

WEST/CENTRAL AREA COMMITTEE MEETING – 20TH AUGUST 2009

Pre-Committee Amendment Sheet

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: 12.1 APPLICATION REF: 09/0550/FUL

Location: 37a Castle Street, Cambridge

Target Date: 12th August 2009

To Note: The appendices were not attached to the original report and have now been attached to the amendment sheet.

Site History

Application Reference	Description	Approve or Refuse
C/01/0738	Erection of 2 houses on former garage site (amendment to approval C/98/0997/FP) including 2 storey annex buildings on St Peter's Street frontage.	APC
C/00/0670	Erection of two houses in place of existing workshop/garage building with ancillary annexes/garage buildings at rear facing St Peters Street.	REF
C/98/0998	Demolition of all garage workshop buildings on site.	APC
C/98/0997	Erection of two houses in place of existing garage workshop (houses fronting Castle Street with ancillary annexes, garages and parking fronting St Peter's Street).	APC
07/0646/CL2PD	Application for a certificate of Lawfulness under Section 102 for a certificate of lawfulness for Jewish ritual bath (Mikvah)	Certificate not granted

	to rear.	
--	----------	--

Officers and comments received suggested that the annexes could possibly be used inappropriately and therefore a restrictive condition was imposed to only allow the annexe to be used as ancillary to the main house.

Appendix D shows the report of the C/98/0997. This report contains the restrictive condition on the annexe.

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: 12.2 APPLICATION REF: 09/0541/FUL

Location: 5 Sherlock Road, Cambridge

Target Date: 12th August 2009

To Note: An additional letter of objection has been received from the occupier of 3 Sherlock Road. He objects to the scale of the proposed extension and notes that the proposed building will have a new wall 6 m long and 2.5 to 5 m tall about 5 m from and overshadowing his conservatory. There would be no objection to a single storey extension. Concern is also raised regarding the plan to double the width of the drive and the precedent that this may set in terms of concreting over front gardens in the area.

Officer Response – The impact of the scheme upon the occupiers of 3 Sherlock Road is addressed in the report. The application does include the works to the front driveway. The materials for the construction of the replacement drive are detailed as block paviors and setts. I would recommend a condition to require that this treatment is laid in such a way as to provide for either drainage into the adjacent flower beds or permeable drainage to minimise surface water run-off.

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

Prior to the commencement of works to widen or replace the existing driveway, full details of the means by which the hard surface will either be laid in such a way as to

provide a permeable drainage system or be drained into the adjacent soft landscaping areas shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason – To ensure satisfactory surface water drainage from the driveway in the context of the site. (Cambridge Local Plan policy 3/4)

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: 12.3 APPLICATION REF: 09/0389/FUL

Location: 18-18A St Peters Street, Cambridge

Target Date: 9th July 2009

To Note: None

Amendments To Text: The comments of the Conservation Officer are attached.

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: 12.4 APPLICATION REF: 09/0390/LBC

Location: 18-18A St Peters Street, Cambridge

Target Date: 9th July 2009

To Note: None

Amendments To Text: The comments of the Conservation Officer are attached.

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:



CONSERVATION CONSULTATION

Application Ref: P/C/09/0390/LBC

Site/Location: The Langdon Building, 18 & 18a Saint Peter's Street.

Description: Refurbishment & alteration of existing Listed Building, conversion of Langdon Building to artists' studios & construction of new college accommodation to rear of site.

Received: 18 May 2009

Case Officer: John Evans

Case Officer's Request:

Respondent : J.Hurst

Date 18 June 2009

Suggested Conditions:

1. A full Method Statement for the structural and other repairs, extensions and reinstatement of The Langdon Building is to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA.

2. No fireplace, fireplace surround, skirting, dado or picture rail, plate rail or other decorative fixture, doorbell mechanism, ceiling centrepiece, cornice [moulded or run], niche, corbel, bracket, column, arch, pilaster, pedestal, panel moulding or other decorative plaster fixture is to be removed without the express written consent of the LPA.

3. The drop-pendent brackets mounted on the party wall at the foot of each staircase are to be carefully removed and stored in a safe & secure manner in a place to be agreed with the LPA. The plans to remove from storage and to reinstate these items elsewhere within the Listed Building are to be notified to and agreed in advance in writing by the LPA.

4. LB17 (flues, pipes and trunking)

No boiler flues, soil pipes, waste pipes or air extract trunking, etc. shall be installed until the means of providing egress for all such items from the new or altered bathrooms, kitchens and plant rooms has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Flues, pipes and trunking, etc. shall be installed thereafter only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: to avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003, policy P7/6 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10)

5. All plasterwork / render repairs are to match the historic existing work exactly in every respect and to meet the requirements of English Heritage

Technical Handbook, Volume 3. The use of traditional, lime-based materials is mandatory.

