

Application Number	17/1164/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	13th July 2017	Officer	Charlotte Burton
Target Date	7th September 2017		
Ward	Newnham		
Site	11 Chedworth Street Cambridge CB3 9JF		
Proposal	Ground floor extension to side and rear.		
Applicant	Mr & Mrs Katznelson 11, Chedworth Street Cambridge CB3 9JF		

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 the amenity of neighbouring properties.</p>
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 No. 11 is a two-storey mid-terrace property on the northern side of Chedworth Street. The property has a two storey outrigger including a single storey lean-to element. The property is constructed in gault bricks. The surrounding area is predominantly residential. The property has a small rear garden.
- 1.2 The site is within the Newnham Croft Conservation Area. Trees are protected by virtue of their location within the conservation area and there are no tree preservation orders on the site. There are no other relevant site constraints.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposal is for a single storey side and rear extension. The side extension would infill between the existing outrigger and the boundary with No. 9. The rear extension would project

approximately 4.2m from the existing two storey rear elevation and would be full width. The extension would have a flat roof at the rear and a sloped roof on the side extension.

2.2 During the course of the application, the proposal was amended as follows:

- ☐ The length of the rear extension was reduced by approximately 0.8m.
- ☐ The roof along the side extension was changed from a flat roof to a sloped roof.
- ☐ The height of the side elevation on the boundary with No. 9 was reduced from varying between 2.5 – 3.15 m to 2.3 - 2.5m.
- ☐ The height of the side elevation on the boundary with No. 13 was reduced from approximately 3.15m to 3.05m.

2.3 The plans were also amended to show the location of some trees and shrubs within the rear garden and the neighbouring garden of No. 13.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

3.1 There is no planning 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 Plan 2006	Local	3/1 3/4 3/7 3/11 3/14
		4/4 4/11 4/13

5.3 Relevant Central Government Guidance, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations

Central Government Guidance	<p>National Planning Policy Framework March 2012</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014</p> <p>Circular 11/95 (Annex A)</p> <p>Planning Policy Statement – Green Belt protection and intentional unauthorised development August 2015</p>
Supplementary Planning Guidance	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007)
Material Considerations	<p><u>City Wide Guidance</u></p> <p>Arboricultural Strategy (2004)</p>
	<p><u>Area Guidelines</u></p> <p>Newnham Croft Conservation Area Appraisal (2013)</p>

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.

South Newnham Neighbourhood Forum

6.3 The importance of using the same style/colour brick on the new extension as on the main house. The referral to the planning committee will be an opportunity to discuss the matters raised by neighbours.

6.4 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 application has been called-in by Councillor Cantrill on the grounds that the proposals would be overbearing on the neighbouring property and the impact on the amenity value of neighbours. The amendments to the plans have not overcome the Councillor's concerns and the call-in request remains.

7.2 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations:

Objections

- ☐ 7 Chedworth Street
- ☐ 13 Chedworth Street x 2

Support

- ☐ 9 Chedworth Street

7.3 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- ☐ Extension is excessively large and 'ugly'. Inappropriate and does not respect the character of the area.
- ☐ Loss of light to north-facing kitchen window of No. 13 and outlook.
- ☐ Impact of noise from dining room and the extension would facilitate 'big parties'
- ☐ Impact on drainage system
- ☐ Unclear rainwater arrangements
- ☐ Unclear the ventilation for the kitchen and toilet.
- ☐ Unclear bin storage arrangements
- ☐ Reduced area of garden will increase noise from children playing in the street.
- ☐ Japanese Quince and Holly trees within the rear garden of No. 13 not accurately shown on plan. Another Holly tree and horse chestnut in rear part of garden unmarked on plans. Apple tree within garden of No. 11 not marked on plans. Request a root survey to be undertaken.
- ☐ Impact of foundations and overshadowing on Japanese Quince tree in the rear garden of No. 13 including resulting impact on ability to screen lower part of extension.
- ☐ Impact of additional weight loading on structural soundness of party wall.
- ☐ Impact of additional roof scape on reduced ground area on surface water drainage.
- ☐ The owners of No. 9 intend to submit an application for a similar proposal and have discussed the plans with the applicant.
- ☐ The owners of No. 9 are likely to consent to the proposed development of a party wall.
- ☐ Likely to set a precedent for similar development at No. 9 which would harm the amenity of No. 7.

Specific comments on first set of revised proposals

- ☐ Welcome that the amended plan extends less into the garden, however the reduced length would still remain a massively large extension and the length and height could be reduced further.

