

Application Number	17/0615/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	8th June 2017	Officer	Michael Hammond
Target Date	3rd August 2017		
Ward	East Chesterton		
Site Proposal	40 St Andrews Road Cambridge CB4 1DL Erection of two storey side extension, part single/part two storey rear extension and rear dormer following demolition of existing rear extension, conservatory and side lean-to.		
Applicant	Mr & Mrs Gilbert & Marie Mensah 40 St Andrews Road Cambridge CB4 1DL		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed works would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area. • The proposed development would not harmfully impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

1.1 40 St Andrew’s Road is a two-storey semi-detached house dating from the early part of the twentieth century. At the front, it is finished in white-painted pebbledash render with red brick mock quoins at first floor level, and red brick at ground floor level. At the rear, it is faced in buff brick throughout. The house has a hipped, tiled roof. It has previously been extended to the rear at ground floor level, creating first a lean-to extension, and subsequently a white PVC conservatory on a buff brick plinth. The street is almost entirely residential. It is composed mainly of semi-detached houses of a similar scale, but varying designs.

- 1.2 The site falls within City of Cambridge Conservation Area No.3 (Chesterton). There are no Tree Protection Orders relating to the site.
- 1.3 The site lies within the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). The whole of the rear garden of the house, and the footprint of the existing single-storey rear extension, lie within the River Cam floodplain. The footprint of the original house lies outside it. The site is not within the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ).

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The original proposal has been amended on three occasions, by revised plans submitted on 2nd May 2017, 7th September 2017, and 1st December 2017.
- 2.2 As amended, the application proposes five alterations to the existing house.
- 2.3 Replacement of the existing front door with a fixed panel resembling a front door, to create a cloakroom within the current hall. (This replaces the earlier proposal to use an obscure-glazed panel in this location.)
- 2.4 Replacement of the existing single-storey side lean-to with a new, two-storey, flat-roofed side extension, 1.8m wide, and 9.2m deep. The extension would be fully glazed on front and rear elevations, with a flat glazed roof, and faced with metal panels on the east side, adjacent to No.42. It would house a porch, the new stairwell, and bin and cycle storage below the stairs.
- 2.5 Removal of previous rear extensions, and construction in their place of a new ground-floor extension spanning the full width of the house (5.5m). This would extend 5.5m to the rear of the original main house on the west side (3m beyond the existing lean-to extension at No.38), and 9.5m to the rear on the east side, and would be 3.5m high. The angled rear elevation thus created would be fully glazed; the rest of the extension would be clad in metal panels. This extension would have a green roof on the section not covered by the proposed first-floor extension, and it would be attached to a 10.5m long canopy covering the walkway on the east side adjacent to No.42.

- 2.6 A first floor extension, having the same angled footprint as the ground floor extension, but extending 3m less into the rear garden. It would be drawn back by 1m from the common boundary with No.38 to the west. It would also have a flat green roof and a large 1.6m x 4.5m window on the rear elevation, and be otherwise clad in metal panels.
- 2.7 A metal-clad dormer on the rear roof slope. It would be set on the lower edge of the roof, and would measure 2m high x 2m wide. The rear face would be glazed, but obscured up to 1.7m from second storey floor level.
- 2.8 The application has been called-in to planning committee by Councillor Abbott due to the overbearing impact the proposed extensions would have on neighbours.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
15/1107/FUL	Two storey rear and single storey side extension.	Approved with conditions
03/1313/FP	Conservatory	Approved with conditions

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> Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (November 2010) Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2005) Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan (2011) Roof Extensions Design Guide (2003)
	<u>Area Guidelines</u> Chesterton and Ferry Lane Conservation Area Appraisal (2009)

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 highways implications.

Urban Design and Conservation Team

First comments, dated 3rd July 2017

6.2 Replacement of the main entrance door with an obscured glass panel would negatively affect the rhythm of the openings in the houses in the street.

6.3 Hip-to-gable roof conversion would destroy the symmetry of the semi-detached pair which is a distinct part of the character of the vicinity.

6.4 Roof extension would put an overlarge alien 'box' onto the roof which does not have any relationship with the original building, and would not be an incidental addition. There are few roof extensions in this part of the street.

6.5 Side extension to accommodate the new stairwell would negatively affect the rhythm of built form and spaces in the street.

6.6 Application not supported

Comments on revised proposal, dated 15th September 2017

6.7 Retention of the hipped roof is welcomed. Otherwise the previous comments still apply. Glazed side extension would affect the rhythm of the street, glazed front doorway would have a negative impact on the character of the building. Although reduced in scale, rear roof extension is still a large box rather

than being an incidental form in the roof. It would not comply with the Roof Extensions Design Guide and would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area. Application not supported.

Comments on revised proposal, dated 19th December 2017

6.8 The glazed front door has been replaced with a more traditional design which is supported. However, the other elements of the proposal are still not considered appropriate for the reasons outlined previously.

