

Application Number	18/0446/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	20th March 2018	Officer	Eloise Limmer
Target Date	15th May 2018		
Ward	Arbury		
Site	33 Redfern Close Cambridge CB4 2DT		
Proposal	Two storey side extension following demolition of existing car port. New front and rear roof extension including raising ridge height. Replace existing conservatory with new single storey rear extension and convert existing out house to study/workshop.		
Applicant	Mr Xinwen Xiong 254 Nuns Way Cambridge CB4 2NT		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The revised proposal is acceptable as it would not have a significant adverse impact on the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers.• The scale and design of the proposal is appropriate and it would not have a significant adverse impact on the character of the area.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site is a two storey, detached dwellinghouse with attached garage situated on the northern side of Redfern Close. Redfern Close wraps around a protected green space and the application site faces onto this. The surrounding area is residential, characterised by detached and semi-detached houses in a range of architectural styles. There are no other relevant site constraints.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The application seeks full planning permission for a two storey side extension following the demolition of the existing car port. Front and rear roof extensions including raising the ridge height by 0.4m. Replacing the existing conservatory with a new single storey rear extension. The conversion of the existing outbuilding into a study/workshop including changing the roof from flat to pitched.
- 2.2 The application has been amended following Officer's concerns about the design of the proposal. The two large dormers to the front have been removed and replaced with a small dormer and rooflights. The rear dormer has been set up from the eaves line of the roof.
- 2.3 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:

1. Plans

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
C/86/0137	Erection of single storey rear extension to existing dwelling house.	Approved subject to conditions

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 Local Plan 2006	3/1 3/4 3/7 3/11 3/14 8/10

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>Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard – published by Department of Communities and Local Government March 2015 (material consideration)</p>
Supplementary Planning Guidance	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007)
Material Considerations	<p><u>City Wide Guidance</u></p> <p>Cambridge City Council (2011) - Open Space and Recreation Strategy</p> <p>Roof Extensions Design Guide (2003)</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 The applicant has provided sufficient information to demonstrate that two cars can be parked within the site following development. A new vehicular access to the public highway is proposed. If the Planning Authority is minded to grant permission to this proposal in its current form please add the requested conditions and informatives to that permission
- 6.2 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 Todd-Jones has commented on the amended application, the comments can be summarised as follows:
- The proposal conflicts with Policy 3/14 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006)
 - Front dormers do not feature in other properties in Redfern Close and therefore the proposal sets a precedent in regard to the street scene.
 - The effect of the rear dormer projecting out from the pitched roof in conjunction with the raised roof line of the property dominates and overshadows the rear and back garden of 35 Redfern Close.
 - The side extension and rear dormer directly affect the light and shadow from the south-west and west with regard to No.35.

- The addition of a pitched roof to the outbuilding contributes to further overshadowing of the western boundary of No.35 due to the increase in height.
- The proposal removes an existing garage and further information is required regarding the parking arrangements.

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

Original

- 20 Redfern Close
- 35 Redfern Close

Revised

- 3 Redfern Close
- 11 Redfern Close
- 35 Redfern Close
- 37 Redfern Close

The representations can be summarised as follows:

7.3 Original:

- The side extension and raised roof ridge will be overbearing on the side entrance to No.35
- The existing outbuilding is currently invisible from No.35 but raising the roof will make it visible and it will overshadow the garden.
- Raising the roof height will make the house much more bulky and higher than all the other houses in the vicinity.
- Concerned about the intended use – the proposals suggest it will be let as a House of Multiple Occupancy (HMO). The owner owns a house on the other side of the street that is poorly maintained. The number of HMO's in the area has a negative effect on the sense of community.
- The proposal will create additional demand on the parking in the close as there is not enough off road parking for the number of occupants.

7.4 Revised:

- The front dormer window and front rooflights would not be in keeping with the surrounding houses.
- No.35 has a window overlooking the side wall which currently receives a lot of sunlight in the afternoon. The

extension will overshadow this window and the garden/patio

- The back No.35 faces north and gets little light. This will be made worse by the rear dormer.
- The house could easily be used as a HMO and this will cause further traffic and noise issues. It will especially impact the amount of on-street parking in the area which is already an issue.
- Front dormers have been denied in the past as they do not match the existing houses, it will negatively impact the character of the area.
- The extended house would dominate and overshadow the neighbouring property.
- The front dormer should be replaced by a velux window.
- The study/workshop should be located on the other side of the garden so it overshadows their own garden rather than the neighbour.

