

Application Number	16/1206/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	30th June 2016	Officer	Charlotte Burton
Target Date	25th August 2016		
Ward	Petersfield		
Site	2 Mill Street Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 2HP		
Proposal	Rear two storey extension and rear garden studio.		
Applicant	Mr & Mrs Steven & Nieves Childerley 2 Mill Street Cambridge CB1 2HP		

<p>SUMMARY</p>	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>The scale, massing, form and materials would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area.</p> <p>The scale and orientation would not have an unacceptable overbearing, overshadowing or overlooking impact on neighbouring properties.</p> <p>The property would retain adequate private amenity space and bin/bike storage for future occupants.</p> <p>The proposed use of the outbuilding would be ancillary to the property and could not be used as a separate unit without planning permission.</p>
<p>RECOMMENDATION</p>	<p>APPROVAL</p>

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

1.1 No. 2 is an end-of-terrace property on the southern side of Mill Street. The property has a two-storey outrigger and has been

extended on the ground-floor. There is an existing brick-built shed on the southern and western boundaries.

- 1.2 Along the western boundary of the garden is a brick elevation over two storeys high. This wall is blank and the building is occupied as offices. To the east the property adjoins No. 4 Mill Street which has been extended at ground and first floor level.
- 1.3 At the rear the property adjoins the garden of No. 105 Glisson Road which is perpendicular to Mill Street. No. 105 has a courtyard garden which has a ground level approximately 20cm lower than the application site.
- 1.4 The surrounding area is predominantly residential with the exception of the public house and offices to the west. The site is within the Mill Road area of the Central Conservation Area. The property is not listed and is not a Building of Local Interest. There are not tree preservation orders affected by the proposal.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposal is for a two storey rear extension and a garden studio following demolition of the existing shed.
- 2.2 The rear extension would be full width with a gable end. The first floor element would extend approximately 1m past the rear of No. 4. The single storey element would project to just inside the line of No. 4's single storey extension and would have a glazed cat-slide roof. The extension would be in brick and slate to match the existing, with a timber panel on the first floor rear elevation.
- 2.3 The studio would adjoin the southern and western boundaries. It would be approximately 2.9m wide and 4.2m long, with a sloped roof varying from 2.3m to 4m in height against the western boundary. It would be in brick and slate with a door, high level windows and roof lights. There would be a study and toilet internally.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

- 3.1 No recent site 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 Local Plan 2006	3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12, 3/14 4/11, 4/13 8/6

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 Planning Policy Statement – Green Belt protection and intentional unauthorised development August 2015
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> Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)
	<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

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

No objection.

6.2 **Urban Design and Conservation Team**

Acceptable subject to a condition to control materials.

The proposed two storey extension and the new studio are acceptable in terms of design. However the need for weatherboard infill on the first floor rear extension between the two windows is questioned. In this conservation area, the

character is one of brick built properties. The use of timber in this location would not fit with that character. This section should be brick to match the rest of the extension.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

7.1 The owner/occupier of the following address has made a representation:

- 4 Mill Street

7.2 The representation can be summarised as follows:

- Noise and disturbance resulting from the relocated bathroom.
- Lack of access to the gutter on the north-west side of No. 4. Rain falling between the gutters would lead to damp on the exposed walls.
- No plans or elevations of existing brick shed.
- Over-development of the property. Could simply rework the layout of the kitchen.
- Studio would be too close to the boundary and the existing ground floor extension of No. 4, which would unreasonably overshadow and visually dominate the neighbouring property.
- Reduced size of garden of No. 2 would mean no space in the garden to store bins and bikes.
- Studio can be accessed independently from the house and has the potential to be rented out or sold as separate office space or dwelling. Would lead to increased use of the passageway beneath and between Nos. 4 and 6 and result in noise and disturbance.
- The owners of No. 6 Mill Street should have been consulted.
- The first floor plan is inaccurate.
- Proposed gable will be higher than the gable of the roof of No. 4.

7.3 Councillor Robertson has called in the application on the following grounds:

- Overdevelopment on the site
- Adverse impact on neighbours by taking light, overlooking and transmitting noise from the bathroom through the party wall
- Studio could be used as a separate dwelling which would overburden the site and shared passageway

- No space allowed on the site for bins and bikes.

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 representation 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
3. Refuse arrangements
4. Car and cycle parking
5. Third party representations

Context of site, design and external spaces / Impact on the conservation area

8.2 The property occupies a relatively 'hemmed in' location being enclosed on the western side by the two-storey office building and backing onto the gardens of the Glisson Road properties that run perpendicular to Mill Street. While the rear of the property is visible from the gardens within the quadrant, in my opinion, it is not prominent within the conservation area.

8.3 The rear elevation has already been altered by the two storey outrigger and ground floor extension. The neighbouring properties along this part of the southern side of Mill Street have also been extended two storeys at the rear. In my opinion, the existing rear elevation is poor quality and the proposal would enhance the appearance of the property.

8.4 The two storey element would have a pitched roof which is similar to the neighbouring property albeit slightly higher. The single storey element would have a glazed cat-slide roof. In my opinion, the scale, massing and form of the proposed extension would be appropriate to the existing property and would not be out-of-keeping with the existing extensions to the neighbouring properties.

