

(CCC) Planning Application: 20/03795/HFUL

I note that the Application Delegated Report for the previous application appears to be incomplete.

Could the council please send me:

1. the shading diagram(s) used in 8.7. to calculate there was no additional overshadowing impact and that sufficient light levels would be received.
2. the assessment against conformation with Local Plan Guidance Appendix E: Roof extensions design guide, which appears to be missing.
3. the plan of the root protection area (report says zone) as used in the response on 8.14 Line 2 as well as the evidence supporting categorisation of the amenity value of the trees?

Response:

BRE (Building Research Establishment) document 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A guide to good practice (2011)' is used as a guide to help Officers' assess whether a planning proposal requires further detailed information in the form of a daylight sunlight study. The guide states to use of the 45 degree test vertically and horizontally for extensions perpendicular to a habitable window. This 45 degree plane was in this instance taken from the proposed parapet wall vertically and the rearmost wall of the proposed extension horizontally to see if it crossed the centrepoint of the adjacent kitchen opening. BRE guidance states that if the proposal fails both the vertical and horizontal 45 degree test, it is likely that a daylight and sunlight study is required to make a full assessment. However, if this is not the case, daylight and sunlight levels are unlikely to be adversely affected because light will continue to be received either over the roof or beyond the end of the extension. In the case of 75 Brampton Road the vertical 45 degree plane did not cross the mid-point of the adjacent kitchen opening and thus, it was concluded that the overshadowing impact would not be significant, in line with the BRE guidance. The link to the BRE factsheet detailing this is here. <https://www.right-of-light.co.uk/resources/factsheet-1/>

Paragraph 8.1 states that whilst the proposed rear dormer would divert from appendix E of the Local Plan (the Roof Extension Design Guide), by virtue of Class B of the General Permitted Development Order 2015 as amended, a rear box dormer of a similar scale, massing and design can be achieved under permitted development (without the need of planning permission). This holds significant weight within the assessment. I hope this addresses this point, however, if you have any further queries do let me know.

There was no plan which showed the extent of the root protection zone for this tree. However, when out on site, it was clear that, due to the siting (rear garden location, behind an existing single storey garage) and scale of the tree, the tree was not very visible from public viewpoints (with only glimpse views from the rear access road and perhaps in long range views from the neighbouring allotment although very obscure views). Therefore, the trees amenity value would be limited to views from surrounding residential gardens, given its limited visibility in public

FOI Ref

8406

Response sent

11 Jan 2021

views, and the public amenity value of the tree is minimal.

Further queries on this matter should be directed to foi@cambridge.gov.uk