

Application Number	17/1838/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	24th October 2017	Officer	Mary Collins
Target Date	19th December 2017		
Ward	Newnham		
Site	40 Grantchester Road Newnham, Cambridge		
Proposal	Rear and side ground floor extension		
Applicant	Ms S Day 40 Grantchester Road Newnham, Cambridge		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The proposal would not unreasonably overlook, overshadow or visually dominate neighbouring properties.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The proposal would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.</p>
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 40 Grantchester Road is a semi-detached property situated on the western side of Grantchester Road. It has a recessed front porch and bay window to the front elevation. To the rear the property has a two storey outrigger which has been extended at two storey level by approximately 4 metres with an additional single storey ground floor extension to the rear and projecting side.
- 1.2 The dwelling is constructed in buff brick with red brick detailing to the front elevation and brown concrete roof tiles.
- 1.3 Grantchester Road is characterised by pairs of dwellings of a similar age and style. The site falls outside the controlled parking zone and there are no other site constraints.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey extension to the side and rear.
- 2.2 There is an existing conservatory to the rear which wraps around the extended outrigger and would be removed. The proposed extension would project 1.3 metres to the rear of the extended outrigger (the same depth as existing) with a rectangular oriel window projecting to the rear elevation. It would extend to the side by 2.1 metres and would wrap around the extended two storey outrigger with the extension to the side having a span of 5.6 metres. The extension would have a flat roof, 3 metres high with a section along the boundary with a sloping roof. The extension would be inset from the boundary by approximately 0.20 metres.
- 2.3 The extension would have grey rendered walls with a zinc roof covering. The lower half of the existing wall of the outrigger would also be rendered in grey to match the extension.
- 2.4 During the course of this planning application, revisions have been made to the application to reduce the impact of the extension on the boundary with the adjacent property at 42 Grantchester Road by reducing the eaves height to 2.4 metres with a sloping section with a pitch of 35 degrees for a span of 0.9 metres. Amendments have also been made to the glazing in the east facing window of the extension so that it would be fitted with obscure glazing.
- 2.5 The proposal also entails a number of elements which are permitted development and do not require planning permission:
- Insertion of French doors to side elevation of the existing two storey outrigger;
 - Insertion of two windows in existing first floor rear elevation instead of one window;
 - Changes to internal room layout.
- 2.6 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:

1. Drawings

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
C/87/0593	Erection of part single, part two storey extensions to existing dwelling houses.	Refused
C/88/1332	Two storey rear extension.	Refused – allowed on appeal

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 3/11 3/14

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)
-----------------------------	---

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.
- 6.2 The Highway Authority has no comment to make upon the amended plans. The previous comments of the Highway Authority still apply.

South Newnham Neighbourhood Forum

- 6.3 Bring attention to an aspect of this application that would seem to cause loss of privacy and amenity to the next-door neighbour at no. 42 Grantchester Road. The particular issue is a window on the proposed new extension that apparently would look towards the bathroom window at no. 42, and on this aspect we understood that the neighbour would be objecting.
- 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 Councillor Markus Gehring has requested that the application be referred to committee if officers are minded to support the proposal, due to concerns regarding the impact on neighbouring properties.

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

- 42 Grantchester Road

7.3 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Loss of privacy/total visual intrusion – From new French windows, East facing window of extension towards bathroom and bedroom.
- Layout and density of building. - Massing even closer.
- Due to the close by mass, microclimate would be affected – less air, breeze circulating round the building.
- Loss of light: Extension has already taken light. North light is still needed. Light lost in the evening to rear windows in the summer.
- Design, appearance and materials – Square edged ‘brutalist block with grey render on its east and west elevations totally out of keeping with the style of that house and this row of houses. Would be visible from Grantchester Road and incongruous intrusion to line of vision between the houses.
- Drainage: Paving slabs cover much of the rear garden apart from a narrow margin around the edges, the larger footprint of the extension and the difference in ground levels between the two properties would increase the likelihood of rainwater overflow onto my site.
- Previous planning decisions – Overlooking, loss of light and visual intrusion from extension to outrigger.
- Permanent and life-limiting damage to good quality fence. Life of fence would logically be shortened.
- Nature conservation – loss of trees and shrubs.

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

Context of site, design and external spaces

- 8.1 The extension would replace an existing glazed and wooden structure with a contemporary extension of a larger footprint and with different materials. The extension would extend further to the side of the extended rear section of the dwelling.
- 8.2 There would be views of a small section of the extension from the street through the narrow gap between the two pairs of dwellings. However due to the set back from the street frontage, views would be limited and be recessive and in my opinion would not have a detrimental impact on the street scene.
- 8.3 The form and design of the extension are contemporary with the associate use of grey render and zinc cladding and in my opinion this would not be detrimental to the appearance of the surrounding area.
- 8.4 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/14.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

42 Grantchester Road

- 8.5 The adjacent property at 42 Grantchester Road is situated to the south of the application site. This property is semi-detached with a two storey outrigger to the rear.
- 8.6 The existing relationship of the two dwellings is tight with the two dwellings separated by a narrow passageway between the properties and the intervening distance then widens to approximately two metres and then to a distance of approximately 4 metres between the outriggers.
- 8.7 The existing outrigger to 40 Grantchester Road has been extended by 4 metres and the proposed extension would extend further sideways at single storey level into this space between the side of the outrigger and the boundary.

