

<b>Application Number</b>	17/1229/FUL	<b>Agenda Item</b>	
<b>Date Received</b>	25th July 2017	<b>Officer</b>	Mairead O'Sullivan
<b>Target Date</b>	19th September 2017		
<b>Ward</b>	Romsey		
<b>Site</b>	2 Madras Road Cambridge CB1 3PX		
<b>Proposal</b>	Demolition of existing rear shed and construction of: bike store, ground floor extension, first floor extension, attic conversion incorporating rear dormers and installation of emergency exit door to side elevation.		
<b>Applicant</b>	Mr Martin 39 Long Horse Croft		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The revised roof extension is considered to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area</li> <li>- The revised ground floor extension would not have an overbearing impact to number 4 Madras Road</li> </ul>
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

**1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT**

1.1 The application site is a two storey detached property on the north western side of Madras Road. Madras Road is predominantly residential in character but the site is also within close proximity to commercial uses in the Mill Road East District Centre. The site falls within the Mill Road area of the Central Conservation Area.

**2.0 THE PROPOSAL**

2.1 The application seeks full planning permission for the erection of a ground floor and first floor rear extension and loft

conversion incorporating rear dormers. The application also seeks to demolish an existing shed and erect a bike store. An additional door to provide emergency exit is proposed to the side elevation.

- 2.2 The application has been amended since submission to reduce the scale of the roof extension and to reduce the height and amend the footprint of the proposed ground floor rear extension adjacent to the boundary with no. 4 Madras Road.
- 2.3 The first floor extension would extend the existing outrigger by 1.1m in length. The pitch of the roof would be altered to facilitate this but the cat slide roof is to be maintained. The courtyard to the ground floor extension has been increased in size. The extension would be partially flat roofed with a lean-to element adjacent to the boundary with number 4. The total roof height would be 2.8m dropping down to 2m close to the boundary with number 4 Madras Road. The rear dormers are two pitched roofed elements with a central flat roofed recessed linking element connecting them.
- 2.4 The application has been called into planning committee by Councillor Baigent. His concerns are summarised in paragraph 7.3.

### **3.0 SITE HISTORY**

- 3.1 The site was accompanied by a similar application with only minor internal and fenestration differences. The applications were more or less duplicates and as a result one application was withdrawn. Details of the withdrawn application are provided in the below table.

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
17/1227/FUL	Demolition of existing rear shed and construction of: bike store, ground floor extension, first floor extension and attic conversion incorporating rear dormers.	Withdrawn

#### 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

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 (Annex A)
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 comments.

### **Environmental Health**

6.2 The proposal is acceptable subject to conditions related to construction hours and piling and the housing standards informative.

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

#### *First comment*

6.3 The scale of the proposed roof extension dominates the rear roof slope of the building and therefore does not comply with policy 4/11 or the Roof Extensions Design Guide.

#### *Second comment*

6.4 The revised roof extension is acceptable. A condition requiring material samples of the dormer and roofing material to be signed off prior to construction is recommended.

6.5 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:

- Camcycle, 140 Cowley Road
- 4 Madras Road

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Object to the height and proximity of the large ground floor extension
- Proposal would be overdevelopment.
- Would result in a loss of light to rear ground floor windows of no.4
- Would greatly enclose no.4
- The roof extension fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area
- The use of the building as a HMO would give rise to an increase in demand for parking
- Suggest that proposal is reduced to 4 bedrooms
- Concerned that first floor extension would enclose and impact on light into kitchen of no.4
- Concerned that cycle parking may not be accessible
- Concerned about width of bin and cycle stores; may be inaccessible
- Development should make provision for larger bikes
- There should be visitor cycle parking

7.3 Councillor Baigent has commented on the application. His comments can be summarised as follows:

- Concerned that moving front door would cause disturbance from comings and goings
- Concerned about loss of light to no.4
- Concerned about increase demand for parking
- Request the application is determined at planning committee if officers are minded to approve.

