



Planning Committee Date	29 th March 2023
Report to	Cambridge City Council Planning Committee
Lead Officer	Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development
Reference	22/04055/HFUL
Site	90 Roseford Road, Cambridge, CB4 2HE
Ward / Parish	Arbury
Proposal	Two Storey Side Extension
Applicant	Mr & Mrs Szelag
Presenting Officer	Tom Chenery
Reason Reported to Committee	Called-in by Councillor Todd-Jones
Member Site Visit Date	N/A
Key Issues	1. Impact on the Character and Appearance 2. Neighbouring Amenity
Recommendation	APPROVE subject to conditions

1.0 Executive Summary

- 1.1 The application seeks to erect a two storey side extension to the existing two storey semi detached property known as 90 Roseford Road, Cambridge.
- 1.2 The proposal is not considered to cause harm to the character and appearance of the area and is designed appropriately.
- 1.3 The proposal is not considered to cause undue harm to the amenity or living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.
- 1.4 The proposal would not have any significant adverse effect upon the Public Highway and would not result in any undue highways safety implications.
- 1.5 Officers recommend that the Planning Committee **APPROVE** the application.

2.0 Site Description and Context

None-relevant	X	Tree Preservation Order	
Conservation Area		Local Nature Reserve	
Listed Building		Flood Zone 1	X
Building of Local Interest		Green Belt	
Historic Park and Garden		Protected Open Space	
Scheduled Ancient Monument		Controlled Parking Zone	
Local Neighbourhood and District Centre		Article 4 Direction	

*X indicates relevance

- 2.1 90 Roseford Road comprises a two storey semi detached dwellinghouse which benefits from parking to the front and a modest rear garden.
- 2.2 The prevailing character of Roseford Road consists of two storey semi-detached dwelling on a linear building line and are set back from the main road. A number of dwellings on Roseford Road benefit from two storey side extensions.
- 2.3 To the west of the site is attached to the host dwelling and part of the pair of semi detached dwellings. This dwelling benefits from a single storey side extension forming a garage.

2.4 To the east of the site is No. 92 Roseford Road, which is a two storey semi detached dwelling which benefits from a single storey side and rear extension up to the boundary.

3.0 The Proposal

3.1 The proposal seeks to erect a two storey side extension to the eastern elevation of the host dwelling. The proposal would extend up to the shared boundary with No.92 Roseford Road at ground floor level and would be set off this shared boundary by 250mm. The proposal would have the same ridge height as the host dwelling.

3.2 The application has been amended to address representations.

3.3 When submitted the proposal extended up to the shared boundary with No.92 Roseford Road, however, through positive engagement, the proposal has been reduced in width so that it is now set off the boundary at first floor level by 250mm.

4.0 Relevant Site History **None relevant**

Relevant Neighbouring Site History

Reference	Description	Outcome
C/79/0664	Erection of 2 storey extension to existing dwelling house	Approved
C/72/0376	Erection of single storey extension to existing dwelling house	Approved

5.0 Policy

5.1 National

National Planning Policy Framework 2021

National Planning Practice Guidance

National Design Guide 2021

Environment Act 2021

Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.

Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017

Equalities Act 2010

Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standard (2015)

Circular 11/95 (Conditions, Annex A)

5.2 Cambridge Local Plan 2018

Policy 1: The presumption in favour of sustainable development
Policy 3: Spatial strategy for the location of residential development
Policy 28: Sustainable design and construction, and water use
Policy 29: Renewable and low carbon energy generation
Policy 30: Energy-efficiency improvements in existing dwellings
Policy 31: Integrated water management and the water cycle
Policy 32: Flood risk
Policy 33: Contaminated land
Policy 34: Light pollution control
Policy 36: Air quality, odour and dust
Policy 55: Responding to context
Policy 56: Creating successful places
Policy 58: Altering and extending existing buildings

5.3 Supplementary Planning Documents

Biodiversity SPD – Adopted February 2022
Sustainable Design and Construction SPD – Adopted January 2020
Cambridgeshire Flood and Water SPD – Adopted November 2016

6.0 Consultations

None Relevant

7.0 Third Party Representations

7.1 1 representation have been received.

7.2 Those in objection have raised the following issues:

- Character, appearance and scale
- Density and overdevelopment
- Residential amenity impact (impacts on daylight, sunlight, enclosure, privacy, noise and disturbance, light pollution)
- Devaluing Property
- Issues extending in the future

8.0 Member Representations

8.1 Cllr Todd-Jones has made a representation objecting to the application on the following grounds:

- The proposal will result in the terracing effect
- Proposal would cause harm to character and appearance of the area
- Proposal is overbearing and causes overshadowing.

