

Application Number	21/00351/HFUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	27th January 2021	Officer	Charlotte Spencer
Target Date	24th March 2021		
Ward	Queen Ediths		
Site	100 Queen Ediths Way Cambridge		
Proposal	Ground floor rear extension, first floor rear extension, loft conversion with raised ridge height, rear dormer windows and internal alterations		
Applicant	Dr C Thippweswamy 100 Queen Ediths Way Cambridge		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>The proposal respects the character and proportions of the original building and surrounding context.</p> <p>The proposal respects the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties.</p> <p>The proposal complies with the Council’s Parking Standards.</p> <p>The proposal provides adequate protection for bats.</p>
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

1.1 The application relates to a two storey, detached dwelling house located to the South of Queen Ediths Way. The brick and tile dwelling is set back from the road by an area of hardstanding and soft landscaping which provides space to park two cars within the curtilage of the dwelling. To the rear

lies a garden area which acts as private amenity space for the occupiers of the dwelling.

- 1.2 The application property shares side boundaries to Nos. 98 and 102 Queen Ediths Way to the West and East respectively. To the rear lies the rear garden of No.1 Almoners Avenue.
- 1.3 The area is residential in character and appearance and there are no relevant constraints on the site.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The application is seeking planning permission for a ground floor rear extension, first floor rear extension, loft conversion with raised ridge height, rear dormer windows and internal alterations.
- 2.2 The single storey rear extension would project to the rear of the dwelling house by 4 metres and would span the full width of the dwelling house. It would be characterised by a hipped roof with a maximum height of 4.5 metres. The first floor rear extension would have a depth of 2.6 metres and would span for a width of 4 metres to adjoin the existing first floor rear extension.
- 2.3 The main ridge would be raised by 0.6 metres to a height of 7.8 metres and a new crown roof would be created to extend over the proposed first floor extension. A rear dormer would be installed on the rear roof slope. The box dormer would have a width of 3.7 metres, a height of 1.5 metres and a depth of 1.8 metres. Two front rooflights and one side rooflight to each side would be installed. The roof space would be converted to habitable use.
- 2.4 During the determination process, the front dormer was replaced with rooflights and the applicant confirmed that the dwelling would be used for a single household. In addition bat surveys have been submitted.
- 2.5 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:
 1. Drawings;
 2. Bat reports.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
C/03/0913	Two storey rear and single storey side extensions to existing dwelling house	PERM 15.10.2003

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 2018 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan 2018	1 3 55, 56, 58 70

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework February 2021 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014 Circular 11/95 (Annex A)
Material Considerations	<u>City Wide Guidance</u>

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Control)

6.1 No comment on behalf of the Highway Authority.

Nature Conservation Projects Officer

6.2 Following receipt of the bat reports, content with the survey effort and support the recommendation to provide one or more integrated bat boxes into development proposals. Can the proposed number, specification and locations be shown on a drawing for approval prior to determination or alternatively secured via condition.

6.3 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 Colin McGerty has commented on this application which is summarised as follows:

- The application impinges substantially on the amenity of the neighbouring properties as it further extends the already extended rear of the property;
- Would block the light to the rear of No.98;
- Concerned that the potential for use as an HMO should be avoided.

Cllr Colin McGerty has subsequently called in the application to Planning Committee.

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

- 98 Queen Ediths Way.

7.3 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- The application forms have not been filled in correctly in terms of trees/hedges, ecology and parking;

- The drawings are of a poor quality and no indication of the setting of the building and extensions in relation to neighbours;
- The site contains significant trees and the scale of the development appear to pose a risk to these;
- A tree survey should be submitted and reviewed by the tree officer;
- Should be noted that trees have been cut down prior to the submission;
- The area is known to have good ecological activity;
- An ecological survey should be carried out;
- The site currently has parking for two cars which cannot be enough for a potential nine bedroomed property;
- Is this a HMO;
- The dormers would cause an overlooking issue for neighbours;
- Dormers are not normal in terms of proposed size;
- The raised roof will create overshadowing issue;
- Wall alongside boundary will impact light and outlook;
- Request a light and shadowing study be conducted;
- There are no houses with pseudo roofs of three storeys with ugly dormers;
- The design is against the grain of development of the whole area;
- Damage the pleasant townscape;
-
- Party wall agreements should be put in place before work starts;
- Building times should be imposed by condition.

