

<b>Application Number</b>	10/1190/FUL	<b>Agenda Item</b>	
<b>Date Received</b>	23rd November 2010	<b>Officer</b>	Mr Marcus Shingler
<b>Target Date</b>	18th January 2011		
<b>Ward</b>	Petersfield		
<b>Site</b>	17 Ainsworth Street Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 2PF		
<b>Proposal</b>	Loft conversion and rear roof extension including raising of roof ridge height.		
<b>Applicant</b>	Dr Jane Clare Murphy 17 Ainsworth Street Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 2PF		

---

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

- 1.1 17 Ainsworth Street is an end of terrace two-storey dwelling and its garden, situated on the west side of the roadway approximately 50 metres south of the junction with Sleaford Street. The area is predominantly residential in character containing mainly terraced two-storey late Victorian dwellings. The house has a 4m deep, substantial two-storey, flat-roof, rear wing. The subject dwelling is finished in Cambridge Stock brickwork under a slate roof.
- 1.2 At the end of the rear garden is a short cul-de-sac, Rivar Place. The site lies within City of Cambridge Conservation Area No. 1 (Central).

## **2.0 THE PROPOSAL**

- 2.1 The application follows the earlier refusal of planning permission for a loft conversion, a decision made under authority delegated to officers delegated authority powers; the Council reference was 09/1044/FUL. The current application again seeks planning permission for a loft conversion involving the raising of the existing main ridge and the insertion of a rear dormer. The ridgeline is to be raised by about 300mm and a

rear 'box dormer' fills the rear roof slope and also straddles the rear wing of the property giving the dormer an overall depth of 4.7m. It is proposed to insert 2 rooflights window to the front roof slope. The only difference between this application and the earlier refused development is that the western face of the box dormer (which looks towards Rivar Place), instead of having a flat vertical face (as in the refused application), slopes back at either end of the roof with a central protruding box window.

2.2 The application is reported to Committee for decision at the request of Councillor Walker.

### 3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
09/1044/FUL	Loft conversion with raised ridge and rear box dormer.	REF

### 4.0 PUBLICITY

4.1 Advertisement:	Yes
Adjoining Owners:	Yes
Site Notice Displayed:	Yes

### 5.0 POLICY

#### 5.1 Central Government Advice

5.2 **Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development (2005):** Paragraphs 7 and 8 state that national policies and regional and local development plans (regional spatial strategies and local development frameworks) provide the framework for planning for sustainable development and for development to be managed effectively. This plan-led system, and the certainty and predictability it aims to provide, is central to planning and plays the key role in integrating sustainable development objectives. Where the development plan contains relevant policies, applications for planning permission should be determined in line with the plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

5.3 **Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment (2010):** sets out the government's planning policies on the conservation of the historic environment. Those

parts of the historic environment that have significance because of their historic, archaeological, architectural or artistic interest are called heritage assets. The statement covers heritage assets that are designated including Site, Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Registered Parks and Gardens and Conservation Areas and those that are not designated but which are of heritage interest and are thus a material planning consideration. The policy guidance includes an overarching policy relating to heritage assets and climate change and also sets out plan-making policies and development management policies. The plan-making policies relate to maintaining an evidence base for plan making, setting out a positive, proactive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, Article 4 directions to restrict permitted development and monitoring. The development management policies address information requirements for applications for consent affecting heritage assets, policy principles guiding determination of applications, including that previously unidentified heritage assets should be identified at the pre-application stage, the presumption in favour of the conservation of designated heritage assets, affect on the setting of a heritage asset, enabling development and recording of information.

**5.4 Circular 11/95 – The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions:** Advises that conditions should be necessary, relevant to planning, relevant to the development permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects.

**5.5 East of England Plan 2008**

SS1: Achieving Sustainable Development  
ENV6: The Historic Environment  
ENV7: Quality in the Built Environment

**5.6 Cambridge Local Plan 2006**

3/1 Sustainable development  
3/4 Responding to context  
3/14 Extending buildings

**5.7 Material Considerations**

**Central Government Guidance**

Letter from Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government dated 27 May 2010 that states that the coalition is committed to rapidly abolish Regional Strategies and return decision making powers on housing and planning to local councils. Decisions on housing supply (including the provision of travellers sites) will rest with Local Planning Authorities without the framework of regional numbers and plans.

## **City Wide Guidance**

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

Guidance relating to development and the Conservation Area.

Roof Extensions Design Guide (2003)

## **6.0 CONSULTATIONS**

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

6.1 No objections.

#### **Conservation Officer**

6.2 Objects to the application on the grounds that the rear box dormer is overly large and does not relate well to the existing roof slope and dwelling. No objection is raised to the ridge height being increased

6.3 The above responses are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the consultation responses can be inspected on the application file.

