

<b>Application Number</b>	16/1314/FUL	<b>Agenda Item</b>	
<b>Date Received</b>	14th July 2016	<b>Officer</b>	Michael Hammond
<b>Target Date</b>	8th September 2016		
<b>Ward</b>	Romsey		
<b>Site</b>	166 Vinery Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3DT		
<b>Proposal</b>	Rear roof extension incorporating rear dormer and single storey rear extension		
<b>Applicant</b>	Mr And Mrs Miah 166 Vinery Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3DT		

<p><b>SUMMARY</b></p>	<p>The proposed roof extension fails to accord with the Development Plan for the following reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed rear roof extension by virtue of its mass and bulk would fundamentally alter the rear roof shape and would appear as an unduly dominant and incongruous feature within the terrace, which would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation area.</li> </ul> <p>The proposed single-storey rear extension accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed works would respect the amenity of neighbouring properties.</li> <li>- The proposed single-storey extension would not harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.</li> </ul>
<p><b>RECOMMENDATION</b></p>	<p><b>PART-APPROVE, PART-REFUSE</b></p>

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

- 1.1 The application site, no.166 Vinery Road, is comprised of a two-storey terraced property situated on the east side of Vinery Road. The property is designed in brick with a slate pitched roof as is characteristic of this area. The site has a small front garden and a long rear garden. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character and is formed of similar sized terraced properties.
- 1.2 The site falls within the Central Conservation Area.

## **2.0 THE PROPOSAL**

- 2.1 The proposal, as amended, seeks planning permission for a rear roof extension incorporating a rear dormer and a single-storey rear extension.
- 2.2 The proposal originally sought permission for a full-width box type, dormer roof extension. The proposed roof extension has since been amended to alter the form to give the appearance of two-pitched roof dormers with a recessed element in-between. The proposed roof extension would extend out to the north side of the roof and would be set marginally in from the south-side. The proposed dormer would be constructed in hanging slate.
- 2.3 The proposed single-storey extension would project 5m to the rear at part-width. The extension would be designed with a pitched roof measuring 2.5m to the eaves and 3.2m to the ridge and would be constructed in matching materials to the existing dwelling.
- 2.4 The application has been called in for determination by the Planning Committee by Councillor Baigent for the reason that the need for extra accommodation in Romsey overrides the argument that box dormers are out of character with the area.

## **3.0 SITE HISTORY**

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
16/0770/FUL	Rear Dormer and addition of rooflights to the front.	Permitted.

#### 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	3/4 3/7 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> 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 that should be taken into account.

## 6.0 CONSULTATIONS

### **Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)**

6.1 No objection.

#### **Urban Design and Conservation Team**

##### Original Comments (11/08/2016)

6.2 The proposal is not supported. The proposal fails to meet the requirements of Local Plan Policy 4/11 in that the box dormer does not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

##### Comments on Revised Drawings (09/09/2016)

6.3 The roof extension has now been pulled away from the party-walls somewhat and no longer fills the roof side-to-side. However, the revised elevation shows the two projecting bays (which are supposed to resemble dormers and reduce the visual impact) have such shallow-pitched roofs that they fail to fulfil their purpose. In addition the recess between these two

bays is far too shallow to break up the box-like form. The proposal is not supported.

- 6.4 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 No representations have been received.

## **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 (and impact on heritage assets)
2. Residential amenity

### **Context of site, design and external spaces (and impact on heritage assets)**

- 8.2 The application site is visible from Vinery Road which wraps around the terrace and leads up to St Philips Primary School to the east of the site. The terrace, which the application site forms apart of (nos.154 – 172 Vinery Road), has not been the subject of any roof extensions. The only extant permission for a roof extension along this terrace is on the application site itself (16/0770/FUL), the design of which is described in greater detail in paragraph 8.2 of this report. The nearest roof extension along this side of the terrace of Vinery Road to the application site is at no.140, approximately 65m to the south. There is no planning history on this nearby site and it is assumed it was constructed prior to the Conservation Area designation in 2012. This other roof extension forms part of a separate row of terraced properties and is not considered to set a precedent for the application site. There are also other roof extensions on the opposite (west) side of Vinery Road. Again though, as these roof extensions are on the opposite side of the road and not visible from the road leading up to St Philips Primary School, these are not considered to set a precedent.