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 The main planning issues to be considered in the report are as follows:

1. Context of the site, design and external spaces;
2. Residential Amenity;
3. Car parking;
4. Other Matters
5. Third Party Representations

Context of site, design and external spaces

- 8.2 Policies 55, 56, and 58 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) seek to ensure that development responds appropriately to its context, is of a high quality, and reflects or successfully contrasts with existing building forms and materials.
- 8.3 Queen Ediths Way comprises a mixture of predominantly detached houses which vary in size, height and design. The raising of the roof would be limited to 0.6 metres and due to the variety of ridge heights of the nearby properties, it is considered it would not appear out of keeping within the street scene. The alterations to the roof would result in a crown roof which would be different to the existing dual pitched roof, however, it is considered that the crown element would not appear overly different to the existing roof form when viewed from the street scene. It is considered that the rooflights would not have a material impact on visual appearance of the existing property.
- 8.4 The roof extension would involve the installation of a dormer on the rear roof plane. Appendix E of the Cambridge Local Plan provides advice for the design of roof extensions. It states that roof extensions should relate well to the proportions, roof form and massing of the existing house and should not over dominate the roof. It is considered that the proposed dormer would not over dominate the rear roof plane as it would be set in from the eaves, sides and ridge. In addition, the dormer would not be visible from the public realm and a number of properties within the area benefit from larger rear dormers. As such, it is considered the dormer is visually acceptable.
- 8.5 The single storey element would have a depth of 4 metres from the existing rear wall. It is noted that it would be attached to an existing rear extension and so it would have a maximum depth of approximately 7.8 metres from the original property. However, as this element would be single storey only it is considered that it would read as a subordinate addition. Whilst it would have a large maximum height it is considered it would have limited visual impact as it would not be visible from the public realm. The first floor element would infill the gap between the original property and the existing first floor extension. It would be limited to 2.6 metres in depth and would not project rearwards of the existing rear element. Subsequently, it is considered that it would not overdominate the existing building.

The works at the rear would not be visible from the street scene, and many properties along Queen Ediths Way have benefit from extensions of varying sizes and designs.

- 8.6 Therefore, it is considered that on balance, the proposal would have an acceptable level of impact on the character and appearance of the existing property, street scene and surrounding area. The proposal is compliant in design terms with Policies 55, 56 and 58 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.7 Policy 58 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) permits extensions and / or alterations to existing buildings provided they do not unacceptably overlook, overshadow or visually dominate neighbouring properties.
- 8.8 The rear extensions would be located 1 metre from the shared boundary with No.102 Queen Ediths Way. The first floor element would not project past the existing rear wall of this neighbouring property and so it is considered it would have limited impact. The ground floor extension would project 4 metres from the ground floor of this neighbour, however due to the limited height of eaves along the boundary, it is considered that the proposed rear extension is unlikely to give rise to any significant amenity impacts in terms of overlooking, overshadowing, or enclosure to No.102.
- 8.9 The rear extensions would be built up to the shared boundary line with No.98 Queen Ediths Way and approximately 1.4 metres from this adjacent dwelling. The first floor rear extension would be on the opposite side of the existing extension and so would not have an impact on this neighbour. The single storey rear extension would not project rearwards of the rear wall of this property, however, No.98 does benefit from side facing ground floor windows close to the proposed extension. However, this has been confirmed by the objector that this window serves a kitchen and due to the low eaves height and small gradient of the roof slope it would not intersect the 25 degree vertical line. It is also noted that there is a ground floor window on the rear elevation which is understood to also serve this area. The height of the eaves would be only 0.3 metres

higher than the maximum height of a boundary treatment that would not require planning permission. Subsequently, whilst it is acknowledged that the single storey extension would have some impact on the side windows of No.98 Queen Ediths Way, it is considered that the impact would not be great enough to warrant a refusal.