6. Where the opening is to be created between rooms, full details of the dimensions of the opening and the resultant stub walls and downstand, the linings and architraves to finish the opening and the reinstatement of the flooring between rooms are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA.

7. **LB7 (joinery details at 1:10)**

No new, replacement or altered joinery is to be installed, nor existing historic joinery removed, until drawings at a scale of 1:10 of all such joinery (doors and surrounds, windows and frames, sills, skirtings, dado rails, staircases and balustrades, etc.) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Joinery shall thereafter be installed only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: to avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003, policy P7/6 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10)

8. Where existing historic windows (sliding sashes, casements, etc.) become windows to new or altered bathrooms, the glazing is **not** to be removed or altered to render it obscure. The means by which privacy is to be obtained in these rooms is to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA.

9. Large scale drawings of details of new / altered sills, lintels, jambs, transoms, mullions, thresholds, etc. to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA.

10. Full details of the design and installation of the renewable energy source(s) including plant, mounting frames/brackets etc., screening systems, etc. to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA.

11. The location, design and materials of external meter boxes [gas, electricity, water, etc.] are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. It is unlikely that white plastic boxes will be agreed on Listed Buildings or in prominent locations in the Conservation Area.

12. Full details of all works to historic fire places, including fire surrounds, hearth stones, fire backs, decorative tiling, etc., to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA.

13. All new / repaired / replacement external metal pipework such as downpipes, gutters, soil vent pipes, etc. is to match the existing historic type [ie: cast iron, lead, etc.] unless otherwise agreed in writing by the LPA. Anomalous or unauthorised plastic pipework should not be copied or repeated.

14. Full details of 'making good' exposed areas revealed by demolitions to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA.

15. LB3 (brickwork details – sample panel)

No brickwork is to be erected until the choice of brick, bond, mortar mix design and pointing technique have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority by means of sample panels prepared on site. The approved panels are to be retained on site for the duration of the works for comparative purposes, and development must take place only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: to avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003, policy P7/6 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10)

16. Full details of the repair/restoration/reinstatement [including copings] of the Southern boundary wall to the site [made of both brick and stone] are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA.

Comments:

This has been the subject of extensive informal discussion with the agents.

EXISTING – An interesting pair of houses, designed symmetrically but with only a single, shared front door. Remains as two separate dwellings internally [although used as student rooms] with various later extensions. That to the North is in a slightly different brick with a straight joint and has a lean-to roof. The houses always appear to have been fairly plain but they do retain some decent architectural detailing and, of course, their interesting internal layout. There are some panelled doors, sash window frames with slender glazing bars, older fireplaces with surrounds [but also a couple of 1930s tiled examples], dado & picture rails, skirting boards and some modest but good plaster cornices. There is a pair of curious drop-pendent brackets on the party wall at the foot of each stair. The stairs have plain square-section balusters but good handrails & newels – there is also a good, very small winder stair behind a planked door in the Northern extension. The later bathroom extensions and the relatively modern flat-roofed kitchen extension to the West are of lesser architectural or historic interest although the doors into the former are good.

The Langdon building is reputedly a former carpenter & joiner's workshop and is very lightly constructed, structurally not entirely sound but of considerable historic interest. There are very few of the remnants of the once common mix

of residential and workplace buildings left in the central city. Whilst not 'designed' in an architectural sense, the timber boarded upper, Eastern façade and the Northern gable end with its 'hayloft'-type door are very prominent in the CA and their retention is important.

The garage and store to the front and East of the house is less interesting but forms an important sense of enclosure to the garden and approach to the LB. The dwarf wall fronting the site is of brick with a stone coping and is old but the railings are modern although the cut off stubs of the originals are visible on the coping. The rear gardens are completely overgrown but do show some signs of the subdivision into two [for each house, in other words] and have important boundaries.

This is quite a prominent site in the CA with a major frontage onto a lesser street and boundaries that relate to the network of pedestrian lanes and minor spaces around it. The housing is a mix of older & newer but almost all is of brick construction with pitched roofs – some of the later C20 blocks of flats are fairly mediocre design & quality but generally the area is fairly harmonious in terms of scale and building form. The boundary wall to the East is important with remnants of fair-faced stonework [but with a once-weathered concrete slab coping] and various vintages of brickwork [with poor brick-on-edge coping and some lengths of brick oversail detail] and buttressing.