## **7.0 REPRESENTATIONS**

7.1 In total 2no. objections have been received. The issues raised relate to the following: -

*Possible asbestos issues during development;*

*Noise and dust during development;*

*The extension will effectively create a three-storey dwelling that will be out of keeping with the area;*

*Loss of light and a dominating and overbearing impact on No's 17, 19, 21 and 23 Ainsworth Street.*

*There are anomalies and errors and misrepresentations in the submitted details.*

7.2 These issues, where relevant to planning, are considered below. Asbestos issues and noise and dust during development are not planning matters and are covered by other legislation. I am satisfied that the submitted plans accurately reflect what it is intended to construct and consider that a conclusion can be reached on the basis of these.

## **8.0 ASSESSMENT**

8.1 From the consultation responses and representations received and from my inspection of the site and the surroundings, I consider that the main issues are:

1. Context of site, design and external spaces
2. Residential amenity

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

8.2 The proposed front rooflights are minor in nature and do not require permission; there are other such roof lights nearby in the street scene and in these circumstances, I do not consider that the character and appearance of the conservation area would be harmed. It is proposed to raise the main ridgeline of the dwelling by 300mm. This will obviously be visible in the street and in most instances, certainly in areas of terraced dwellings, would be considered to be unacceptable, as it usually results in the uniform ridgeline of the locality being disrupted. In this instance however, the subject dwelling is already higher than the attached dwelling and the ridgeline is mixed in height in the locality and given those circumstances, I do not consider that objection can reasonably be raised to this element of the proposals. The Conservation Officer has raised no objections to the raising of the ridgeline.

8.3 It is the proposed rear dormer that is of greater concern. The dormer will not be visible in Ainsworth Street but will be visible from Rivar Place to the rear. The site lies within a conservation area and care should be taken to ensure that such extensions relate well to the existing dwelling and do not harm the conservation area. In this respect, I consider the rear dormer to remain fundamentally flawed. Although reduced in size, slightly,

from that previously refused (by the setting back of side of the face of the dormer), it remains substantial in nature and still projects out a significant distance over the flat roof two storey rear wing. The dormer effectively creates a three-storey property at the rear and will in my view, have an extremely large and box like appearance that will appear completely alien in the rear garden environment; it will be both visually intrusive and incongruous in the locality. While I accept that the same could be said of the existing extension, that is two-storey height only and cannot constitute a justification for a much taller and more intrusive form. I consider that the dormer will fail to integrate well with either the existing property or its surroundings and would cause demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area. The proposal is therefore considered to be in conflict with East of England Plan 2008 policies ENV6 and ENV7 and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/14 and 4/11.

### **Residential Amenity**

- 8.4 The proposed front velux windows are minor in scale and will have no impact on light, outlook or privacy to neighbouring properties. The raising of the ridge and insertion of a large dormer at the rear will inevitably impact on light and outlook to some degree. The dormer will sit south of the neighbouring property, 15 Ainsworth Street, but as that is a property with a part single and part two-storey rear wing abutting the common boundary with 17, I do not consider that the impact on light and outlook would be so harmful as to merit refusal. The dormer will sit north of the unattached neighbouring dwellings at No's 19, 21 and 23 and any impact on light or outlook to these dwellings would not be of a degree to merit refusal.
- 8.5 The rear dormer will afford views over the rear garden of both the subject dwelling and the neighbouring gardens either side, but given the presence of existing first floor rear facing windows, I do not consider that privacy would be made significantly worse by the proposals. Given the separation distance between the application site and the houses in Rivar Place (about 28 metres) I do not consider that there will be any significant effect on the amenities of the occupants of those dwellings.

8.6 The development is considered to be acceptable from the neighbourliness perspective and adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours.

## **9.0 CONCLUSION**

9.1 The proposals are considered to be unacceptable and refusal is thus recommended.

## **10.0 RECOMMENDATION**

### **REFUSE for the following reason:**

1. The proposed rear box dormer would, by reason of its excessive scale, bulk, height and poor design, represent an overly dominant and visually intrusive and incongruous feature that would fail to integrate satisfactorily with the existing dwelling or relate satisfactorily with its surroundings. The development would therefore cause demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, of which this dwelling forms a part. For these reasons the proposals are contrary to policies ENV6 and ENV7 of the East of England Plan (2008), to policies 3/4, 3/14 and 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and to advice provided by PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development and PPS5 Planning for the Historic Environment.

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

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

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

5. Any Structure Plan, Local Plan or Council Policy Document referred to in individual reports.

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