6.9 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:

42 St Andrew's Road.

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Property boundary has been infringed by previous works, and must be restored.
- Party Wall Agreement required.
- Works must avoid discharge of water on to No. 42.
- Fully glazed stairwell would be out of character with the street.
- Stairwell would adversely affect privacy at No.42.
- Second floor bedroom is excessively bulky and out of proportion with nearby houses.
- Extension would adversely affect daylight to, and outlook from, No. 42.
- Boundary fence at rear of No.40 needs to be addressed.
- Unclear whether part of new extension to be used as car port.

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 Permission is sought for a replacement front door, two-storey side extension, part single/ part two-storey rear extensions and a rear metal clad roof dormer. I will assess the impact of each aspect in turn below.

Replacement front door

8.3 Permission was originally sought to infill and fully glaze the original front door. I was of the view that this would have appeared alien in the street scene and not acceptable in the context of the Conservation Area. In response to this, a door profile similar to that of the existing has been proposed instead. The proposed door would serve for aesthetical purposes only as the proposal still includes the main front door being situated on the front of the proposed side extension. Nevertheless, the appearance of the original front elevation would be retained and I consider this element would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Proposed two-storey side extension

8.4 The proposed side extension, by virtue of its position, would inevitably be visible from the public realm. The original proposals included a three-storey fully glazed extension that would have changed the hipped roof profile to a gable end. This was not supported by the Urban Design and Conservation Team and I concurred with this advice as it would have appeared extremely prominent and completely out of character with the area. The hip-to-gable roof extension would have unbalanced the symmetrical relationship of nos.38 and 40.

- 8.5 In response to the above concerns, the massing of the proposed side extension has been reduced considerably and the proposal is now two-storeys in height with a flat glazed roof that is level with the original eaves line of the property. In addition to this, the proposed extension has been set back approximately 1m behind the front building line and the neighbouring single-storey lean-to extension. A trim of metal cladding has been introduced along the edge of the proposed extension also to improve the definition of the extension.
- 8.6 It is acknowledged that the Urban Design and Conservation Team have outstanding objections to the proposed side extension as they consider it would negatively affect the rhythm of the street. I do not agree with this assessment and am of the opinion that the rhythm of the street and general character and appearance of the conservation area would be preserved. The proposed amendments significantly reduce the level of perceived massing from the street scene and allow for the original building, and its symmetry as part of a pair of semi-detached properties, to remain legible. The two-storey mass proposed would be set no higher than the original eaves and well back from the front building line. In my view, it would clearly read as a contemporary yet subservient addition to the property. Through its unorthodox design, fenestration and modern material palette it would provide a successful contrast with the traditional architectural treatment whilst also not competing with the established character.

Proposed part single, part two-storey rear extensions

- 8.7 The proposed rear extensions would not be prominent from public viewpoints by way of the position they would occupy on the rear elevation. There would be glimpses from Mariner's Way to the south-east of the site, allowing views into the conservation area. However, these views would be over 40m away and I believe the proposed rear extension could not be argued to be readily visible from the public domain.
- 8.8 The Urban Design and Conservation Team has not raised this aspect of the scheme as being problematic throughout the consultation process and the proposed rear extensions have remained in their format as originally proposed. The proposed rear extensions would occupy unusual layouts, effectively consisting of a pair of asymmetrical wedges, with large panels

of glazing and colourful metal flat roof profiles. The proposed rear extensions clearly make no effort to disguise their contemporary form and impression. Nevertheless, their overall massing and appearance represent an appropriate expression of massing and design within this context and I do not consider the proposal would appear awkward or overly developed. The proposed extensions would be situated on the least sensitive elevation in the context of the area and I am of the view that the character and appearance of the conservation area would be preserved. The detailed design of these works, notably materials, will be of importance and I have therefore recommended a materials condition.

Roof dormer

- 8.9 The original proposals included a metal clad box-like dormer which would have occupied a considerable proportion of the original rear roof slope by exploiting the hip-to-gable three-storey extension that was initially proposed. The removal of the hip-to-gable roof extension from the proposed works has meant that the size of the proposed dormer has been reduced considerably and sits more centrally within the original rear roof plane.
- 8.10 The Urban Design and Conservation Team states that the roof extension, although reduced in scale, would still be overly large which combined with its fenestration and materials would draw the eye rather than appearing incidental. Whilst I agree to an extent that the proposed dormer would be conspicuous by virtue of its contemporary appearance, I do not agree that this would harm the conservation area. The proposed dormer would not be prominent from any public viewpoints due to its position on the rear roof plane. The proposed dormer would be set in from the sides, eaves and ridge of the original roof which would enable it to be read as a later addition and allow the original rear roof plane to remain legible. In addition, the proposed roof extension would be read in conjunction with the single-storey and two-storey extensions that would sit beneath which share similar characteristics materially and in form. I consider that a contrasting and striking design would be more coordinated in conjunction with the other extensions proposed and that a traditional approach in isolation would appear contrived and forced.