PROPOSED – No objection to the 'knocking together' the two houses into one subject to the detailing being retained and the sense of the historic semi-detached layout being clearly discernable. Opening the link between units at the foot of the pair of stairs is acceptable subject to detail but the relocation of the decorative brackets is important. The opening up to form the large kitchen at the Southern end is acceptable as stubs of wall are retained but there will also need to be a downstand from the ceiling to ensure that the two rooms remain distinct whilst linked. The problem is the French doors proposed for the rear [West] elevation which do not retain a stub of wall beside the historic backdoor by the understair area. This makes the opening look too large from the garden and there is no visual indication of how the walling above the opening is supported; this is extremely important in an LB. There is an odd indication on the drawing of this area of Ground Floor walling being in some way different to the walling above but no note as to what this is. The proposed demolition of partitions in the Northern end of the house is more radical and looks most uncomfortable. Removing the historic end wall right up to each chimney breast only leaves pitifully small gaps [750mm ?] through to the historic lean-to extension. In combination with the opening up between East & West rooms [which would be acceptable on its own – see above], this makes for a very awkward junction but it is not at all clear how this might be done more suitably. The retention of the winder stair at the eastern end of the extension is good but it is not clear whether the partition and door are also to be retained; if not, it is unacceptable. The loss of the existing window into the former stair space is unacceptable as is the one into the side passage. The rest of the rear GF elevation doesn't appear to show the retention of the second backdoor in a traditional form and the sash window is converted to another French door on plan but doesn't appear on elevation.

The First Floor alterations are much less radical in the main houses. The conversion of front [East] rooms to bathrooms is acceptable subject to dealing with SVPs, air extracts and other visually intrusive elements but this is usually possible. The blocking of the link through to the historic extension is fine subject to detail. The retention of the good sash window frames, skirtings, picture rails, fireplaces, etc. will be essential.

The overhauling of the roof is fine but the installation of solar panels will radically alter the appearance of the LB. The rear slope is the only South-facing roof in the complex [as proposed], so is technically the optimum location. The acceptability will depend upon both the finished appearance of the panels and the means of fixing them onto the historic roof structure – assuming that it can take the weight.

The alterations to Langdon's workshop are fairly intensive but it is in such a frail structural condition, it is difficult to see how it can be brought back into use without major upgrades. The main thing is that its new use [artist's studios] will be compatible with its character and the modest changes to the front extension look suitable enough. It will be necessary to get a Method Statement detailing the structural strengthening, etc., as there are several ways in which this might be done. The concept of creating an access 'yard' or side passage behind the workshop as entrance to the proposed complex is acceptable but some of the proposed alterations [demolition of the Northern lean-to extension end wall & West wall] are not acceptable.

New Build : No objection to the concept of a NW extension to the LB linking to the new house in the garden [comments on that below] creating a First Floor flat. However, the demolition of significant parts of the LB [2 walls, 2 windows, the upper part of the winder stair & enclosure, etc.] is unacceptable. The new-build element also wraps around the corner of the LB, which obscures the rear elevation. This idea is not bad but the detailing and scale need to be rethought to make a much more conservation-minded unit.

The new house at the bottom of the garden with the high level link is quite bulky and does detract from the feel of the semi-detached nature of the houses and gardens. However, the block does work well in a practical sense as it can link to the side passage behind the workshop and enter from the street. The currently-fashionable timber cladding proposed is only seen in the area in relation to the workshop and hence has connotations of working buildings rather than residential buildings in this CA. The very rectilinear nature of the design gives a rather overbearing profile for the nearby dwellings and it is considerably taller than the ridge of the LB.

CONCLUSION – There are elements of the LBC part of the scheme that are acceptable but there are some components [like the degree of demolition of the lean-to] and some details [such as the removal of internal partitions] that are not. Some negotiation would probably be able to resolve these problems and a series of Conditions on the NOD would sort out final details. The link with its flat and the new house are more problematic; there are questions of

scale, height, bulk, materials and relationships within and outwith the site. If this is considered to be acceptable, these will need to be further Conditions relating to the PP part of the scheme.

Amendments:

Received: Case Officer:

Respondent: Date:

Comments:

Discharge of conditions:

Received: Case Officer:

Respondent: Date:

Comments:



CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL

The Guildhall, Cambridge, CB2 3QJ

REFUSAL TO GRANT A CERTIFICATE OF LAWFUL USE OR DEVELOPMENT

Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Section 192 (as amended by S10 of the Planning and Compensation Act 1991)
Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995: Article 24

Ref: 07/0646/CL2PD

Murdoch Associates
16 South Road
Bishops Stortford
Herts
CM23 3JH

DECISION	SIG + DATE
NOTED IN	DATE
STATUTORY REGISTER	/
COUNTY	/
RENEWAL DATE ON COMPUTER	

In pursuant of their powers under the above-mentioned Act and Order, The Cambridge City Council ("the Council") as local planning authority **HEREBY REFUSE** your application for a Certificate of Lawful Use or Development under Section 192 of the Act, dated the **1 February 2008** for the development described in the First Schedule hereto and outlined/edged/hatched/coloured in **RED** on the plan attached to this certificate.

