

Application Number	17/0898/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	22nd May 2017	Officer	Charlotte Burton
Target Date	17th July 2017		
Ward	Newnham		
Site	111 Grantchester Meadows Cambridge CB3 9JN		
Proposal	Extension of garage roof including installation of solar panels.		
Applicant	Mrs Barbara Tuchel 111 Grantchester Meadows Cambridge CB3 9JN		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>The proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the conservation area;</p> <p>The proposal would not have a significant adverse impact on residential amenity of neighbouring properties.</p>
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The site is within the curtilage of No. 111 Grantchester Meadows which is on the northern side of the road and has an 'L' shaped plot. The existing garage is within the rear garden and fronts onto South Green Road. The garage is located on the north western boundary.
- 1.2 To the north is the property known as 'Innisfree' fronting South Green Road. To the south is the rear garden of No. 113 Grantchester Meadows which has a single storey outbuilding referred to as a 'consulting room' which also fronts onto South Green Road.

- 1.3 The existing garage is single storey with a flat roof. There is a garage opening on the western end. It is constructed of brick.
- 1.4 The site is located within the Newham Croft Conservation Area. The property is not listed and there are no listed buildings within the vicinity. The site is outside the controlled parking zone. There are no other relevant site constraints.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposal is for a roof extension to the existing garage to incorporate the installation of solar panels on the southern roof slope.
- 2.2 During the course of the application, revised plans were submitted which changed the mono-pitched roof to an asymmetric pitched roof and removed the roof overhang onto Innisfree. The height of the building would be increased from a maximum of 2.61m to 4.13m high.
- 2.3 The materials would be timber cladding on the end elevations and slate on the roof, with solar panels on the south-facing roof slope. The garage doors would remain on the western elevation fronting South Green Road. The existing openings on the southern and eastern elevations would remain.
- 2.4 The plans show a roof overhang onto No. 113 Grantchester Meadows. I am expecting an update from the applicant on this issue to report on the amendment sheet.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
05/1100/FUL	Installation of dormer window and terrace.	Approved
05/0088/FUL	Erection of ground floor rear bay window and rear 1st floor extension.	Approved
13/0221/FUL	Study in the garden for personal use.	Approved
13/0614/FUL	Installation of dormer window and terrace.	Approved

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 Plan 2006	Local	3/1 3/4 3/7 3/14
		4/11 4/13

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 (Conditions)
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> Newnham Croft Conservation Area Appraisal (2013)

--	--

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

6.2 No objection. The revised proposals have introduced a dual pitch roof which has reduced the height and the area of roof slope which have mitigated its impact. The application is supported as it will not affect key views in the conservation area.

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 objecting to the proposal:

- ☐ Innisfree, South Green Road

- ☐ 1 South Green Road
- ☐ 2 South Green Road
- ☐ 3 South Green Road
- ☐ 4 South Green Road
- ☐ 5 South Green Road
- ☐ 6 South Green Road
- ☐ 7 South Green Road
- ☐ 8 South Green Road
- ☐ 104 Grantchester Meadows
- ☐ 106 Grantchester Meadows
- ☐ 109 Grantchester Meadows
- ☐ 113 Grantchester Meadows
- ☐ St Catharine's College
- ☐ South Newnham Neighbourhood Forum (16 Grantchester Road)

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Character/context/conservation

- ☐ Out-of-keeping with the character of the area
- ☐ Scale of the structure and excessive height
- ☐ Steeply sloped roof
- ☐ Number of panels
- ☐ Glare from panels
- ☐ Suitability of felt roof
- ☐ Visual impact on South Green Road and harm to its rural character.
- ☐ Negative impact on views across Grantchester Meadows and the playing field to South Green Road
- ☐ Unsightly and obtrusive solar panels would be contrary to the Council's 'Micro Renewable Energy Guidance for Householders' (July 2010).
- ☐ Drawings are partial, lack detail including regarding materials, inaccurate and do not show the impact looking from Grantchester Meadows.
- ☐ Other examples of solar panels within the Conservation Area are on first floors, and are either not visible or unobtrusive from the street.
- ☐ The revised proposal is an improvement, but has not gone far enough.

Residential amenity

- ☐ Overshadowing and enclosure of Innisfree front garden amenity space, and loss of light to sitting room
- ☐ Height of the building prejudices re-development of adjacent derelict consulting room of more than one storey.
- ☐ Use of extended building potentially for residential and access to the building.
- ☐ Overhanging roof onto Innisfree is unacceptable.
- ☐ Overhanging roof onto No. 113 Grantchester Meadows.