8.2 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations are available on the Council's website.

9.0 Assessment

9.1 Impact on the Character and Appearance of the area

9.2 Policies 55, 56 and 58 seek to ensure that development responds appropriately to its context, is of a high quality, reflects or successfully contrasts with existing building forms and materials and includes appropriate landscaping and boundary treatment.

9.3 The application site comprises a two storey semi-detached dwelling. The proposal seeks to erect a two storey side extension on the eastern elevation of the host dwelling. The proposal would be highly visible to the streetscene from the front and from public views.

9.4 Roseford Road comprises a residential area of two storey semi-detached dwellings on a similar building line with garden frontages and modest rear gardens. Dwellings are of a similar architectural stylings with an absence of any notable design features. A number of dwellings have benefitted from extensions to the side both at single storey and two storey level.

9.5 The proposed extension would be the same ridge height 7.8m as the host dwelling (5.1m to the eaves) and would extend some 3.1 from the side elevation of the existing dwelling at first floor level and approx. 3.4m at ground floor level.

9.6 The proposal would protrude up to the shared eastern boundary with No.92 Roseford Road to the east.

9.7 The originally submitted scheme sought for the proposal to extend up to the boundary at both single storey and second storey, however, through positive engagement with the applicant, the scheme has been reduced in scale at first floor level to be set off the boundary by 250mm.

9.8 Concerns have been raised by the Local Councillor as well as a neighbouring property regarding the proposals impact on the character and appearance of the area and would cause harm. The object also notes that the proposal would lead to the terracing effect and would reduce the distances between houses.

- 9.9 As highlighted Roseford Road is characterised by two storey dwellings of a similar scale and style with similar spaces between dwellings. A number of dwellings have benefitted for planning permission for side extensions both at ground floor and first floor which significantly reduces the gap between buildings with a number of instances that are evident within the immediate streetscene.
- 9.10 The applicant has provided a number of examples of these types of development at first floor level up to the boundary within the immediate streetscene. These include No.87 and 89 Roseford Road which have both gained permission (under application references C/88/1074 and C/72/0185 respectively) for two storey side extensions up to/close to the shared boundary with the adjacent neighbour. This has resulted in a gap between the dwellings of some 750mm. No.93 Roseford Road has also benefitted from a two storey side extension up to the shared boundary with the neighbour (application reference C/85/0115) which results in a gap of some 750mm but is attached at ground floor level. There are other examples within the streetscene where properties have been allowed to extend up to the boundary at first floor level and at ground floor level.
- 9.11 It is therefore considered that although previously there may have been a prevalent gap between dwellings, as a result of development and built form over the years, this is not a prominent feature within the streetscene and does not form part of the established character.
- 9.12 In regard to the terracing effect, the proposal would be set off the boundary at first floor level by 250mm and as such there would be a clear separation between the development and the boundary with the adjacent neighbour. The neighbouring property (No.92) currently benefits from a two storey side extension which is located some 1.2m from the shared boundary with the application site. This would result in a 1.45m separation distance between the proposal and the adjacent dwelling, a distance that would result in the separation between the two dwellings and would not result in the terracing effect. This distance is greater than others observed within the immediate streetscene and highlighted above. The proposal is therefore considered to maintain an acceptable distance between dwellings and would not be against the grain of the established character of the area.
- 9.13 Within the registered objection, it also notes that the development would restrict them from extended at first floor level. Although it is not possible to materially consider potential development in the future, the proposal has been designed as such so that irrespective of the scale of any proposed future development at the adjacent property (No.92), there would still be a gap between the dwellings and would not result in the terracing effect.
- 9.14 It is therefore considered that due to the scale and design of the proposal, it would be similar to other examples within the immediate streetscene and

as such would relate acceptably to the host dwelling and wider character and appearance of the area. The proposal would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area and would be compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 55, 56 and 58 as well as the NPPF.

9.15 Amenity

9.16 Policy 35, 50, 52, 53 and 58 seek to preserve the amenity of neighbouring occupiers in terms of noise and disturbance, overshadowing, overlooking or overbearing and through providing high quality internal and external spaces.

9.17 Neighbouring Properties

9.18 The principal dwelling to be impacted by the proposal is No.92 Roseford Road located to the east of the application site.

9.19 A site visit has been undertaken.

9.20 *Impact on No. 92*

9.21 The proposed development would be located on the shared boundary with No.92 Roseford Road at ground floor level but be set off the shared boundary by some 250mm. The proposal would be located some 1.45m from the dwelling itself.

9.22 No.92 benefits from a two storey side extension (approved under application reference C/72/0376) which is located some 1.2m off the shared boundary with the application site.