- 7.4 Consultation with third parties is ongoing on the latest set of revised plans showing the location of trees and shrubs and a reduction in the height of the upstand on the eastern elevation. Any third party comments received prior to committee will be reported on the amendment sheet or as a verbal update.
- 7.5 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. Impact on trees
 4. Refuse arrangements
 5. Highway safety
 6. Car and cycle parking
 7. Third party representations

Context of site, design and external spaces / Impact on heritage assets

- 8.2 The Conservation Team supports the proposal on the basis that the extension would not harm the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, and I share this view. Third parties have raised concerns about the scale and form being inappropriate for the terrace, which is identified within the Newnham Croft Conservation Area Appraisal as being 'buildings important to the character'. The appraisal notes this is a 'well-designed early 20th century terrace with some remaining historic details' however acknowledges that 'little of the rear aspect can be seen from the Lammas Field car park'.
- 8.3 The extension is single storey so the form of the traditional two storey outrigger would remain visible. This would retain the overall character of the property as a typical mid-terrace Victorian property. The extension would be full width and would

have a flat roof element at the rear. The change to include a sloped roof on the side element of the extension would break up the mass of the proposal, so that in my opinion it would read as a flat roof rear extension and a subservient side extension. This would be appropriate to the existing dwelling and would not overwhelm or dominate the traditional proportions.

- 8.4 I acknowledge that the extension would be contemporary in form and design, however in my opinion it would be a high quality addition. The materials on the side elevation would be brick to match the existing and I have recommended a condition to secure this. The rear elevation would be glazed, which would be contemporary and visually light-weight. The extension would not be visible from the public realm and therefore not prominent within the Conservation Area. For these reasons, it would not harm the character or appearance of the Conservation Area in my opinion.
- 8.5 In my view, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/14 and 4/11.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.6 The neighbouring properties are No. 9 to the west and No. 13 to the east. I have also assessed the impact on the wider residential area.

No. 9

- 8.7 The property has a two storey outrigger which faces towards the proposed extension. On the ground floor side elevation of the outrigger is a door and a small window which serve the kitchen, however there is also a larger window on the north elevation which provides light and the primary outlook. There is also a ground floor window on the rear elevation of the main house which serves the main living area, however there is a south-facing window on the front elevation which is the primary window serving this living space.
- 8.8 No. 9 has an unusually narrow gap between the outrigger and the boundary approximately 1.35m wide. I am satisfied that the amendments that have been submitted to reduce the length of

the side extension and the height of the side elevation from 3.15m to a maximum of 2.5m have overcome my initial concerns about enclosure and loss of light impacting on the small window on the side elevation. The side extension would not cut the 25 degree line from this window taken from a point approximately 1.7m above the internal floor level, so I am not concerned about any significant loss of light. Moreover, this is a secondary window and the proposal would not have a significant impact on the primary window on the north elevation. I am not concerned about the impact on the living space served by the window on the rear elevation.

- 8.9 The extension includes roof lights above the side and rear extension. There would be some light emission from these windows which could be visible from upper floor windows on the rear elevations of No. 9. However, as this is a residential property the pattern of use would be similar to the neighbouring property, so would be unlikely to emit direct light into neighbouring windows at unreasonable hours. The roof lights are acceptable in my opinion.

No. 13

- 8.10 This property has a two storey outrigger adjoining the application site. There is a single storey element with French doors on the northern end of the outrigger.
- 8.11 The proposed extension would project approximately 1.1m beyond the rear elevation and would be approximately 3.05m high to the upstand. The occupier has objected to the proposal partly on the grounds of enclosure and loss of light. I acknowledge that the ground level lowers towards the rear of the site. I appreciate that the extension would be higher than the existing boundary, however the extension would only be glimpsed from the French windows at an oblique angle, so would not have a significant enclosing impact. In my opinion it would not have a significant overbearing impact on the rear garden as it would not project far along the boundary. Due to the orientation of the extension to the west of the garden, the extension would not have a significant overshadowing impact. For these reasons, in my opinion, it would not cause significant harm to the residential amenity of the occupants of No. 13.

- 8.12 The occupants of No. 13 have raised concerns about the impact of noise from dinner parties being held within the extension. While the extension does increase the size of the dining area, the use would be residential in nature and I do not consider it would generate unreasonable noise that would have a significant adverse impact on the residential amenity of neighbours.

Wider area

- 8.13 Third parties have raised concerns about the reduction in the size of the garden which would displace children from playing in the garden to the street, resulting in noise that would harm residential amenity. The property would retain a good-size garden approximately 10m long which would provide acceptable amenity space, so this would not be a likely result in my opinion. Moreover, the planning system cannot control children playing in the street, so this is not a relevant consideration.
- 8.14 I am satisfied that the impact on residential amenity during construction can be controlled through conditions to restrict construction hours and that this would be reasonable due to the narrowness of the plot and the density of dwellings in this particular area.
- 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, 3/7 and 4/13.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

- 8.16 The property would retain a good sized garden which would provide an acceptable amenity space for the future occupants. The proposed extension would provide a good quality living environment. I consider that in this respect it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7, 3/14 and 4/13.