Other

- ☐ Support renewable energy technologies
- ☐ Disappointment that the applicant did not consult the South Newnham Neighbourhood Forum nor any neighbours, contrary to paragraph 66 of the NPPF
- ☐ The disbenefits are to the residents of South Green Road and only the applicants will benefit who do not live on the road.

7.3 The application has been called-in to planning committee by Councillor Cantrill on the following grounds:

- ☐ The proposal fails to meet policy 4/11 as the height of the proposed roof and the location of the solar panels would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

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 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 the conservation area
2. Residential amenity
3. Third party representations

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

- 8.2 The site is located to the south of the traditional terrace of properties along South Green Road in a position between the 1960s dwelling known as 'Innisfree' and the outbuilding at the rear of No. 113 which is referred to as a 'consulting room'. The latter is a single storey structure which is currently derelict and identified within the Newnham Croft Conservation Area Appraisal (2013) as detracting from the conservation area. It is the traditional terrace to the north which is identified within the appraisal as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- 8.3 The garage is stepped forward of the front elevation of Innisfree on a building line similar to the boundary of No. 113 on which the consulting room sits. The building is visible in views along South Green Road. Looking north, due to the positioning adjacent to Innisfree, the building is viewed within the context of the two storey side elevation of this property, albeit stepped forward. Looking south, only the part of the building that projects forward of Innisfree is visible. The existing flat-roof building is not considered to make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area, albeit the scale and positioning results in a relatively modest building.
- 8.4 During the course of the application, the proposal was amended to reduce the height of the roof extension from 5.65m high to 4.13m. The steep monopitched roof was changed to an asymmetric pitched roof. As a result, the overall increase in height compared to the existing 2.61m high flat roof building is 1.52m. The highest part of the asymmetric roof would be on the northern side which is adjacent to the two storey side elevation of Innisfree. I accept that the scale and massing of the building would be increased so that it would be more prominent in views along South Green Road, however it would be viewed in the context of the two storey building of Innisfree and the pitched roof breaks up the mass of the building. In my opinion, it would appear as a subservient outbuilding which would be appropriate within the street scene.
- 8.5 The solar panels would cover the extent of the south-facing roof slope and would be black panels. The revised proposal has reduced the area of solar panels and has lowered the slope of

the roof so that the panels would be less prominent. While I accept that the solar panels would be visible, in my opinion they would be similar in colour to traditional slate tiles. The shallower roof pitch is likely to reduce the amount of glare from the panels.

- 8.6 I accept that the building would be more prominent than the existing garage in views along South Green Road, both as a result of the increase in height and the addition of solar panels to the roof. However, I share the view of the Conservation Team that this would not harm the character and appearance of the conservation area. When assessing applications within conservation areas, the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) makes it clear that not all elements necessarily contribute towards its significance (paragraph 138). The Newnham Croft Conservation Area Appraisal assesses the conservation area as a whole and has identified features that are important or make a positive contribution to the character of the conservation area, which is a material consideration.
- 8.7 The existing garage is not identified as making a positive contribution and thus the alteration would not directly affect an important building. The views along South Green Road and from Grantchester Meadows are not identified as important views and are towards a mixture of traditional and late C20 development, which in my opinion is not characteristic of the conservation area. It is the views from South Green Road looking out over the playing fields that are marked as being important and the proposal would not impact on these. The proposal also would not impact on the terrace to the north of the site, which is identified as making a positive contribution. For these reasons, while the building and the solar panels would be visible, in my opinion the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the conservation area when assessed against the conservation area appraisal.
- 8.8 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

- 8.9 The neighbouring properties are Innisfree along South Green Road to the north and No. 113 Grantchester Meadows to the south.