- 8.10 The extensions to the roof including the raising of the ridge and dormer would not project rearwards of the roof planes of either neighbouring property. As such, it is considered it would have a limited impact on the amenities of the adjacent dwellings.
- 8.11 One first floor side facing window would be relocated on the western flank elevation. This window serves a landing area, and so it is considered reasonable to add a condition to ensure that this window is obscurely glazed to protect the privacy of No.102 Queen Ediths Way. Concerns have been raised regarding the loss of privacy from the proposed dormer windows. Gardens in a built up area would have some level of overlooking from first floor windows of nearby properties. Whilst it is noted that the proposed dormer would result in windows at a higher level, they are angled to face down the host properties garden and would not allow for direct views over either neighbours' patio area. As such, it is considered that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable level of overlooking.
- 8.12 Concerns have been raised regarding the construction impacts of the proposal. The scheme is, however, relatively small in scale and such impacts are likely to be limited to a temporary period. Whilst there may be impacts arising from construction related activities that would give rise to some harm to the amenity of nearby occupiers, the level of harm would not be significant.
- 8.13 Subsequently, it is considered that the proposal would have an acceptable level of impact on the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties by reason of loss of light, loss of outlook, sense of dominance or loss of privacy. It is considered it is compliant with Policies 56 and 58 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

Car and Cycle Parking

- 8.14 Policy 82 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) states that developments should comply with the Council's Parking Standards. Appendix L states that dwelling houses of 3 or more bedrooms outside of the controlled parking zone should have a maximum of 2 spaces per dwelling.
- 8.15 Concerns have been raised about the availability of parking for a potential nine-bed dwelling house. However, the existing property benefits from two off street parking spaces and the proposal would not involve any loss of parking. As such, the maximum amount of car parking spaces for this dwelling is provided and so the proposal is compliant with Policy 82 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

Other Matters

- 8.16 The applicant has provided bat surveys and reports and the Council's Ecology Officer has confirmed they are content with the information and is in agreement with the recommendations to provide one or more integrated bat boxes. The details of the bat boxes have not been provided on the plans, however, as it is considered that the location and number of boxes would not impact the recommendation, it is reasonable to request this information by way of condition. Subject to this condition, it is considered that the application complies with Policy 70 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).
- 8.17 Concerns have been raised regarding the impact on the trees on the site. Whilst no information regarding any potential impact on trees has been submitted, it is noted that the trees and hedges on the site are not protected and so can be removed without permission from the Council. As such, it would not be reasonable to request this information.
- 8.18 Concerns have been raised regarding the size of the property following development and that it would be turned into a House of Multiple Occupation. The applicant has confirmed that the dwelling would be used for a single household and not a HMO. As the proposal is for the extension to a dwelling house any potential future uses cannot be considered. It is also noted that a HMO of this size would require separate planning permission

for a change of use. In that instance the impact of having a HMO on this site would be considered.

Third Party Representations

- 8.19 The majority of the neighbour objections have been discussed in the report above.
- 8.20 The plans have been drawn to scale and officers were able to consider the proposal based on the plans submitted and as such the quality of the plans are sufficient. A block plan has been submitted to show the relationship between the proposed extension and neighbouring properties.
- 8.21 Party Wall concerns are a civil matter between different landowners in which the local planning authority has no role. The Party Wall Act 1996 governs the process by which party walls and associated disputes are handled. However, an informative can be added to remind the applicant of the requirements within the Party Wall Act.

9.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE, subject to 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 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by 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 development, hereby permitted, shall not be occupied until the proposed first floor windows in the east elevation of the

development have, apart from any top hung vent, been fitted with obscured glazing (meeting as a minimum Pilkington Standard level 3 or equivalent in obscurity and shall be fixed shut or have restrictors to ensure that the windows cannot be opened more than 45 degrees beyond the plane of the adjacent wall. The glazing shall thereafter be retained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To prevent overlooking of the adjoining properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 57/58).

4. No development above ground level shall commence until a scheme for the provision of bat boxes has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of box numbers, specification and their location. No dwelling shall be occupied until nest boxes have been provided for that property in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To conserve and enhance ecological interests. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 57).