Reasons For Refusal:

1. The development proposed in the application for a Certificate of Lawfulness and accompanying plans: Location Plan at a scale of 1:1250; Floor Plan 1; and Cross Sections, does not fall within the tolerance limits for development allowed under Class E of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, as amended, because the works include excavation which is operational development and is also a building alteration. The site is within a Conservation Area, the development provides for alteration of a building with a cubic content greater than 10 cubic metres. Planning permission is therefore required.

INFORMATIVE: Because you have specifically stated in your application; that you were seeking a determination solely in relation to the proposed works associated with the construction of the Mikvah and not for the use, this determination does not address the proposed use. However, it should be noted that on the basis of the information you provided about the use with your application, it is considered that planning permission would be required, since the use would not be incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse.

This decision notice relates to the following drawings

Floor plans and cross sections

FIRST SCHEDULE:

Construction of a Jewish ritual bath (Mikvah) in the ancillary building to the rear.

SECOND SCHEDULE:

37a Castle Street, Cambridge

Dated: 1 February 2008

Guildhall, Cambridge, CB2 3QJ



Director of Environment & Planning

SR

Notes

1. If you are aggrieved by the decision of the Council to refuse an application for a certificate under S192 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) or to refuse it in part you may appeal to the Secretary of State under S195 of the Act (as amended).
2. Notice of appeal must be given in writing to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Eagle Wing, Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Temple Quay, Bristol, BE2 9DJ or, in Wales, to the Secretary of State for Wales, Cathays Park, Cardiff, CF1 3NQ. Copies of all relevant documents, including the application, the notice of decision and all plans, drawings and correspondence must be supplied to the Secretary of State.
3. You are advised to consult the brief official guide to application and appeals, published by the Department of the Environment and the Welsh Office from whom appeal forms may be obtained on request.

Item 12.1 Appendix B

From: John Hipkin [REDACTED]
To: <amit.patel@cambridge.gov.uk>
Date: 25/07/2009 09:04
Subject: 09/0550/FUL

Amit

Just to confirm that I have requested that this application be brought before the WC Area Committee for determination if you are minded to approve it.

My grounds are that the further intensification of use for religious and community uses may impact detrimentally upon the occupants of 37 Castle St.

John Hipkin

From: [REDACTED]
To: "Amit Patel" <Amit.Patel@cambridge.gov.uk>
CC: "Simon Kightley" [REDACTED]
Date: 24/07/2009 16:36
Subject: Re: Planning application 09/0550/FUL

Amit

Thank you for the information. I have received today copy of letter to you from Simon Matthews at cb4law on behalf of Mr Mark Donachy objecting to the application.

Regards
Tania Zmura

----- Original Message -----

From: "Amit Patel" <Amit.Patel@cambridge.gov.uk>
To: "Tania Zmura" [REDACTED]
Cc: "Simon Kightley" [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2009 3:12 PM
Subject: Re: Planning application 09/0550/FUL

To Cllr Zmura,

I have looked over the objections submitted and policies in Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and minded to approve this application.

I can say that due to objections received this will be heard at Area Committee.

I have logged your concerns.

Kind regards

Amit Patel
Planning Officer
Cambridge City Council
amit.patel@cambridge.gov.uk
Tel: 01223 457147
Fax: 01223 457109

>>> "Tania Zmura" [REDACTED] 17/07/2009 15:37 >>>

Dear Amit

I have been approached by Mrs Frances Aizoaceae with regard to planning application 09/0550/FUL at 37A Castle Street, Cambridge. As you know Mrs Isacke has written to object to the application. Without fettering my discretion, I am convinced that there are already sufficient issues relating to residents' parking in St Peter's Street and the adjacent streets for the application to come to committee should you be minded to approve.

I would be grateful if you could let me know the outcome of your deliberations.

Many thanks

Cllr Tania Zmura

Item 12.1 Appendix C

From: "Tania Zmura" [REDACTED]
To: <Amit.Patel@cambridge.gov.uk>
CC: "Simon Kightley" [REDACTED]
Date: 17/07/2009 15:38
Subject: Planning application 09/0550/FUL

Dear Amit

I have been approached by Mrs Frances Isacke with regard to planning application 09/0550/FUL at 37A Castle Street, Cambridge. As you know Mrs Isacke has written to object to the application. Without fettering my discretion, I am convinced that there are already sufficient issues relating to residents' parking in St Peter's Street and the adjacent streets for the application to come to committee should you be minded to approve.

