
MAIN CASE

Reference No: 18/00770/FUL

Proposal: Loft conversion and rear extension

Site Address: 33 Cambridge Road Ely Cambridgeshire CB7 4HJ

Applicant: Mr S Paragon

Case Officer: Catherine Looper, Planning Officer

Parish: Ely

Ward: Ely East
Ward Councillor/s: Councillor Richard Hobbs
Councillor Lis Every

Date Received: 7 June 2018 **Expiry Date:** 04/10/2018

[T102]

1.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

- 1.1 Members are recommended to APPROVE the application subject to the recommended conditions below. The conditions can be read in full on the attached appendix 1.
1. Approved Plans
 2. Time Limit
 3. Materials
 4. PD- Restriction – Windows
 5. PD- Restriction – Extensions
 6. Obscure glazing

2.0 **SUMMARY OF APPLICATION**

- 2.1 The application seeks consent for a single storey rear extension and loft conversion, including a dormer window to the rear aspect of the roof. The application also seeks an alteration to the pitch of the roof at the rear of the dwelling, which will extend the side elevation of the rear element of the dwelling by 1.3m. The proposed single storey rear extension would bring the side elevation of the dwelling closer to the south boundary of the site, and would extend the ground floor level by 4m further into the garden area.
- 2.2 The full planning application, plans and documents submitted by the Applicant can be viewed online via East Cambridgeshire District Council’s Public Access online

service, via the following link <http://pa.eastcambs.gov.uk/online-applications/>. **Alternatively a paper copy is available to view at the East Cambridgeshire District Council offices, in the application file.**

2.3 The application has been called into Planning Committee by Councillor Richard Hobbs.

3.0 PLANNING HISTORY

00/00613/FUL	Extension to rear forming utility room	Approved	01.09.2000
17/01395/FUL*	Loft conversion, dormer window and rear extension	Refused	08.06.2018

*Please note application 17/01395/FUL was approved at Planning Committee on 4th January 2018. The application was then subject to Judicial Review and the decision was quashed. Following this the application was presented to Committee again and refused on 8th June 2018.

4.0 THE SITE AND ITS ENVIRONMENT

4.1 The site is located within the Conservation Area of Ely and comprises a two storey detached dwelling constructed from red brickwork with a large bay window and recessed porch to the front aspect. The dwelling has white arches and cills around the windows, and a white archway above the recessed porch. The property is under an Article 4 Direction which restricts development permitted under Classes A, C, D, F(a) of Schedule 2 Part 1, and Classes A and C of Schedule 2 Part 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015. Cambridge Road is characterised by large dwellings which are positioned closely together. The dwellings are generally set back from the public highway with a small amenity space to the front.

5.0 RESPONSES FROM CONSULTEES

5.1 Responses were received from the following consultees and these are summarised below. The full responses are available on the Council's web site.

Consultee For Other Wards In Parish - No Comments Received

Senior Trees Officer - I have no concerns in relation to this proposal as we have recently approved an application for trees near the property for removal, therefore I do not perceive a tree impact.

Parish – The City of Ely Council recommends refusal of this application on the grounds of a number of large windows to the rear of the property, which will overlook the neighbouring properties and cause a loss of privacy. Another piece of

land is identified as a parking area, but members believe that this was refused planning permission to be used as off-street parking. It was felt the amendments did not address the Council's concerns.

Conservation Officer – The conservation area appraisal has described Cambridge Road as a residential street with mainly large and imposing dwellings running the whole length of the road. The number of substantial buildings give this part of the city a dignified and welcoming entrance to the historic city. There is no predominant materials found in this part of Cambridge Road other than a variety of gault and red brick as walling materials and slate and tile for roofing materials. The character of the area therefore is given over to large villas of no particular style but dating from 19th and 20th century.

The proposed single storey rear extension is considered to be designed to have minimal impact on the character of the conservation area given its flat roof profile which will cause no harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area. The rear building line of this row of villas already stretches deep into the rear gardens. However, there could be scope for upstand on the roof light to be reduced.

The extension will hardly be visible from the public domain between number 33 and 35 given the view is at an oblique angle from the public roadway.