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
2. Residential amenity
3. Car parking
4. Third party representations

Context of site, design and external spaces (and impact on heritage assets)

8.2 The front extension, side extension and front roof dormer would be visible from Redfern Close, the other elements of the proposal would not be visible from the public realm.

8.3 The single storey front extension would project 1.5m from the front building line and would be constructed in materials to match the host dwelling. The roof ridge of the host dwelling

would be raised by 0.4m. As the building is not increasing in width this will result in a steeper pitch to the roof than the existing. This increase is considered to be minor and would not affect the character of the area as there are a range of roof styles and heights. The existing attached car port to the side of the property would be demolished and replaced with a two storey side extension. The extension would match the (increased) ridge and eaves height of the host dwelling. It would not read as a subservient addition; however there are a number of examples of similar extensions in the immediate vicinity (Nos. 19, 25, 27 and 29 Redfern Close). It is therefore considered that the proposed extension would be in keeping with the character of the area.

- 8.4 A small front dormer is proposed alongside three rooflights in the front roof slope. Although the properties are of a different architectural style, there are examples of small front roof dormers at Nos. 10, 12, and 16 Redfern Close. The dormer would sit low on the roof slope; projecting 0.9m from the front roof slope at its highest point. It is considered that the proposed dormer would be relatively unobtrusive in the roof and would not be detrimental to the character of the area. The two large box dormers in the original proposal were not considered acceptable as they would have dominated the roof slope being of a much larger scale. The rooflights fall under Part 1 Class C of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) and therefore do not require planning permission.
- 8.5 The cubic content of the proposed rear dormer would be approximately 35m³, the bottom edge is 0.2m from the eaves of the roof. If the roof height was not raised and the materials matched the existing roof then a similar dormer could be constructed in the original roof of the house without planning permission under Part 1 Class B of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended). This is a strong fall-back position that needs to be kept in mind. The design, whilst long and boxy, is considered to be acceptable for this style and age of property outside the Conservation Area.
- 8.6 There is an existing rear extension and conservatory, the conservatory is proposed to be demolished and replaced with an extension on the same footprint. A single storey extension is

proposed to join the rear of the dwellinghouse to the existing single storey outbuilding that runs along the boundary with No.35. This extension would be 2.7m in width and project 2.9m from the rear wall of the existing rear extension. The outbuilding will be converted into a study/workshop space and the existing flat roof would be replaced by a pitched roof. The eaves of the pitched roof would be 2.2m (the same as the flat roof) but the ridge would be 0.6m higher than the existing. I have no concerns with the design of these elements.

- 8.7 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/14.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

35 Redfern Close

- 8.8 The side extension would be built on the boundary with No.35 and would be two storeys with a box dormer on the roof. The gap between the side wall of No.35 and the boundary is used for vehicular access to the garage to the rear. This space to the side of the property is therefore not well used and although there will be an enclosing impact as the result of this proposal it is not considered that this would have a significant detrimental impact on the amenity of the occupier of No.35. The proposed single storey rear extension connecting the dwelling to the existing outhouse would not have a harmful impact as it follows the line of the garage to the rear of No.35 along the boundary and would not be significantly taller than this.
- 8.9 The rear window of No.35 which sits closest to the boundary is situated approximately 3m from the boundary. There is a window serving the kitchen/diner in the side elevation of No.35 facing the application site. This is not the principal window serving this room, there is a larger window facing the rear garden. This neighbour is situated to the east of the application site so the rear windows and garden are north facing. The impact on the daylight received by the rear windows has been considered using the 45 degree test. The proposal fails on the vertical plane but passes on the horizontal plane which means that daylight and sunlight levels are unlikely to be adversely affected. The two storey side extension will cause an increase

in overshadowing of part of the outside space of No.35 as it narrows the gap between the properties. Most of this overshadowing would fall upon the side access and rear garage of No.35. The overshadowing impact would likely also extend over a small part of the rear garden but the orientation means that the main patio space would not be affected. The overshadowing impact is considered to be acceptable as it would not be significant and would not impact the most used section of the garden.