I would be grateful if you could let me know the outcome of your deliberations.

Many thanks

Cllr Tania Zmura

NORTH

Applic. Nos: C/98/0997/FP
Date Recvd: 11th November 1998

Agenda Item No. : 17
Officer: Ruth Lucy

Site: Keys garage, 37 Castle Street, Cambridge

Proposal: Erection of two houses in place of existing garage workshop (houses fronting Castle Street with annexes, garages and parking fronting St Peter's Street).

Applicant: Heritage Homes
c/o Paul Harney Associates
22 Hills Road
Cambridge, CB1 1JP

Report

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site is located on the west side of Castle Street where the street rises steeply to Castle Hill. The site is currently occupied by a vacant garage workshop building, with vehicular access onto both Castle Street and St Peter's Street. An area of parking to the south of the site belongs to the adjoining Methodist Church and has in the past been shared with the garage use.
- 1.2 To the north of the site are terraced residential properties and a sandwich shop; these properties are known as Bell's Court and are listed, grade II. Most of the terraces have single storey rear extensions facing the site and at no.39 Castle Street, the rear extension fills the rear part of the site.
- 1.3 The existing garage building on the site is not listed. The site is within Conservation Area No1.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The planning application is accompanied by an application for conservation area consent for the demolition of the garage building (also on this agenda).
- 2.2 The proposal is to redevelop the site for residential accommodation. The applicants are proposing two large terraced houses on Castle Street with ancillary garages / first floor annexes to the rear accessed from St Peter's Street. The scale of the houses has been reduced in response to officer comments. A previous scheme with the main houses fronting St Peter's Street was withdrawn as a result of discussions with officers.
- 2.3 The two houses proposed would have three and four bedrooms. They would be two and a half storey with rooms in the roof and a semi-basement. The annexes proposed above

the garages would contain a living room, kitchen, one bedroom and a shower room each. The entrance doors to the annexes would be within the private gardens of the main houses.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

- 3.1 C/96/0225/FP Demolition of existing Church, Church Hall and garage, erection of new Methodist's Church and student accommodation (29 one-bed units and 3 two-bed units). A/C
- C/98/0297/FP Change of use from garage workshop to residential and erection of two 5 bedroomed houses with two storey annexes. Withdrawn
- C/98/1084/LB Addition of brick cladding to gable wall of 39 Castle Street (adjoining property to the north). A/C

- 4.0 PUBLICITY Advertisement: YES
Adjoining Owners: YES
Site Notice Displayed: NO

5.0 POLICY

5.1 Central government advice

PPG1 General Policy and Principles (1997) paragraph 40 states that Section 54A of the 1990 Act requires that applications for planning permission shall be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Conversely, applications which are not in accordance with relevant policies in the plan should not be allowed unless material conditions justify a planning permission.

PPG3 Housing (1992) gives guidance on new housing proposals, including infill and development affecting older, established residential areas and urges the efficient use of urban land.

PPG13 Transport (1994) expects local authorities to encourage appropriate developments which reduce the need to travel.

PPG15 Planning and the Historic Environment (1994) sets out guidance on assessing applications which affect listed buildings or Conservation Areas.

PPG16 Archaeology and Planning (1990) sets out the guidance for considering archaeological matters relating to development proposals.

5.2 The Development Plan

Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 1995

Policy SP4/2 gives guidance on housing density, allowing variations which reflect the local environment and make efficient use of land.

Policy SP12/10 expects new development to conform to principles of good design and layout.

Policy SP12/11 only permits development in a conservation area if the character and

appearance of the area would not thereby be adversely affected.

Policy 18/16 emphasises the need to secure housing on appropriate sites in the City in order to achieve a better balance between housing and employment, whilst avoiding overdevelopment.

Policy SP18/19 identifies the need to safeguard and enhance the character of Cambridge, particularly the historic core.

Cambridge Local Plan 1996

One of the main aims of the Local Plan is to encourage provision of more housing within the City, particularly in residential areas; see paragraphs 6.33 and 6.34.

Built environment policies BE1, 2, 4, 9, 15, 25 and 26 require that developments respect the character and constraints of specific sites, avoid any adverse impact on amenity, take account of crime prevention in their layouts and minor aspects such as bin storage and boundary treatments.

Policy BE29 states that consent to demolish buildings in conservation areas will only be permitted where there are approved detailed plans for redevelopment. Policy BE32 states that the City Council will only permit development in a conservation area which preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the area.

Policies NE18 and BE7 require new planting to integrate developments into the local area.