The view from the opposite direction walking down Cambridge Road from numbers 27 towards 31a and with views into the rear of 33 are considered not to cause harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area especially set against the current soft landscaping.

Arguably the current car parking to the side of 31a and to the front of 31 has a more impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area than the proposed single storey rear extension.

- 6.2 A site notice was posted on 8th May 2018 and an advert was placed in the Cambridge News on 10th May 2018.
- 6.3 Neighbours – Six neighbouring properties were notified by post and the responses received from three properties are summarised below. A total of five responses have been received. A full copy of the responses are available on the Council's website.

Residential Amenity

- The increase in built form is overbearing on neighbouring occupiers.
- The proposals will increase overlooking to neighbouring occupiers.
- Neighbouring properties will have an outlook of brick walls.
- The orientation of the houses means that rear elevations face each other.
- The proposals will create overshadowing.
- The drawings show the intervisibility of the windows to the rear.
- The proposals will create a feeling of enclosure to neighbouring occupiers.

- An increase in the height of the fence will have a major impact on the neighbouring garden as it will be increasingly enclosed.
- The plans do not show that the obscure glazed sections of the ground floor windows will be fixed shut and does not prevent overlooking.
- The proposal will create a 12m long façade along the boundary with neighbouring occupiers.

Visual Amenity

- The houses in this area contribute to the distinctive character of settled peace and have sufficient outdoor space. The proposal removes a significant fraction of the house's garden area and undermines the character of the whole group.
- The proposal would create overdevelopment of the plot and is out of scale.
- To build a further extension albeit that this is single storey will be an ugly addition to the present building.

Conservation Area

- There are no changes to the proposals which mean the assessment is any different, and as such would again fail to adhere to the guidance within the NPPF where harm to both designated and undesignated Heritage Assets needs to be weighed against any public benefits from the development proposals.

Parking

- Parking is an issue in the area already.
- The change of garden space to parking space is contrary to policy and regulation.
- The land identified for parking exits onto Cambridge Road over the pavement in a dangerous location between parked cars and a cul-de-sac.

Other Matters

- The house is used as a House of Multiple Occupancy.
- Additional rooms will be rented out.
- The house does not have the relevant planning permissions to be used as an HMO.
- There is no planning permission for the use of the conservatory as a separate dwelling house.
- The only time that occupancy levels have dropped is during the planning application periods.
- The use as an HMO is contrary to regulations.
- The unlawful use of the house has a detrimental impact on neighbouring occupiers.
- Neighbours already experience a greater level of disturbance than would be expected from a conventional family home.
- The nature and use of rooms are all living and sleeping areas.
- Increasing the occupancy of the house will impact on neighbouring occupiers.
- The proposals appear to be maximising the available floor area.

- There is no guarantee that the 2m fence will remain in place as it would be detrimental to daylight in 33 Cambridge Road.
- A secondary fence would prevent maintenance of the existing fence.
- The proposal presents a fire risk to neighbouring properties due to the proximity.
- The proposals create a 21m long narrow dark alleyway adjacent to Number 35. The flat roof extension also provides easy access to neighbouring gardens. These points are not addressed by this application.

6.0 The Planning Policy Context

6.1 *East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015*

ENV 2 Design

ENV 11 Conservation Areas

6.2 *Supplementary Planning Documents*

Design Guide

6.3 *National Planning Policy Framework 2018*

12 Achieving well-designed places

16 Conserving & enhancing the historic environment

6.4 *Submitted Local Plan 2017*

LP27 Conserving and Enhancing Heritage Assets

LP22 Achieving Design Excellence

7.0 PLANNING COMMENTS

- 7.1 The previous application 17/01395/FUL was refused at Planning Committee on 8th June 2018 on four grounds. The current application has been submitted to try to overcome those four reasons for refusal and this will be addressed throughout the report. The main changes included the removal of the Juliet balcony to the rear at first floor level, the removal of the vertical element of the first floor side windows and rooflights, and the removal of one window at ground floor in the side elevation.
- 7.2 It should be noted that the application has been subject to amendments since it was first received which include a reduction in the width of the ground floor extension and the obscure glazing of upper panes in side-facing windows.
- 7.3 The main considerations are the impact the proposal may have on the residential amenity of nearby occupiers and the impact it may have on the visual appearance and character of the Conservation Area.

