 Roseford Road could enable trespassers to climb the fence more easily. However, as a shed could be erected adjacent to the fence, in the rear garden of the existing dwelling it is my opinion that it would be unreasonable to refuse the application for this reason.
- 8.17 The fence along the common boundary with 9 St Albans Road is not secure. In order to avoid insecurity I recommend a condition requiring details of boundary treatment. This condition of boundary treatment will also give clarity to other neighbours if any changes will take place. Any changes to boundary

treatment will have to be agreed by both involved parties under the Party Wall Act.

8.18 Building works are disruptive and in order to minimise this I recommend that construction hours are restricted by condition, along with the hours of collections and deliveries.

8.19 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.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

8.20 The proposed flats would share a large communal garden, which is considered to be acceptable.

8.21 In my opinion the proposal provides an appropriate standard of residential amenity for future occupiers, and I consider that in this respect it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/7 and part c) of policy 5/2.

Refuse Arrangements

8.22 The refuse arrangements were found acceptable in the previous application. This application is for five units therefore there will be approximately 10 wheelie bins; the approved application had six units and therefore approximately 12 wheelie bins. However, a management condition will be put in place to further assess how bins will be collected on collection day.

8.23 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 5/2.

Highway Safety, Car and Cycle Parking

8.24 The Highway Authority have raised no concerns regarding the impact on highway safety subject to conditions. It is proposed that four off-street car parking spaces are provided at the front of the property. This is less than the maximum parking standards outlined in Appendix C of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006). The City Council promotes lower levels of private car parking particularly where good transport accessibility exists. There are bus stops on Histon Road and the city is within

walking distance or cycling distance of shops on Arbury Court and the City Centre. It is, therefore, my view that it would be unreasonable to refuse the application for this reason. No disabled parking spaces are proposed but due to the layout of the frontage it would be possible for either of the two central spaces to be marked out as disabled spaces if required in the future.

It is also noted that the previous scheme of 6 units had the same amount of parking and this was considered sufficient.

The Highways Authority has recommended a number of conditions. The driveway exists at present and the application would entail the need to lower a section of kerb for accessing one parking space. I have only recommended a condition relating to lowering this kerb. The remaining recommended conditions I do not consider necessary.

8.25 A communal cycle store is proposed in the rear garden. Twelve cycle parking spaces would be provided. This exceeds the requirements of Appendix D of the Cambridge Local Plan and is acceptable.

8.26 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10 and parts b) and d) of policy 5/2.

8.27 Third Party Representations

Summarised issues	Response
Use is out of character	See paragraphs 8.1, 8.2 and 8.3
Overshadowing	See paragraphs 8.13 and 8.14
Cycle store design	See paragraph 8.6
Overdevelopment	See Paragraphs 8.1, 8.2, 8.3 and 8.4
Vehicle parking	See Paragraph 8.24
Local Plan Policy 50 2014	See Paragraph 5.5
Refuse arrangements	See Paragraph 8.22 and condition

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 This application is very similar to that previously approved and the minor extension proposed will not add further units, instead it will decrease the number units and makes them more spacious. I am of the opinion this is beneficial to the scheme as a whole. It is also my opinion that the proposal would not have a significant detrimental impact on neighbouring properties or highway safety. I recommend that the application is approved subject to conditions.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to 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. There should be no collection or deliveries to the site during the demolition and construction stages outside the hours of 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours to 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. Prior to the occupation of the flats hereby approved a Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This Management Plan shall include the maintenance of the garden and a detailed plan of how refuse will be collected. The property shall be managed in accordance with the approved Management Plan unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To minimise the impact on neighbouring properties.
(Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 3/7)

6. No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected. The boundary treatment shall be completed in accordance with a timetable agreed in writing with the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure an appropriate boundary treatment is implemented. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12)

7. Before first occupation of the flats, hereby permitted. the kerb shall be lowered across the full width of the site and the vehicular access where it crosses the highway shall be laid out and constructed to Cambridgeshire County Council specification.

Reason: In the interest of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan, Policy 8/2)