Policy TR22 requires parking provision in accordance with current standards; in this case two car and two cycle spaces per dwelling.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Head of Engineering Services (on behalf of the Highway Authority)

- 6.1 Future occupants of the development will not qualify for residents parking permits and an informative to this effect should be attached to any permission. 2m x 2m pedestrian visibility splays should be maintained from the back edge of the footpath by keeping features and planting below 0.6m. A standard informative about works affecting the Public Highway should be attached to any approval.

Head of Environmental Health and Protection

- 6.2 To be reported. *(see over page for details)*

County Archaeologist

- 6.3 In view of the significant finds which have been excavated in the area close to the site, it is considered that an archaeological investigation should be carried out prior to the granting of planning permission. However, on further consideration and in the light of previous advice given, the County Archaeologist is content for permission to be granted subject to the usual negative condition (see para. 8.3 below and condition 14).

Conservation and Design Panel

- 6.4 Keys garage and the adjoining car park should ideally be developed together, the neo-

6.2

To Note : Head of Environmental Health and Protection comments are as follows; Ground contamination may be present because of the previous site uses. The site should be investigated to determine the exact nature of the contamination, involving documentary research to establish past uses, information on the type of contamination that may be present and where on site it may be found. The investigation should also consider any remedial works necessary to enable residential accommodation with gardens to be erected on site. In my opinion this work should be carried out prior to the granting of planning permission, however, if Members are minded to approve the scheme, a site investigation of the contamination and necessary remedial measures could be conditioned (see condition 4). I would also recommend the imposition of condition 63 (construction hours limit - see condition 10), and informatives drawing attention to considerate contractors scheme (see informative 1) and reference to the Department of the Environment Industry Profile - 'Road Vehicle Fuelling, Service and Repair - Garages and Filling Stations.'

One further representation has been received from B Wilson, Walden House, 84 Rampton Road, Cottenham; 1) the application should be described as 4 dwellings not 2 and should, therefore, have 2 more car parking spaces, 2) one houses appears to have only one car parking space, a much reduced standard from what was required when the flats on the opposite side of Castle Hill were built, 3) garages should be located at least 4.8m from the edge of the footpath, 4) parking and manoeuvring shortfalls will lead to obstruction and illicit parking in the residents parking spaces.

Amendments To Text : I consider that the enforcement of a detailed site investigation of contamination should be achieved by condition (see condition 4). Although the usual standard for allowing 4.8m in front of garage doors is not achieved in the case of one of the garages, the development represents a considerable improvement in highway safety given the improvements to the visibility and position of vehicle accesses.

Victorian design approach would depend on very careful detailing and materials to work successfully.

Environment Agency

- 6.5 Condition recommended to deal with potential site contamination. Advice is given to the applicant (copy supplied) on the method of decontamination and discharge of foul and surface water.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

- 7.1 The period for neighbour consultations has been extended until 27 January to allow comments on the amended plans; any further comments will be reported on the amendment sheet.

- 7.2 N Hellawell, Masons Garden, St Peter's Street
J M Sharpe, 9 Champneys Walk on behalf of Castle Street Methodist Church
J Stevens, 4 and 5 Bells Court, Castle Street
R George, 2 Bells Court

1. Inappropriate design
2. Construction hours should be limited, with no Sunday working
3. Boundaries should be secure during construction
4. Permanent boundaries should ensure continued security to adjoining sites
5. Having the main houses on Castle Street means the development relates more successfully to the area
6. Scale of houses facing St Peter's Street seems excessive and leads to a very unfortunate precedent. The pitch of their roofs seems unnecessary.
7. The existing disturbance and high levels of refuse created by neighbours to no.2 Bells Court and nearby pubs and sandwich shop would be exacerbated
8. Overlooking of bathroom window at no.2 Bells Court.
9. Numbers of skylights on drawings CS/1 and CS/3 do not tie up (to be checked with applicants and reported on amendment sheet).

8.0 ASSESSMENT

- 8.1 In assessing this application I have considered the following issues:

- a) principle of residential development on this site,
- b) details of design and layout in the context of the conservation area and adjoining listed building,
- c) impact on residential amenity (including parking),
- d) outstanding issues raised by third parties.

Principle of residential development on this site

- 8.2 The general principle of introducing new housing in established residential areas is encouraged by central government guidance in PPG3 and the strategic policies in the

Cambridgeshire Structure Plan, providing that the amenities of existing residents are not adversely affected by cramped forms of development. PPG13 encourages development in areas well served by a variety of transport modes, including walking and cycling. The policies in the Local Plan support these aims.