7.4 Residential Amenity

- 7.5 Policy ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and policy LP22 of the Submitted Local Plan 2017 require that proposals should ensure that there are no significantly detrimental effects on the residential amenity of nearby occupiers.
- 7.6 The proposed ground floor extension would protrude into the garden by 4 metres from the rear elevation and increase the width of the ground floor of the rear protruding element. This would feature a flat roof, with a maximum height of 2.9m and would leave a gap of 1.8m between the rear extension and the south boundary. Windows are proposed in the south elevation at ground floor level, which face Number 35, however the upper panes of these windows would be obscure glazing to prevent overlooking. It is considered necessary to secure this as a condition and also that the upper panes will be fixed shut, leaving the lower panes to be openable. It should be noted that the number of windows in the ground floor side elevation has been reduced from three (in application 17/01395/FUL) to two in the current application.
- 7.7 At first floor level, the rear extension widens the existing first floor element by approximately 1.3m, and the pitch of the roof has changed accordingly. This is to provide larger bathroom areas and a wider bedroom area. The applicant proposes velux rooflights in the south elevation at first floor level. This will prevent significant overlooking to neighbouring occupiers. The proposed alterations to the first floor will reduce the space between the dwelling and the neighbouring occupier to the south, however this will be by approximately 1.3m and is not considered sufficiently harmful to residential amenity to warrant refusal of the application. The extension has been designed to continue the slope of the roof and does not involve the erection of a full height wall at first floor level. Since the previous application, the agent has removed the vertical windows at first floor level in the side elevation and only proposes rooflights. The previous Juliet balcony has also been removed from the plans, and the existing window remains.
- 7.8 The application also includes the introduction of a box dormer window to the rear roof slope. This measures 4.7m in width and features three panes. This will create an increased level of overlooking, but this is not considered to be significantly detrimental to residential amenity due to the existing presence of windows at the rear of the dwelling which already allow views into neighbouring gardens. The potential for additional windows in the future can be controlled by condition, to prevent overlooking impacts on neighbouring residential dwellings.
- 7.9 The single storey element of the proposed extension features a flat roof with a maximum height of 2.9m. This is set back from the south boundary line by approximately 1.8m. While the uppermost part of the proposed extension would be visible above the boundary fencing, this is not considered to be significantly overbearing or create a loss of light to the adjacent neighbour, due to its position north of the neighbouring dwelling at Number 35. The proposed extension at first floor level increases the width of the proposed extension by approximately 1.3m. The existing pitch of the roof would be extended down to cover the short extension to the side, and would finish approximately 2.7m from the boundary line. The small extension to the first floor section of the property will be visible from the neighbouring dwelling of Number 35 but is not considered to be significantly

overbearing or create a loss of light which is detrimental to neighbouring occupiers' quality of life. It should be noted that under permitted development a boundary fence could be erected up to 2m in height.