9.23 The proposed development would not protrude from the existing front building line of the host dwelling or from No.92. The proposal would also not protrude from the rear building line of the host dwelling. No.92 also benefits from a single storey rear extension which is located on and forms the shared boundary with No.90 Roseford Road.

9.24 The proposal would not extend beyond this rear extension and as such would not result in any loss of light, privacy or outlook to the windows on the rear elevation of No.92 Roseford Road.

9.25 In addition to this, as the proposal would not extend to the rear garden of the site, the proposal is not considered to cause any overbearing impact or overshadowing impact to the rear garden space of No.92 Roseford Road.

9.26 No.92 benefits from a window on the side/western elevation that direct faces the application site. The host dwelling at present also benefits from a window on the side elevation which directly faces this adjacent neighbour (No.92). The proposed development although extending closer to the

shared boundary would result in the removal of this window facing No.92 and as such the proposal is not considered to cause any undue loss of privacy to this adjacent neighbour.

- 9.27 A concern has been raised regarding the loss of light to the upper level side window mentioned above. Conversations with the neighbouring property indicate that this window serves a landing on the first floor. A landing is not considered to be a habitable room and as such although there would a degree of light lost to this window as it is not a habitable room, it is not considered to cause demonstratable harm to the amenity and living conditions of the neighbouring property.
- 9.28 Moreover, this upper level window experiences a loss of light by virtue of its relationship and orientation with the existing dwelling irrespective of any extensions/development.
- 9.29 A concern has also been raised by the registered objector and within the representation from the Local Councillor regarding the proposal would result in an unacceptable overbearing impact which would visually dominate the side entrance along the boundary.
- 9.30 This area is not considered to be a habitable area nor is it the main garden amenity space used by the neighbour. The area would still benefit from light from the front of the site. In addition to this, the host dwelling within the application site is already located in relatively close proximity to this area and result in a degree of overbearing impact already.
- 9.31 Therefore, for the reasons outlined above, the proposal is not considered to cause any undue loss of light, privacy, outlook, appear overbearing or result in any overshadowing to the adjacent neighbouring property No.92 Roseford Road.
- 9.32 All other neighbours are far enough removed from the property that it would not impact upon their amenity or living conditions.
- 9.33 Given the adjacent context, location, size, and design of the proposal it is compliant with Local Plan policies 55 and 58 regarding the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.
- 9.34 Third Party Representations**
- 9.35 The remaining third-party representations not addressed in the preceding paragraphs are summarised and responded to in the table below:

Third Party Comment	Officer Response
----------------------------	-------------------------

Devaluing of property	The loss of value to a property or neighbouring property is not a material consideration and as such can not be considered as part of the planning assessment.
Future Planning Applications	The submission of future planning applications and a proposals impact on these is purely speculative and are not a material planning consideration. As such it cannot be considered within the planning assessment
Right to light	A right to light is a civil matter between different landowners and a planning permission would not interfere with a right of light. The local planning authority has no jurisdiction in checking or enforcing a right to light. This is not a material planning consideration.

9.36 Other Matters

9.37 Car/Cycle Parking

9.38 The application site currently only benefits from 1 allocated parking space. There is ample space at the property for the parking of a vehicle. There is also space for cycle parking to be situated at the front of the site. The proposal would comply with Appendix L of the Local Plan.

9.39 Bin Storage

9.40 The Bin Storage arrangements at the site will be unaffected by the proposal.

9.41 Highways

9.42 The proposal does not seek to amend the existing access or result in any highways safety implications. As a result, the proposal would comply with Paragraphs 110-111 of the NPPF.

9.43 Planning Balance

9.44 Planning decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan unless there are material considerations that indicate otherwise (section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and section 38[6] of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

- 9.45 A strong and detailed objection has been raised by the neighbouring occupier at no.92 Roseford Road. However, despite the character, appearance and amenity issues raised, including but not limited to the personal circumstances of the objector's disabled aunt, officers do not consider that the additional enclosure of the side of the extended house and its impact on the street scene or the neighbouring amenity of no. 92 would be significantly harmful to warrant a refusal of planning permission.
- 9.46 Having taken into account the provisions of the development plan, NPPF and NPPG guidance, the views of statutory consultees and wider stakeholders, as well as all other material planning considerations, the proposed development is recommended for Approval.

10.0 Recommendation

10.1 Approve subject to:

-The planning conditions as set out below with minor amendments to the conditions as drafted delegated to officers.

11.0 Planning 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 materials to be used in the external construction of the development, hereby permitted, shall be constructed in external materials to match the existing building in type, colour and texture.

Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the development does not detract from the character and appearance of the area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55 and 58 (for extensions))