- 8.10 Currently the roof line of the outbuilding sits at 2.4m, around the same height as the boundary fence between the properties. The proposed changes to the roof would mean that at the boundary the height would be the same but would rise 0.6m at the ridge which is 1.4m in from the boundary. The roof would be visible from No.35 but it is of a low pitch and it is not considered that the increase in scale would have an enclosing effect on the garden space or result in any significant loss of light.
- 8.11 There would be no new windows on the elevation facing No.35 other than two roof lights in the pitched roof of the outbuilding. The dormer will introduce windows at a higher level than existing, therefore it is recognised that there will be an increase in overlooking albeit obliquely and I note the closest loft window would serve a dressing room. There is already a certain level of inter looking between properties from first floor windows and it is not considered that the introduction of these further windows would have a significant impact on the privacy of the neighbouring occupiers.

31 Redfern Close

- 8.12 No.31 is situated to the west of the application site, it has an attached garage and rear outbuilding which are situated on the boundary with No.33. There is currently a significant amount of vegetation on the boundary with this neighbour. The single storey extension closest to the boundary would sit in the footprint of the existing conservatory. As it is situated away from the boundary and is single storey it is not considered that there would be any impact as a result of this extension. The rear dormer window and raising the ridge height would add to the bulk of the dwelling at the rear but given the distance between the host dwelling and the habitable rooms of No.31 it is not

considered that there would be any significant impact on the amenity of these occupiers.

Wider impact

- 8.13 A number of representations raised concerns about the property being used as a House of Multiple Occupancy (HMO) and the parking and noise issues that would be associated with this. This application relates only to the proposed extensions to the existing dwelling not the change of use to a HMO. Therefore only the impact of the extensions can be considered when deciding this application.
- 8.14 In my opinion the proposal provides a high-quality living environment and an appropriate standard of residential amenity for future occupiers, and I consider that in this respect it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/14.

Car Parking

- 8.15 Since the comments from neighbours and Cllr Todd-Jones have been received the applicant has submitted further details relating to the parking and the Highways Officer considers that the application is acceptable subject to conditions. Two off-street car parking spaces are proposed which is the maximum provision allowed under the car parking standards set out in the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) for new developments outside the Controlled Parking Zone. Although this is not a new development this demonstrates that the level of provision is in accordance with policy. The site is in a sustainable location within cycling distance of the city centre and with access to good public transport links on Arbury Road.
- 8.16 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/10.

Third Party Representations

- 8.17 One representation suggests amendments to the design however I can only consider the application that has been proposed. Another representation states that one of the other properties in the close is owned by the same individual and is let out as a HMO which is badly maintained. However, the

ownership and maintenance of other properties is not a material planning consideration.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The revised proposal is acceptable as it would not have a significant adverse impact on the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers. The scale and design of the proposal is appropriate and it would not have a significant adverse impact on the character of the 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. 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 brick and tiles used in the construction in the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building in type, colour and texture.

Reason: To ensure that the extension is in keeping with the existing building (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, and 3/14).

5. No unbound material shall be used in the surface finish of the driveway within 6 metres of the highway boundary of the site.

Reason: To avoid displacement of loose material onto the highway in the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy 8/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

6. Notwithstanding the provision of Class A of Schedule 2, Part 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, (or any order revoking, amending or re-enacting that order) no gates shall be erected across the approved vehicular access unless details have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy 8/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

7. Prior to the commencement of the first use the vehicular access where it crosses the public highway shall be laid out and constructed in accordance with the Cambridgeshire County Council construction specification and shall thereafter be maintained as such.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory access into the site and in the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy 8/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

8. Prior to the commencement of first use the vehicular access hereby permitted shall be constructed with adequate drainage measures to prevent surface water run-off onto the adjacent public highway in accordance with a scheme submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with the Highway Authority, and shall thereafter be maintained as such.

Reason: To prevent surface water discharging to the highway in the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy 8/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

9. The access to the Highway shall be provided as shown on the approved drawings and retained free of obstruction.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy 8/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

INFORMATIVE: This development involves work to the public highway that will require the approval of the County Council as Highway Authority. It is an OFFENCE to carry out any works within the public highway, which includes a public right of way, without the permission of the Highway Authority. Please note that it is the applicant's responsibility to ensure that, in addition to planning permission, any necessary consents or approvals under the Highways Act 1980 and the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 are also obtained from the County Council.

INFORMATIVE: No part of any structure may overhang or encroach under or upon the public highway unless licensed by the Highway Authority and no gate / door / ground floor window shall open outwards over the public highway.

INFORMATIVE: Public Utility apparatus may be affected by this proposal. Contact the appropriate utility service to reach agreement on any necessary alterations, the cost of which must be borne by the applicant.