- 8.5 The Urban Design and Conservation Team have commented that the use of weatherboarding on the rear elevation would be out-of-keeping with the character of the conservation area. I agree that this is not a traditional material, however it would only be a small panel between the windows and would not be prominent within the conservation area. In my opinion it would not be reasonable to require this to be omitted and replaced with brickwork.
- 8.6 I have recommended a condition for the brickwork to be in matching materials, which is sufficient to ensure the extension does not harm the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- 8.7 Subject to the recommended condition, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/12, 3/14 and 4/11.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.8 The immediate neighbours are No. 4 Mill Street which adjoins the property to the east, and No. 105 Glisson Road which has a rear garden adjoining the rear boundary wall.
- 8.9 The two storey rear extension would project approximately 1m further past the existing two storey extension of No. 4. The drawings show that this would not cut the 45 degree line taken from the centre of the first floor window nearest to the boundary, which is used as a guideline to assess overbearing impact. As a result of this and due to the orientation of the extension to the south west, in my opinion, the proposal would not have an unacceptable overbearing or overshadowing impact on this window. Two bedroom windows would be inserted into the first floor rear elevation and views towards No. 4 would be possible, however this is not untypical of terraced living arrangements.
- 8.10 The single storey rear extension would not project beyond the line of the existing single storey element of No. 4. The side elevation would be between 2.6 – 3.5m high. As a result, in my opinion, the proposal would not have an unacceptable overbearing or overshadowing impact on ground floor windows of No. 4.

- 8.11 The studio would be 0.7 - 0.8m from the boundary with No. 4. The side elevation would be approximately 2.3m high closest to No. 4 on its east side and 4.2m long. In my opinion, the scale of the proposed studio and the set back from the boundary means it would not have an unacceptable overbearing or overshadowing impact on the neighbouring garden compared to the existing vegetated boundary planting. The windows on the side elevation would be 1.5m from ground level and, in my opinion, there would not be an unacceptable overlooking impact towards No. 4.
- 8.12 The studio would be on the southern boundary of the site adjoining the rear garden of No. 105 Glisson Road. This elevation would be approximately 2.9m long and varying in height from 2.3 - 4m where it adjoins the office building. While this would have some enclosing impact on this garden, in my opinion, it would not have an unacceptable overbearing impact compared to the existing situation. The neighbouring garden already has a high degree of enclosure from the existing shed and the corner of the office building. The orientation of the studio to the north means it would not have an unacceptable overshadowing impact on the garden.
- 8.13 Third parties have raised concern about the impact of noise from the bathroom adjoining the bedroom of No. 4. The bathroom would be in an original part of the house and the applicants could rearrange the internal uses without the need for planning permission.
- 8.14 Third parties have also raised concern about the use of the studio as a separate office or dwelling and the impact of noise and disturbance this would have from additional comings and goings along the shared passageway. The current proposal is for an outbuilding which could not be occupied as a separate unit without planning permission. Nonetheless, I have recommended a condition restricting the use of the studio as ancillary to the main house. Should the applicants or future occupiers intend to use the studio as a separate unit, the impact of noise and disturbance would be considered as part of a future planning application.
- 8.15 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, 3/12 and 3/14.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

- 8.16 Third parties have raised concern about the loss of garden space affecting the residential amenity of future occupiers. In my opinion, the property would retain some garden space which would provide an acceptable level of amenity. In my opinion, the occupants should be able to choose how they use their amenity space, and a studio would provide some level of amenity to offset the loss of the garden.
- 8.17 The proposal provides a high-quality living environment and an appropriate standard of residential amenity for future occupiers, and I consider that in this respect it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7, 3/12 and 3/14.

Bin and Bike Storage

- 8.18 The property would retain space for storing bikes and bins in the rear garden and access to the shared passageway would remain as existing. The proposal would not generate an additional demand for bike or bin storage. In my opinion, the proposed arrangements for bikes and bins are compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/12 and 8/6.

Third Party Representations

- 8.19 These are addressed in the text above or as below:

Comment	Response
Noise and disturbance resulting from the relocated bathroom.	Not a planning matter.
Lack of access to the gutter on the north-west side of No. 4. Rain falling between the gutters would lead to damp on the exposed walls.	Not a planning matter.
No plans or elevations of existing brick shed.	These were provided during the course of the application and are available to the public.
Over-development of the	The proposal would retain

property. Could simply rework the layout of the kitchen.	adequate amenity space.
Studio would be too close to the boundary and the existing ground floor extension of No. 4, which would unreasonably overshadow and visually dominate the neighbouring property.	See 'Residential Amenity' section.
Reduced size of garden of No. 2 would mean no space in the garden store bins and bikes.	Paragraph 8.18.
Studio can be accessed independently from the house and has the potential to be rented out or sold as separate office space or dwelling. Would lead to increased use of the passageway beneath and between Nos. 4 and 6 and resulting noise and disturbance.	Paragraph 8.14.
The owners of No. 6 Mill Street should have been consulted.	The proposal would not include a separate unit and therefore there is no requirement to include access via the shared passageway within the red line. No. 6 does not share a boundary with the application site and therefore there is no legal requirement for them to be consulted. Nonetheless, a site notice was posted on the public highway.
The first floor plan as existing is inaccurate.	The use of the existing first floor as a timber deck is not relevant to the current proposal.
Proposed gable will be higher than the gable of the roof of No. 4.	The two storey extension would be a similar height to No. 4 and would not be out-of-character.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The rear elevation of the property is not prominent within the conservation area. The existing property and its neighbours have already been altered. The proposal would replace existing poor quality additions with a high quality extension. The scale, massing, form and materials would not be out-of-keeping with the character of the conservation area.
- 9.2 I have assessed the impact on neighbouring properties, and in my opinion, the scale and orientation of the extension and outbuilding means it would not have an unacceptable overbearing, overshadowing or overlooking impact. The proposal would retain adequate amenity space and bin/bike storage and there is no conflict with adopted policies in this regard. I have recommended conditions to control the use of the outbuilding to protect against any unacceptable noise or disturbance impact from its separate use.

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. 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)

5. The development hereby permitted shall be used solely in conjunction with and ancillary to No. 2 Mill Street and shall not be separately used, occupied or let.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining residential properties and to avoid the creation of a separate planning unit (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 4/13).