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 heritage assets
2. Residential amenity
3. Third party representations

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

8.2 The majority of the proposed works are to the rear of the property and would not be visible from the public realm. The proposed ground and first floor extensions are modest in scale and would clearly read as later additions to the property. Both of these elements are considered acceptable in terms of design.

8.3 The proposed bike store replaces a much smaller shed on the site. Whilst the proposed replacement shed is larger, it would still read as subservient to the host dwelling in terms of scale. I am satisfied that this element of the proposal would be acceptable.

8.4 The emergency door is in the side elevation and would not be prominent in the streetscene. The door would be similar to the other doors on the property. This could be constructed under permitted development.

8.5 The original proposed roof extension was considered to be unacceptable as it was bulky and would obliterate the rear roof form. The proposed recess to the linking element was inadequate and the proposal was considered to read as one large mass rather than as two individual dormer windows. This element has been amended. The revised dormer has a much larger recess to the linked element. Both dormers have also been moved in from the sides. The revised scheme allows the original roof form to be read and is considered acceptable. The Conservation Officer is satisfied that the revised roof extension

design would preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area. A condition is recommended requiring material samples of the dormer and roofing material to be approved prior to construction.

- 8.6 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

- 8.7 There were concerns that the original single storey rear extension would have an unacceptable impact on the occupier of 4 Madras Road. The original proposal was to have a flat roof with a height of 2.8m running hard on the boundary with No.4. The proposal has been amended and the extension height has been reduced, the mass has been set off the boundary and the size of the courtyard to bedroom 2 on the extension has been increased. All of these amendments reduce the massing near the single aspect kitchen and living/dining room of number 4. The revised single storey element has been reduced to have an eaves height of 2m and gently sloping roof and has also been pulled away from the boundary. The increase to the size of the courtyard allows more space adjacent to the neighbouring windows and immediate garden area. The revised proposal at ground floor level is acceptable in terms of its impact on number 4.
- 8.8 I note that the neighbour at number 4 has concerns regarding the first floor element of the proposal. The extension is set away from the boundary by 2.3m and would have a cat slide roof which would keep the height low. The first floor extension is of a modest depth and would only add an additional 1.9m to the length of the existing outrigger and the roof of this element slopes down to 4.8m in height. As a result of the low height, modest scale and separation from the boundary, I do not consider this element would result in significant enclosure to the neighbouring property. Number 4 is located to the south of the site and as a result there would be no significant loss of light. Given the tight, enclosed nature of the site, a condition is recommended, in line with the request from the neighbour at number 4, requiring the side wall of the first floor element to be painted white to help reflect light.

- 8.9 A condition is recommended to ensure that the flat roof of the extension is not used as a roof terrace. The neighbour at number 4 has expressed concerns regarding overlooking if this were used for sitting out on. I share his concerns as these gardens are small and the use of the roof as a terrace would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy to the adjoining occupiers.
- 8.10 The gardens of the adjacent properties on Mill Road are relatively long and as a result I am satisfied that the proposed extensions would not have any significant adverse impact on the amenity of these occupiers.
- 8.11 The representation raises concerns regarding the use of the building as a HMO. The concerns mainly relate to the likely increase to on-street parking demand. The application is for a domestic extension and does not include any proposed change of use element. If the building is to be occupied by over 6 people, then a change of use would be required and consideration could be given to the use of the building. However as it stands it is not possible to consider the use of the building as part of this application
- 8.12 Concerns are also raised regarding bike and bin storage provision and access arrangements. As the application is for a domestic extension, then there are no minimum cycle parking standards which need to be addressed. The accessibility of the bikes and bins is an issue for the applicant to resolve. The proposed store in the rear garden is modest in size and is not considered to have any significant harmful impact on adjoining occupiers in terms of enclosure or overshadowing.
- 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.