- 7.10 Concerns have also been raised about the level of overlooking created by the proposal, and the amount of overbearing and sense of enclosure. Neighbours are concerned that adjacent gardens will be overlooked, resulting in a loss of privacy and enjoyment. There are also concerns that the side-facing windows will completely overlook neighbouring gardens. There are two existing side-facing windows at first floor level, one of which is inter-visible glass, and it is proposed to replace these with three velux rooflights in the roof slope. The plans show these windows are to serve bathrooms and a bedroom. The use of rooflights is considered sufficient to prevent significant levels of overlooking as the cill height would be located at a minimum of 1.7m above floor level, to protect residential amenity.
- 7.11 There are concerns that the ground floor extension is significant and will result in a new 13m long façade. Comments have been received to say that the extension is very dominant and will increase the feeling of enclosure to neighbouring properties. There are also concerns that the extensions would dominate the outlook from neighbouring windows due to the proximity to the boundary. As set out in paragraph 7.5, the single storey element of the proposed extension features a flat roof with a maximum height of 2.9m, which is set back from the boundary by approximately 1.8m. While the uppermost part of the proposed extension would be visible above the boundary fencing, this is not considered to be significant enough to cause overbearing or contribute to an increased sense of enclosure to neighbouring properties. The proposed windows would be positioned behind the boundary fencing, and the upper panes of these windows would be obscure glazing, limiting direct views of the neighbouring property. A condition can be imposed to ensure that these remain obscurely glazed in perpetuity and also that only the lower panes are openable. The extension at first floor level would increase the width of the first floor element by 1.3m, and the existing roof pitch would be lengthened accordingly to accommodate this increase. This extension is not of a scale that would significantly increase the level of overbearing or sense of enclosure created by the existing house. Neighbours are concerned that the proposals would remove any distance outlook from their properties and leave only short distance outlooks. Due to the existing two-storey element of the dwelling, certain views from neighbouring properties are restricted at present. The proposed extension to the first floor element is small in scale and is not considered to worsen the relationship between the dwelling and neighbouring properties. There are existing windows at first floor level which overlook neighbouring gardens, not only in the host dwelling but also other dwellings within the vicinity, and therefore the addition of a dormer window to the roof slope is not considered to significantly increase this level of overlooking. The Supplementary Planning Document, Design Guide, recommends that rear inter-visible windows should be a minimum of 20m in distance apart. The rear elevation of the proposed extensions is approximately 25m from the rear boundary of the property and therefore this accords with the Design Guide SPD.
- 7.12 Neighbours have raised concerns that the increase in height of boundary fencing would create an increased feeling of enclosure. It should be noted that a fence of

up to 2m could be installed under permitted development. Concerns have been raised that the proposal creates a narrow alleyway between the properties and that this creates a security risk. Neighbours are also concerned that the flat roof element of the extension will also allow access to neighbouring properties. The private security of dwellings, including access to private gardens, is not a matter that would influence a planning decision and is a private matter for property owners to manage.

7.13 Visual Amenity

7.14 The proposed alterations to the dwelling will not be highly visible from the public highway of Cambridge Road as only the northern elevations of the dwelling are visible. The length of the rear element at first floor level is not being increased, and views of the ground floor extension would be limited by the boundary treatments of the property and the neighbouring property at Number 31a. The application form states that materials will be used which match the original dwelling, and therefore the proposal will not appear uncoordinated.

7.15 Concerns have been raised during the neighbour consultation regarding the visual impact of the proposal. These concerns include that the properties in the vicinity have a distinctive form and character, and the proposals would remove a significant fraction of the house's garden, preventing this from being used as an outdoor amenity and undermining the character of the whole group of properties. The concerns state that proposed extensions would feel crowded and out of scale in the setting of the neighbouring properties, and that the proposals are out of context with a conventional C3 or C4 home. Neighbours have commented that all similar properties have been extended at single storey level, but not the full width of the house, which has maintained the spacing and openness for neighbours. It was noted by neighbours that Number 33 is the only house to have already been extended beyond the others at 2 storey scale, and is dominant over neighbouring properties. The rear private amenity space of Number 33 is still over 50m² and remains in accordance with the Design Guide SPD. While the design of the extension to the rear of Number 33 is different to other dwellings in the vicinity, the layout of the proposed works at first floor would not be significantly dissimilar to neighbouring properties. Neighbours dispute that the proposed works would not be seen from the public highway, and say that these would be clearly visible in the gap between the Numbers 33 and 35. The proposed extension at ground floor level would be set in the from the side elevation of the existing dwelling and while this may be partially visible from certain aspects when viewed from Cambridge Road, these views are minimal and would not significantly alter the appearance of the dwelling within the street scene.

7.16 Historic Environment

7.17 Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 gives Local Authorities a general duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of Conservation Areas.

7.18 Policy ENV11 of the Local Plan and policy LP28 of the Submitted Local Plan 2017 require that development proposals within Conservation Areas be of a particularly high standard of design and materials. When assessing the impact of a proposed

development on a heritage asset, the more important the asset, the greater weight should be. For example, a Grade I, Grade II*, or a Grade II listed building should be afforded greater weight than a conservation area. The NPPF states that “Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.”