Conclusion

- 8.11 Overall, I consider the proposed works would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area. The contemporary approach would provide a contrasting yet subtle design approach that would not appear overly prominent or harmful in the conservation area.
- 8.12 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

- 8.13 The main considerations are the impacts of the proposed works on the two adjoining neighbours.

Impact on no.38 St Andrews Road

- 8.14 No.38 St Andrews Road is a two-storey semi-detached property which adjoins onto the application site from the south-west.
- 8.15 I do not consider the proposed works would compromise the privacy of this neighbour. The large glazed window serving the roof dormer would be obscure glazed up to a height of 1.7m above the finished floor level and the side glazed wall at first-floor level would be fully obscure glazed. I have recommended a condition to control this. The remaining rear windows would only offer views across the latter part of this neighbour's garden and would not offer harmful overlooking opportunities. I have also recommended a condition to ensure that the flat roofs of the first-floor and ground-floor extensions are not at any time used as terrace areas as this could compromise neighbour privacy.
- 8.16 In terms of overshadowing, the proposed rear extensions have been angled so that they are at their lowest depth along this neighbour's boundary. In my opinion, the limited depth, coupled with the low height of the flat roofs, would only cause minimal overshadowing in the early morning hours. The levels of light reaching this neighbour throughout the remainder of the day would be retained.

8.17 I do not consider the proposed works would visually overbear this neighbour. The proposed first-floor rear extension would only project approximately 2.7m beyond the nearest first-floor window of this neighbour. This limited depth in conjunction with the lightweight appearance of obscure glazing would not visually enclose the nearest first-floor habitable outlook in my view. The proposed single-storey rear extension would project around 3m beyond the rear ground-floor window of this neighbour and then dramatically step away from the shared boundary. The proposed extension would be approximately 3.5m in height and I am of the opinion that this would not represent an overbearing relationship with this neighbour's rear windows or garden.

Impact on no.42 St Andrews Road

8.18 No.42 St Andrews Road is a semi-detached property which is set off the boundary with the application site. This neighbour has raised a number of concerns but specifically regarding loss of light, visual dominance and overlooking.

8.19 In terms of overlooking, I am of the opinion that the proposal would retain this neighbour's privacy. The proposed dormer would be obscure glazed and the side elevation glazing facing towards this neighbour would also be obscure glazed. The obscure glazing condition would control this. The remaining rear facing views are orientated to face way from this neighbour and would only offer limited views towards this neighbour, not significantly worse than that of present.

8.20 In respect of overshadowing, I consider the proposal would not adversely impact upon this neighbour. There would be an approximately 4m separation distance between the proposed extensions and this neighbour's nearest window. The ridge of the proposed first-floor flat roof would be set below the eaves line of the main roof and the proposed rear dormer would be set in from this neighbour's boundary. Any likely loss of light would be insignificant and limited to the extreme afternoon hours.

8.21 I am of the opinion that the proposed extensions would not visually dominate this neighbour. The proposed two-storey and single-storey rear extensions would be set in from the side boundary and with low flat-roof forms, I do not consider this would represent a visually enclosing built form from this

neighbouring property. The proposed walkway canopy element of the single-storey extension would be close to this neighbour's boundary but at 2.5m in height would not be visually oppressive. The proposed two-storey side extension would sit opposite the gable end elevation of no.42 which does not feature any habitable windows. In my opinion, whilst the proposed works would inevitably change the outlook from certain windows and the garden of this neighbour, I do not perceive this relationship would be visually enclosing or harmful to this neighbour.

8.22 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 3/7.

Third Party Representation

8.23 The majority of the third party concerns have been addressed in the main body of this report. Those outstanding have been addressed below:

Comment	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Property boundary has been infringed by previous works, and must be restored. • Party Wall Agreement required. • Works must avoid discharge of water on to No. 42. • Boundary fence at rear of No.40 needs to be addressed. 	<p>These are all party wall civil/legal matters and not planning considerations.</p>
<p>Unclear whether part of new extension to be used as car port.</p>	<p>The extension would not be used as a car port and no alterations to parking arrangements are proposed.</p>

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 The proposed works would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area. The proposed development would respect the amenities of neighbours.

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. No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate and to avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/14 and 4/11)

5. The windows identified as having obscured glass on drawing numbers P-0009 Rev P2 & P-008 Rev P2 shall be obscure glazed to a minimum height of 1.7m and to a minimum level of obscurity to conform to Pilkington Glass level 3 or equivalent prior to commencement of use (of the extension) and shall have restrictors to ensure that the window cannot be opened more than 45 degrees beyond the plane of the adjacent wall and shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 3/14).

6. The flat roof areas identified as 'green roof' on drawing no. P-004 Rev P2 of the development hereby permitted shall not be used as external terraces and shall only be accessed for maintenance purposes only.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 3/14)