### **Third Party Representations**

- 8.14 I have addressed the main issues raised by the third party representations within the body of my report. I will address the outstanding issues in the below table:



Representation	Response
Object to the height and proximity of the large ground floor extension	See paragraph 8.7
Proposal would be overdevelopment.	The proposal is considered to be of an appropriate scale and design and the revised scheme would no longer harm the amenity of number 4 Madras Road
Would result in a loss of light to rear ground floor windows of no.4	See paragraphs 8.7 and 8.8
Would greatly enclose no.4	See paragraphs 8.7 and 8.8
The roof extension fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area	See paragraph 8.5
The use of the building as a HMO would give rise to an increase in demand for parking	See paragraph 8.11
Suggest that proposal is reduced to 4 bedrooms	There is no policy justification to seek a reduction in the number of proposed bedrooms.
Concerned that first floor extension would enclose and impact on light into kitchen of no.4	See paragraph 8.8
Concerned that cycle parking may not be accessible	See paragraph 8.12
Concerned about width of bin and cycle stores; may be inaccessible	See paragraph 8.12
Development should make provision for larger bikes	See paragraph 8.12
There should be visitor cycle parking	There is no policy requirement for visitor cycle parking. See paragraph 8.14
Concerned that moving front door would cause disturbance from comings and goings	The movement of the door would constitute permitted development. I am satisfied that the new door location

	would not cause any significant harm, in terms of noise and disturbance, to the neighbouring properties on Mill Road.
Concerned about loss of light to no.4	See paragraphs 8.7 and 8.8
Concerned about increase demand for parking	See paragraph 8.11
Request the application is determined at planning committee if officers are minded to approve.	Noted

## 9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 The revised ground floor extension design is considered to address concerns regarding enclosure and loss of light. The first floor extension is relatively modest, with a low height and would be set off the boundary so is not considered to have any significant impact in terms of enclosure or overshadowing. The revised roof extension no longer dominates the roof and is considered to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

## 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. Prior to the commencement of any work to the roof, samples of the dormer and roofing materials to be used shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/11)

4. 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)

5. In the event of the foundations for the proposed development requiring piling, prior to the development taking place the applicant shall provide the local authority with a report / method statement for approval detailing the type of piling and mitigation measures to be taken to protect local residents from noise and/or vibration. Potential noise and vibration levels at the nearest noise sensitive locations shall be predicted in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228-1&2:2009 Code of Practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Due to the proximity of this site to existing residential premises and other noise sensitive premises, impact pile driving is not recommended.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

6. Access to the flat roof over the ground floor extension hereby approved shall be for maintenance or emergency purposes only and the flat roof shall not be used as a roof garden, terrace, patio or similar amenity area.

Reason: To protect adjoining properties from overlooking and noise disturbance in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan policies 3/4 and 3/14.

7. Prior to the occupation of the extension, the south-western flank wall of the extension, adjacent to number 4 Madras Road, shall be painted white.

Reason: To help reflect light towards the neighbouring property (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/4 and 3/14)

**INFORMATIVE:** The Housing Act 2004 introduced the Housing Health & Safety Rating System as a way to ensure that all residential premises provide a safe and healthy environment to any future occupiers or visitors.

Each of the dwellings must be built to ensure that there are no unacceptable hazards for example ensuring adequate fire precautions are installed; all habitable rooms have adequate lighting and floor area etc.

Further information may be found here:

<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/housing-health-and-safety-rating-system>

**INFORMATIVE:** The Housing Act 2004 introduced Mandatory Licensing for Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) across all of England. This applies to all HMOs of three or more storeys and occupied by five or more persons forming more than one household and a person managing or controlling an HMO that should be licensed commits an offence if, without reasonable excuse, he fails to apply for a licence. It is, therefore, in your interest to apply for a licence promptly if the building requires one. Further information and how to apply for a Licence may be found here:

<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/licensing-of-houses-in-multiple-occupation>.