- 7.19 The Conservation Area Appraisal has described Cambridge Road as a residential street with mainly large and imposing dwellings running the whole length of the road. The number of substantial buildings give this part of the city a dignified and welcoming entrance to the historic city. There is no predominant materials found in this part of Cambridge Road other than a variety of gault and red brick as walling materials and slate and tile for roofing materials. The character of the area therefore is given over to large villas of no particular style but dating from 19th and 20th century.
- 7.20 The heritage asset in relation to this application is the Ely Conservation Area. It is considered that the proposed extensions would not impact on the significance of this heritage asset (Ely Conservation Area) and this is concurred with by the Conservation Officers comments, who in their view states that most of the proposal will not be visible from the public domain. They consider the proposal to be acceptable and not to have a detrimental impact on the significance, character and appearance of the Conservation Area. They have advised that the proposals satisfy the provisions of Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 the aims of Section 16 of the NPPF
- 7.21 The proposal would be sympathetic to the surrounding area and the street scene in terms of the materials proposed and will not be highly visible from the street scene of Cambridge Road. Officers consider that the proposal will not lead to substantial harm or the loss of significance of the heritage asset. The proposed demolition of the conservatory is considered acceptable and a benefit as it has no architectural, historic or visual significance. In contrast, the proposal comprises a high standard of design and materials in order to preserve the character of the conservation area as stated within policy ENV11 of the Local Plan, 2015 which is a further benefit. Views of the proposed works from the heritage asset will not be evident or will only be limited, due to the location of the extensions, and the existing 2 storey element in situ, boundary treatments and the positioning/location of the dwelling in the conservation area. In view of this it is considered that there would no harm to the conservation area so there is no requirement to weigh the public benefits against any harm.
- 7.22 Highway Safety
- 7.23 Concerns have been raised during the neighbour consultation regarding the parking arrangements for the property. The proposal is for extensions to the property and therefore is not required to provide additional parking provision. Concerns have been raised that the area of land outlined in red to the north of the dwelling is not a parking area owned by the applicant, however the applicant has stated that they own the land. Further concerns have been raised regarding the use of the property and that this may be used as an HMO. Neighbours have objected to the extension of the property as an increase to the living space provided may increase the

number of tenants and have a negative impact on the demand for parking in the area. The use of the property is for a C3/C4 dwellinghouse, and this has not been changed under a planning application. The proposals considered by this application are to an existing C3/C4 dwellinghouse, and additional parking provision would not be requested as part of an application such as this due to the existing parking situation. The use of the property has been raised with the Planning Enforcement Team as a separate matter and this is being investigated.

7.24 Neighbours have raised concerns that the parking shown on the plans exits onto Cambridge Road in a dangerous location and has no turning provision. Additional comments received state that the parking shown is only suitable for one large vehicle, and that parking on Cambridge Road is already a problem as it is on-street only. Further comments indicate that this area is actually garden land, and that the additional pressures on parking would have a significant negative public amenity impact. In any event, land ownership issues are not a material planning consideration and would not affect the determination of an application. The application does not propose parking or provide the necessary details for this to be considered, and therefore any grant of permission does not include permission for a new parking area.

7.25 Other Matters

7.26 A number of concerns have been raised by neighbours regarding the use of the property. These state that the property is used as an HMO and that by extending the property there is potential for subdivision of the property to increase tenants rooms and occupancy. Neighbour comments state that there is a separate dwelling unit in the form of the conservatory to the rear. Neighbours anticipate that the number of occupants will significantly increase. Neighbours are also concerned that additional accommodation will cause more noise pollution due to tenants coming and going at all times of the day and night. Neighbours have commented that the present level of occupancy is approximately 10, sometimes 13, and is broadly peaceful, but that the increase in accommodation mean that there could be 20 or more adults living in what is supposed to be a family home. In addition, it is noted that the occupants create a regular low level noise nuisance, but that the increase in occupancy will make this more frequent and troublesome. Neighbours have also commented that the impacts on the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers is exacerbated by the manner in which the property is used, as rooms are used as bedsits, and that the use should be addressed as part of the application.