- 8.8 The 2.4 metre high side elevation of the proposed extension would span for a distance of approximately 5.6 metres in close proximity to the boundary and would be separated from the rear of the existing dwelling by approximately 7 metres.
- 8.9 During the course of this application amendments have been made to address neighbours concerns with the eaves height along the boundary being reduced to 2.4 metres with a section of the roof sloping upwards with a pitch of 35 degrees away from the boundary.
- 8.10 The extension is not considered to be overbearing on the boundary with 42 Grantchester Road or to cause enclosure or a tunneling effect. This is due to the massing and single storey nature of the extension, the intervening gap between the rear of the properties and the position of the extension and its marginal inset from the boundary.
- 8.11 In addition the extension would not in my opinion be detrimental to the outlook and visual amenities of the neighbour at 42 Grantchester Road.
- 8.12 The fall-back position is that an outbuilding could also be located in the position of the proposed extension up to a height of 2.5 metres without the need for planning permission and could have a similar impact on the boundary.
- 8.13 The proposal would not result in a detrimental loss of light to the adjoining property at 42 Grantchester Road.

Loss of privacy

- 8.14 The property at 42 Grantchester Road has windows to habitable rooms in its rear elevation on the ground floor and to a bedroom and bathroom at first floor level. As noted previously, the existing relationship of the two dwellings is tight and as such there is already a degree of inter-visibility due to this close proximity.
- 8.15 There is potential for overlooking from the proposed window in the east elevation of the proposed extension which would face back towards the rear of the property and the adjacent neighbour at 42 Grantchester Road. The bedroom window to

this property has a low cill level and this adds to the perception of overlooking.

- 8.16 The proposed window to the eastern elevation of the extension would be a secondary window to the proposed kitchen and would be fitted with obscure glass. This has been amended since the original submission in response to neighbour's concerns. It is considered that a detrimental loss of privacy through inter-looking would therefore not occur. A condition will be imposed to ensure that this opening is fitted with obscure glazing and is non-opening and fixed at all times.
- 8.17 The applicant also proposes to make internal alterations to the existing property and an existing bedroom would be changed into a bathroom. The submitted drawings show this window fitted with obscure glazing. The proposed bathroom window is a vertical sash fitted with frosted glass, however when this window is opened for ventilation, there would be clear views out towards the neighbouring property. However, given this is in an existing elevation of the dwelling, a condition cannot be imposed to ensure that it is restricted in its opening and given that there is already an opening window in this position, there is considered to be no additional harm than the existing situation.
- 8.18 A pair of French doors is also proposed to be inserted in the existing side wall of the outrigger. This can be carried out as permitted development. These doors are aligned at 90 degrees to the rear facing windows in 42 Grantchester Road and as such, it is considered that a detrimental loss of privacy through inter-visibility between rooms would not occur owing to this acute angle and intervening boundary treatment.
- 8.19 The internal floor level of the family room would be approximately 0.40 metres above ground level and the intervening fencing is 1.7 metres high. However given the inset of the French doors from the boundary, it is considered that the intervening fence would still provide sufficient screening to ensure that a detrimental loss of privacy through overlooking from this room into the neighbouring garden would not occur.
- 8.20 The use of the resultant courtyard garden is not considered to create any additional issues of loss of privacy to this neighbouring property as the proposed situation would not differ

from the existing circumstances where this outdoor area is currently used as amenity space.

- 8.21 The insertion of two window openings at first floor level to the rear can be carried out under permitted development rights, however these are not considered to be detrimental to privacy as views from these windows would only be towards the far end of adjoining gardens and would not be directed towards the private areas directly behind the rear of adjoining properties.

38 Grantchester Road

- 8.22 This property is attached and lies to the north of the application site. This property has a single storey rear extension and the proposed extension would only marginally project above and beyond it. This property in my opinion would not be detrimentally affected by the proposal.
- 8.23 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

- 8.24 The issue of drainage has been raised as the existing property has a mostly paved rear garden and there is concern about the amount of additional surface water runoff from the roof of the extension and whether it can be adequately drained away within the application site so it does not discharge on to their property, particularly as there are differences in levels between the two properties.
- 8.25 The final sizes of the gutters and rain water downpipes form part of the Building Regulation requirements as they are dependent on the area of roof to be drained and the relevant capacity of the gutters/pipes.
- 8.26 There is sufficient room for guttering to be added to the roof of the extension so that rain water is collected and drained away within the application site.
- 8.27 With regards to the views expressed regarding the future maintenance of the fence, many extensions are inset from the

boundary and the maintenance and upkeep of this area would be the responsibility of the land owner, whilst the maintenance of the fence would fall to the owner of the fence.

- 8.28 The removal of small trees, bushes and plants climbing up and over the intervening fence is not a material matter in the determination of this planning application. The property is not within the conservation area and there is no protection against their removal which would only extend to trees in any case. The owners are free to maintain the garden as they wish.

9.0 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. The window identified as having obscured glass on drawings numbers (apa.187.103 Rev P3 and apa.187.104 Rev P3) on the east elevation at ground floor level shall be obscure glazed 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 be fixed and non-openable at all times.

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