- 8.3 Planning permission was recently granted (16/0770/FUL) for a roof extension at this site. This approved roof extension is set well in from the eaves and width of the roof and has the appearance of two-pitched roof dormers with a recessed linking element in-between. This previously permitted roof extension was deemed to be acceptable because it read as a subservient and well-proportioned extension to the original dwelling. It allowed for a large portion of the original rear roof plane to remain legible and did not appear overly dominant or bulky when viewed from public viewpoints.
- 8.4 In contrast, the roof extension proposed under this current application seeks permission for a roof extension which is significantly larger in scale and mass than the previously approved application. The proposed roof extension would be virtually full-width and offers little relief in terms of its set back from the eaves of the roof. Only a small portion of the original roof would remain legible and the proposed dormer would appear prominent and alien from views into the Conservation Area from the east and north-east of the site. As described in paragraph 8.1 of this report, there is not considered to be a precedent for this form of development in this area. It is appreciated that there would be some element of a gap between the two dormers, provided by the recessed linked extension, and that the dormers would have a traditional pitched roof form. Nonetheless, by virtue of the size and overall proportions of the structure, I consider that the scheme would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and would be contrary to guidance contained within the Roof Extensions Design Guide (2003).
- 8.5 The proposed single-storey extension is of a relatively modest scale and design. The pitched roof would reflect the context of the site and its surroundings. In my view, the proposed single-storey rear extension would not cause any harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and is acceptable from a design perspective. A matching materials condition is recommended.
- 8.6 In my opinion the proposal fails to comply with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/14 and 4/11.

## **Residential Amenity**

The main consideration is the impact of the proposed single-storey extension on nos.164 and 168 Vinery Road. The proposed roof extension would not adversely impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties. The views from the dormer would be similar to the existing first-floor rear windows and the proposed dormer would not harmfully overshadow or visually enclose neighbouring properties due to its position on the rear roof slope.

### Impact on no.164 Vinery Road

- 8.7 No.164 Vinery Road is comprised of a terraced property which adjoins onto the application site from the south.
- 8.8 There are no windows situated on the side (south) elevation of the proposed extension. There is a door but this would not serve as the primary outlook for this room. The main view out of the proposed kitchen would be on the rear elevation and the oblique views across the garden of this neighbour would be no worse than the existing first-floor windows.
- 8.9 In terms of loss of light, as the proposed extension is positioned to the north of this neighbour, I am content that the levels of light reaching this neighbour would not be significantly affected.
- 8.10 No.164 has a rear living room window and side kitchen windows which face towards the proposed extension. These existing neighbouring windows already look out onto the two-storey mass of the rear projecting wing of no.166. The proposed single-storey extension would not project any closer to this neighbour's boundary than the two-storey rear wing and is considered to be of a minimal scale and mass at 2.5m to the eaves and 3.2m to the ridge of the roof. In my opinion, the nearest windows and garden of this neighbour would not be visually enclosed by the proposed single-storey extension.

### Impact on no.168 Vinery Road

- 8.11 The view from the proposed rear window would be no worse than the existing rear first-floor windows which allow for views across the garden of no.168.

8.12 The proposed extension would not project any further to the rear than this neighbour's single-storey extension and I am therefore of the opinion that this neighbour would not be visually dominated or overshadowed by the proposed development.

8.13 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 3/14.

## **9.0 CONCLUSION**

9.1 In conclusion, the proposed roof extension would unbalance the rear elevation of the property and appear overly prominent and out of context with its surroundings when viewed from public viewpoints. There is a consistent pattern of unaltered roof slopes along this terrace of Vinery Road and the proposed roof extension would harmfully interrupt the consistency of roof forms in the area and consequently fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposed roof extension is considered unacceptable and is recommended to be refused. The proposed single-storey rear extension would not have a harmful impact on the character of the area and would respect the amenity of neighbouring properties. The proposed single-storey extension is deemed to be acceptable and recommended for approval.

## **10.0 RECOMMENDATION**

**REFUSE** the rear roof extension for the following reason:

1. The proposed rear roof extension by virtue of its mass and bulk would fundamentally alter the rear roof shape and would appear as an unduly dominant and incongruous feature within the terrace, which would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation area. As such the proposed rear roof extension is contrary to Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/14, 4/11 and the Cambridge Roof Extensions Design Guide.

**APPROVE** the single-storey rear extension, 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. 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)

3. 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. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, and 3/14)