7.27 It should be noted that the lawful use of the property is for a C3/C4 dwellinghouse, and this has not been changed under a planning application. Therefore the proposals considered by this application are to an existing C3/C4 dwellinghouse which can accommodate not more than 6 residents as a HMO. The use of the property has been investigated previously and the applicant has been advised that no more than 6 residents can reside in the property.

7.28 Other concerns raised by neighbours include the relationship between the proposal and the neighbouring dwellings. These concerns discuss the close proximity of the proposed works to the neighbouring properties, and that this poses an increased

fire risk. The proposed extensions do not sit any closer to the neighbouring dwellings than the existing main body of the house.

7.29 The Public Sector Equality Duty is a consideration in planning applications to ensure the quality of life of people with additional needs is maintained. That duty, in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, is to have due regard to the need to (i) eliminate discrimination and other prohibited conduct under the Act; (ii) to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share relevant protected characteristics and those who do not; and (iii) to foster good relations between such persons. The duty is to have due regard to these three aims. The impacts on the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers, including at least one who may share relevant protected characteristics, has been considered at length in section 7.4 - 7.12 of this report and the Council has demonstrated due regard for the impacts of this proposal on such persons. In addition, it has been suggested that at least some of the current occupiers of the application property may also be persons who share relevant protected characteristics as defined in s149. However, given that the application, if approved, is likely to result in some improvements to the property with little or no identified detriment to such persons, it is considered that due regard has been had to the impact of the proposal on such persons.

7.30 Planning Balance

7.31 On balance, the proposal is considered to comply with both local and national planning policy and does not cause harm to the heritage asset which is Ely Conservation Area. The lack of parking weighs against the proposal, however this remains unchanged from the current arrangement. The proposal is not considered to create significantly harmful impacts to the neighbouring dwellings or on the visual amenity and character and appearance of the conservation area. On balance, this application is therefore recommended for approval.

8.0 APPENDICES

8.1 Appendix 1 – Recommended conditions

<u>Background Documents</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Contact Officer(s)</u>
17/01395/FUL	Catherine Looper Room No. 011 The Grange	Catherine Looper Planning Officer 01353 665555 catherine.looper@eastcambs.gov.uk
00/00613/FUL	Ely	

National Planning Policy Framework - https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf

East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 - <http://www.eastcambs.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Local%20Plan%20April%202015%20-%20front%20cover%20and%20inside%20front%20cover.pdf>

APPENDIX 1 - 18/00770/FUL Conditions

- 1 Development shall be carried out in accordance with the drawings and documents listed below

Plan Reference	Version No	Date Received
EDG/15/40/1G		8th August 2018
EDG/15/40/2A		7th June 2018

- 1 Reason: To define the scope and extent of this permission.
- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be commenced within 3 years of the date of this permission.
- 2 Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended.
- 3 The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces, including walls, doors, windows and the roof, shall be as specified on the application form. All works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 3 Reason: To safeguard the special architectural or historic interest, character and appearance and integrity of the Conservation Area, in accordance with policies ENV2 and ENV11 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP22 and LP27 of the Submitted Local Plan 2017.
- 4 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(England) Order 2015 (or any order amending, revoking or re-enacting that Order), no windows, dormer windows, rooflights or openings of any other kind, other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be constructed at first floor level or above in any elevations.
- 4 Reason: To safeguard the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers, in accordance with policy ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP22 of the Submitted Local Plan 2017.
- 5 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order amending, revoking or re-enacting that Order), the dwelling shall not be extended in any way, and no structures shall be erected within the curtilage of the dwelling.
- 5 Reason: To safeguard the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers, in accordance with policy ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP22 of the Submitted Local Plan 2017.
- 6 The upper panes in the ground floor side elevation (south) windows shall be obscure glazed and fixed shut. This shall remain in perpetuity. Only the lower panes, as shown in drawing EDG/15/40 1G received 8th August 2018 shall be openable and inter-visible glass.

- 6 Reason: To safeguard the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers, in accordance with policy ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and LP22 of the Submitted Local Plan 2017.