- 8.3 In view of the general context of encouraging residential development across the City, particularly where easy access to public transport and other services is available, the principle of accepting a residential use on the site should be supported. The previous permission was for a comprehensive re-development, which involved provision of a new church for the Methodists and student accommodation, taking in adjoining under-used land and the existing church. I understand that the property deal behind that scheme has now fallen through hence the present proposal to redevelop only part of the site. Whilst the proposal now being considered covers only part of the previous approval site, the applicants have demonstrated, with the design and layout proposed, that future development on the adjoining car park would not be prejudiced by this scheme and it would, therefore, be unreasonable to refuse the application on the grounds that it did not cover the whole of the previous. It can easily be imagined that further residential development on the under-used car parking area could be designed to respect the characteristics of both this site and the church to the south.
- 8.4 The archaeological interest on the site is likely to have been significantly disturbed by the previous garage use, which included below ground fuel stores. The previous permission was granted on the basis of a standard condition requiring an archaeological investigation prior to commencement. As the circumstances of the site and the scope of below ground works has not been significantly altered by this application, the County Archaeologist has accepted that it would be unreasonable to withhold planning permission in this instance until an archaeological investigation was completed. I have, therefore, suggested the usual condition in line with government guidance in PPG16.
- 8.5 The principle of demolition of unlisted buildings in conservation areas needs careful consideration. The test for redevelopment is that the impact of the proposal should be positive or at the very least neutral. The existing garage building, whilst low key, does not make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the conservation area and, furthermore, its existence allows a potential future source of noise and general disturbance which could adversely affect the amenities of adjoining residents. I consider that, subject to appropriate scale and careful detailing, the proposal does offer the opportunity for enhancing the visual character of the conservation area and removing a potential nuisance.

Details of Design and layout

- 8.6 The general scale of the houses proposed is appropriate in the context of the adjoining two storey listed buildings and the taller buildings opposite. The flank wall of the development facing south over the car park, would be clearly visible and would form part of the street scene where the road rises on to Castle Hill. The scale of the front elevation has been considerably reduced through negotiation both in overall height and width. Details of the southern aspect of the development have been designed in a way that would not prejudice future development on the adjoining car park.

- 8.7 The reduction in the scale of the house next to the listed terrace has been done mainly in response to amenity considerations. Its impact on the integrity of the design is in some ways unfortunate, in that it introduces contrived elements to the design, but, I am satisfied that the effect of these less successful elements in the design are, for the most part, internal to the development and will not have an unfortunate wider visual impact. I am also satisfied that the scale of the annexes is reasonable, being considerably lower than the terraced housing on the opposite side of St Peter's Street. These annexes are designed to be ancillary to the main houses and I suggest a condition to prevent their separation into further housing units.
- 8.8 The relationship of the proposed houses to the adjoining listed building to the north is reasonable in my view. The stepping back of the new front facades could have left an awkward partial side elevation, but the applicants have addressed this by proposing a brick skin to the exposed section which will tie in with the proposed houses. Listed building consent has been granted for these works, subject to the current proposal being implemented.
- 8.9 The proposed elevational treatments would be relatively traditional, borrowing elements and style from the Victorian era. The success of the scheme in offering a visual improvement to the area will depend on the details and materials being carefully handled. I am satisfied that these matters can be properly controlled by the conditions suggested below.
- 8.10 The layout of parking spaces and their access points are satisfactory, particularly given the number of cars involved, the creation of the necessary pavement width and bearing in mind the intensity of vehicle movements during the previous use. The removal of existing vehicular access points on Castle Street should be welcomed.

Impact on residential amenity (including parking)

- 8.11 As discussed above at 8.6 the scale of the main houses has been reduced to protect the amenities of adjoining residential properties to the north. The applicants have provided sections showing a comparison of the former church proposal and the current application. Some of the proposal would have less of an impact than the church and, where there is an increase in height or mass, this is compensated by a reduced impact in other parts of the design and its scale. I am satisfied, therefore, that the revised development would not significantly affect the rear outlook or private garden areas of those properties.
- 8.12 In terms of overlooking, I am satisfied that the window to window distances are reasonable, particularly as the main windows of the proposed houses and their annexes are almost at right angles to the aspect of the adjoining houses to the north. The houses across St Peter's Street would be at least 11.5m away from windows of the annexes and this seems reasonable given the lower scale of the annexes and this being the public side of the existing houses. I have suggested a condition (14) to ensure that overlooking does not occur from the proposed rooflights.
- 8.13. I am satisfied that the level of disturbance and activity created by this proposal would be an improvement in terms of protecting nearby residents from a potential non-conforming use re-starting. Issues raised by the Environmental Health Officer can be resolved by

condition.

- 8.14 The level of car parking accords with adopted standards and I propose to condition cycle parking within the development. The existing residents on-street parking scheme would remain unaffected (see 6.1).

