

Application Number	17/0757/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	27th April 2017	Officer	Mairead O'Sullivan
Target Date	22nd June 2017		
Ward	Romsey		
Site	24 St Philips Road Cambridge CB1 3AQ		
Proposal	Single storey rear extension		
Applicant	Mr S Miah		
	11 Hayster Drive Cambridge CB1 9PB		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The design of the proposed extension is considered acceptable and would not have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.- The proposed extension would not have a significant adverse impact on the residential amenity of either of the adjoining occupiers.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The site is a two storey terrace dwelling on the south eastern side of St Philips Road between the junction with Cavendish Road and Sedgwick Street. This is a predominately residential area within the Mill Road Area of the Central Conservation Area. The area is characterised by terraced houses which are mainly finished in brick occasionally with accents of render.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The application seeks full planning permission for a single storey rear extension. The extension is proposed to protrude 6m from the rear wall. It is to have a pitched roof with a total height of 3.5m dropping to 2.5m at the eaves. The extension is

to provide a larger kitchen/dining room to the property. The extension is to be finished in materials to match the host dwelling.

- 2.2 The application has been called into planning committee by Councillor Anna Smith. She has called the application in on the grounds that she considers the proposal to be overdevelopment of the site, that it would result in a loss of light to the neighbours and that it would be an incongruous form of development.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

- 3.1 No site history.

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
		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>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 The Highway Authority does not consider that this application has any implications that merit comment by the Highway Authority.

Urban Design and Conservation Team

- 6.2 It is considered that there are no material Conservation issues with this proposal.
- 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:

- 156 Tenison Road
- 22 St Philips Road
- 33 St Philips Road

- 7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- The proposed mass and scale of the extension is out of character
- Would dominate, overshadow and enclose the garden of no. 26 which is much smaller than No.24's garden
- Intensified use would cause increased pressure on on-street car parking
- Would be overbearing, cause overshadowing and loss of light to kitchen of 22.
- Intensification of use would cause added noise and disturbance to surrounding residents
- Potential to increase the amount of renters in the HMO.

- 7.3 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 and impact on heritage assets
2. Residential amenity
3. Third party representations

Context of site, design and external spaces and impact on heritage assets

- 8.2 The proposed extension would not be visible from public viewpoints as it is to the rear of the property. The extension is single storey with a relatively low eaves height. Given its scale, it would clearly read as a subservient later addition to the property. A number of properties on St Philips Road have similar style single storey rear extensions; including the adjoining neighbour at no. 22. I note that the extension at no.22 is not as large as what is proposed, this was constructed under permitted development and is approx. 3m in length, however there are many larger single storey extensions in the area that are similar to that which is proposed.
- 8.3 The extension is to be finished in materials to match and I have recommended a condition to ensure that this is the case.
- 8.4 The Conservation Officer considers there to be no material conservation issues with the proposal. I share this view.
- 8.5 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/14 and 4/11.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.6 The neighbour at no. 22 has an existing extension to the rear of the property which has recently been constructed under permitted development. This is approx. 3m in length. The proposal at no.24 would extend beyond this extension by approx. 3m. I am satisfied that the proposed extension, given its relatively low height and its siting adjacent to the existing extension, would not have a significant adverse impact on the amenity of no. 22 in terms of enclosure or visual dominance. Given the relatively modest scale of the proposal, with low eaves height and a roof which is to slope away from the

boundary, I am satisfied that there would be no significant impact in terms of overshadowing of this neighbouring garden.

- 8.7 The proposed extension would be set off the boundary with no.26, by approx. 2.5m, with a passage providing additional separation between the extension and this neighbouring garden. I note that the garden of no.26 is shorter than the application site and that No.24s garden narrows further south. However, given the relatively low height of the extension and the significant set away from the boundary, I am satisfied that the extension would not result in any significant overshadowing of the garden or rear windows nor would it appear unduly dominant when viewed from this garden.
- 8.8 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, 3/14 and 4/13.

Third Party Representations

- 8.9 The representations express concerns about an increase in noise and disturbance and issues with car parking associated with the use of the building as an HMO. The application seeks full planning permission for an extension and does not seek a change of use. I can only assess the application on the basis of what has been applied for and as noted above the extension is considered to be acceptable.
- 8.10 A C3 dwelling house can change to a small HMO without the need for a change of use as this is permitted development. However, if the building were to be occupied by more than 6 people it would be classed as a large HMO (sui Generis) and a planning application would be required for change of use. This does not form part of the current application and the impact of this use cannot therefore be assessed.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The proposed extension would not be visible from the public realm. It is of a modest scale and considered in keeping with the prevailing form of development. The extension is not considered to have any significant adverse impact on the amenity of the surrounding occupiers in terms of overshadowing

or enclosure. The use of the property as a HMO cannot be assessed as part of this application.

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)