□ *Innisfree*

- 8.10 Third parties have raised concerns about the overshadowing and enclosing impact on the front garden, and loss of light to the ground floor sitting room window on the front elevation. There are no windows on the side elevation of this property. Innisfree is set back from the general building line along South Green Road so that the existing garage is forward of the front elevation. The existing garage has some enclosing impact on the front garden.
- 8.11 The revised proposal would have the same eaves height and northern elevation as the existing garage. The asymmetric pitched roof would be a maximum of 4.61m high. I accept that this would have a greater enclosing impact on the front garden than the existing flat-roof garage, however in my opinion, this would not have a significant adverse impact on residential amenity.
- 8.12 The front garden of Innisfree is laid out as lawn with some planting beds and bench. The occupants have advised that this area is important for their residential amenity. While I accept this, I also note that this property has a rear garden which provides more private amenity space. The side elevation extends only part of the southern side of the amenity space and in my opinion, the additional enclosure as a result of the increase in height would not have a significant adverse impact on residential amenity.
- 8.13 Regarding overshadowing, the garage is to the south of Innisfree. The increase in height would have an additional overshadowing impact on the front garden, however in my opinion, this would not have a significant adverse impact on residential amenity as it would not overshadow the whole of the front garden, and there is alternative amenity space available.
- 8.14 In terms of loss of light to the sitting room, the ground floor window is wide, being almost half the width of the frontage. I have applied the 45 degree tests in accordance with BRE guidance, which are used as a 'rule of thumb'. Due to the width

of this window, the centre point of the window would not be within 45 degrees taken from the north western corner of the building. As a result, I am satisfied that the increase in height would not result in an unacceptable loss of light.

□ *No. 113*

8.15 No. 113 sits on the southern side of a large plot and is currently being extended following the granting of planning permission. The consulting room is on the northern part of the site, however is currently derelict, and is understood not to be used for residential accommodation. I am satisfied that due to the size of this property's plot, the orientation of the proposal to the north, and the scale of the proposed extensions, this would not have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of the occupants of this property.

8.16 In my opinion the revised 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, 3/7 and 3/14.

Third Party Representations

8.17 I have addressed the third party representations as follows:

Representation	Response
Out-of-keeping with the character of the area	See paragraphs 8.2-8.7
Scale of the structure and excessive height	The scale of the roof extension has been reduced during the course of the application, and in my opinion, would be a subservient outbuilding which is appropriate to the street scene. See paragraphs 8.2-8.7
Steeply sloped roof	The roof slope changed from a steep mono-pitch to a shallower asymmetric roof, which in my opinion would be acceptable. See paragraphs 8.2-8.7

Number of panels	The area of solar panels was reduced during the course of the application and in my opinion would be acceptable. See paragraphs 8.2-8.7
Glare from panels	See paragraph 8.5.
Suitability of felt roof	This is not proposed.
Visual impact on South Green Road and harm to its rural character.	I have assessed this in paragraphs 8.2-8.7.
Negative impact on views across Grantchester Meadows and the playing field to South Green Road	I have assessed this in paragraphs 8.2-8.7.
Unsightly and obtrusive solar panels would be contrary to the Council's 'Micro Renewable Energy Guidance for Householders' (July 2010).	This document is guidance and recommends discussing proposals for micro renewable energy projects in conservation areas with the Conservation Team.
Drawings are partial, lack detail including regarding materials, inaccurate and do not show the impact looking from Grantchester Meadows.	I am satisfied that the information submitted meets validation requirements and provides the detail necessary to assess the application. Materials have been annotated on the revised plans. The applicant is not required to provide streetscene views.
Other examples of solar panels within the Conservation Area are on first floors, and are either not visible or unobtrusive from the street.	Each application must be assessed on its own merits.
The revised proposal is an improvement, but has not gone far enough	Noted.
Overshadowing and enclosure of Innisfree front garden amenity space, and loss of light to sitting	See paragraphs 8.10-8.14

room	
Height of the building prejudices re-development of adjacent derelict consulting room.	The application must be assessed on the basis of the situation on the ground today and with regard to other material planning matters. There is currently no planning consent for redevelopment of the consulting room, so this is not a material consideration.
Use of extended building potentially for residential and access to the building.	The applicant could use the garage for accommodation ancillary to the main house without the need for planning permission. The proposed roof extension does not affect this.
Overhanging roof onto Innisfree is unacceptable.	The overhang was removed through the submission of revised drawings.
Overhanging onto No. 113 Grantchester Meadows.	The applicant is aware of this issue and I am expecting an update to report on the amendment sheet.
Support renewable energy technologies	Noted.
Disappointment that the applicant did not consult the South Newnham Neighbourhood Forum nor any neighbours, contrary to paragraph 66 of the NPPF.	There is no requirement for applicants to consult third parties prior to a submitting planning application.
The disbenefits are to the residents of South Green Road and only the applicants will benefit who do not live on the road.	This is not a relevant planning matter.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 I acknowledge the objections from third parties raising concerns primarily on visual impact and amenity terms. In my opinion, the revised proposal would have an acceptable impact in this regard. It must be acknowledged that not all elements of the conservation area contribute towards its significance and, in my opinion, the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area when taken as a whole.

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)