Impact on trees

- 8.17 The owners of No. 13 have raised concerns about the impact of the proposal on trees and bushes within their rear garden. In particular, a Japanese Quince on the boundary fence within

approximately 1.1m of the rear elevation of their property and a Holly tree on the boundary further north, as well as the impact on an Apple tree within the rear garden of the application site. During the course of the application, revised plans were submitted showing more accurately the location of the trees, as well as photographs taken from within the neighbouring property No. 13.

8.18 Trees are protected by virtue of their location within the conservation area, however the Japanese Quince is a shrub, which is not afforded such protection. I appreciate the neighbour's concerns, however it would not be reasonable to recommend a condition for protection and mitigation measures. The occupants of No. 13 could take reasonable measures to protect or replace the shrubs. The Holly tree is far enough away from the proposed development that it would not be significantly adversely impacted. The loss of the Apple tree within the garden of the application site would be acceptable as it is a garden tree and does not make a significant contribution to the conservation area.

8.19 For these reasons, in my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 4/4.

Refuse Arrangements

8.20 Third parties have queried whether the proposal would alter the existing bin storage and collection arrangements. The proposed site plan shows a bin store against the northern boundary. The bin store would be acceptable in terms of the size and location in accordance with the adopted guidance, nonetheless the store is not necessary in order to make the development acceptable, as the extension does not require changes to the existing arrangements. As no elevations have been submitted, the erection of a store would not form part of the consent. However provided the store does not exceed 2.5m in height, it would be permitted development.

8.21 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

Highway Safety

- 8.22 The proposal does not impact on existing access arrangements and the Highways Authority has advised that the proposal raises no issues for highway safety. I accept their advice and in my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Third Party Representations

- 8.23 I have addressed the third party comments as follows:

Representation	Response
Extension is excessively large and 'ugly'. Inappropriate and does not respect the character of the area.	See paragraphs 8.2-8.5
Loss of light to north-facing kitchen window of No. 13 and outlook.	See paragraphs 8.10-8.11
Impact of noise from dining room and the extension would facilitate 'big parties'	See paragraph 8.12
Impact on drainage system Unclear rainwater arrangements	The site is not within an identified area of flood risk and therefore a surface water drainage scheme is not required. The impact on the existing drainage infrastructure is a civil matter and is not a relevant planning matter.
Unclear the ventilation for the kitchen and toilet.	The use would be residential and not commercial and therefore the ventilation of the kitchen and toilet would be acceptable within the residential area. These details are not relevant planning matters.
Unclear bin storage arrangements	See paragraph 8.20

Reduced area of garden will increase noise from children playing in the street.	See paragraph 8.13
Japanese Quince and Holly trees within the rear garden of No. 13 not accurately shown on plan. Another Holly tree and horse chestnut in rear part of garden unmarked on plans. Apple tree within garden of No. 11 not marked on plans. Request a root survey to be undertaken.	See paragraph 8.17-8.19
Impact of foundations and overshadowing on Japanese Quince tree in the rear garden of No. 13 including resulting impact on ability to screen lower part of extension.	See paragraph 8.17-8.19
Impact of additional weight loading on structural soundness of party wall.	Structural stability and party walls are civil matters and not a planning matter.
Impact of additional roof scape on reduced ground area on surface water drainage.	The site is not within an area of surface water flood risk and therefore a surface water drainage scheme is not required. The scale of the proposal is unlikely to generate a significant additional impact.
The owners of No. 9 intend to submit an application for a similar proposal and have discussed the plans with the applicant.	There has been no application submitted to extend No. 9 and the current proposal must be considered on its own merits.
The owners of No. 9 are likely to consent to the proposed development of a party wall.	This is a civil matter and not a planning matter.

Likely to set a precedent for similar development at No. 9 which would harm the amenity of No. 7.	There has been no application submitted to extend No. 9. The current proposal any future applications on neighbouring sites must be considered on their own merits.
Welcome that the amended plan extends less into the garden, however the reduced length would still remain a massively large extension and the length and height could be reduced further.	I acknowledge these comments which I have addressed in my report.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 I acknowledge the concerns that have been raised by third parties in response to the impact on the character of the conservation area, however I share the view of the Conservation Team that the proposal would not have a material impact on the conservation area. I have assessed the impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, and I consider that the proposal as amended during the course of the application would be a scale that would not have a significant adverse impact on Nos. 9 and 13. For these reasons, the recommendation is for approval subject to conditions.

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 external brickwork on the extension hereby permitted shall match the existing building in type, colour and texture as much as possible, or shall be in accordance with alternative details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of external brickwork.

Reason: To preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/11).