Outstanding Issues Raised by Third Parties

- 8.15 I suggest a condition to ensure appropriate provision of walls or railings on the boundaries of the site.

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE

Subject to the following conditions:

- 1 C01 - permission valid for 5 years.
2. The annexes which form part of the development hereby approved shall be used solely as ancillary residential and garage accommodation, in association with the dwellings and shall not be sold or let separately from the respective main dwellings.

Reason : To prevent the creation of separate dwellings and protect the amenities of residents in the immediate area.

3. C85A - archaeological investigation prior to commencement.
4. Prior to the commencement of any development, a scheme for the provision and implementation of ground contamination assessment and remediation shall be submitted and agreed in writing with the local planning authority. The agreed works/scheme shall be undertaken and completed in accordance with the approved plans in accordance with a timetable to be agreed in writing with the local planning authority.

Reason - To prevent the increased risk of pollution to the water environment, and to ensure that the living environment is suitable for future residents.

5. C21 - provision and retention of car parking.
6. C22A - cycle provision for '4' cycles (two per dwelling).
7. C31 - hard and soft landscaping scheme.
8. C35 - landscape implementation.
9. C37A - boundaries agreed and implemented before occupation.
10. C63 - limit on construction hours.
11. C64 - contractors arrangements to be formally approved.
12. C80 - permitted development rights for extensions withdrawn.

13. C81 - permitted development rights for windows and dormers withdrawn.
14. All rooflights hereby approved shall be positioned such that the lowest part of the sill shall be at least 1.7m above the floor level of the rooms they light unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason - To protect the amenities of nearby occupiers.

15. C11 - material samples.
16. C14 - 1:20 scale details of 'window and door openings, eaves, brick bond, chimney stacks and dormers'.
17. Before any works commence on site, details at a scale of 1:5 of all decorative stone, brick or ironwork features including a) string courses, b) quoin, c) lintels, d) sills, e) copings, f) dentil eaves, g) joinery sections, h) balcony railings, shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning application.

Reason - To ensure that the details of the development are satisfactory in the context of the immediate conservation area and grade II listed building.

18. All joinery shall be painted softwood, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason - as 17 above.

19. No intake or extract ventilation points shall be installed to serve the houses or their annexes hereby approved unless full scale details of the ventilation points and any covers, together with details of materials, are submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason - as 17 above.

20. No above ground external metre or service connection points shall be installed unless prior written approval is given by the local planning authority.

Reason - as 17 above.

21. Full details at a scale of 1:50 of the type, including materials and finish, and positions of rainwater goods shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority prior to installation.

Reason - as 17 above.

22. C101 - repair of accidental damage to listed building

Informatives

1. A105 - considerate contractors

2. The applicants are encouraged to adapt the internal layout and fittings within the development hereby approved to meet wheelchair user accessibility standards.
3. The applicants are advised that the above approval does not constitute a permission or license to carry out works within, or causing disturbance or interference with any part of the Public Highway. The cost of such works must be borne by the developer.
4. The applicants are advised that future occupants of the development will not qualify for residents parking permits.
5. A106 - Party Wall Act.
6. The applicants are advised to liaise with adjoining occupiers to arrange security to adjoining sites during construction.
7. In order to discharge conditions ¹⁵ 3 and ¹⁶ 4 above in relation to the brickwork, the applicant is advised that a sample panel of brickwork should be prepared on site; this panel should include the choice of brick, bond, mortar mix and pointing technique. Details of window openings should include the topmost rear facing sash window on the southern house and this should show lintel details and the relationship with the line of the gable. The developers will be expected to recess all fenestration and door joinery at least 100mm from the front face of the masonry / brickwork surrounds. The applicants are further advised that condition 17 applies to any trickle vents in window joinery as well as bathroom, kitchen and utility type vents.
8. THE APPLICANT IS ADVISED TO REFER TO THE DEPT. OF THE ENVIRONMENT INDUSTRY PROFILE - 'ROAD VEHICLE FUELLING, SERVICE & REPAIR - GARAGES & FILLING STATIONS'.



C/98/0997/FP Keys Garage, Castle Street

Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationary Office © Crown copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. (Copyright Licence No. LA 077372)

Date:	22/01/99	
Drawn By:	Janine Barker	
Section / Department:	Planning	
Scale:	1:1,250	

CONSERVATION CONSULTATION

Application Ref: P/C/09/0389/FUL

Site/Location: The Langdon Building & 18 & 18a Saint Peter's Street.

Description: Refurbishment & alteration of existing Listed Building, conversion of Langdon Building to artists' studios & construction of new college accommodation to rear of site.

Received: 18 May 2009

Case Officer: John Evans

Case Officer's Request:

Respondent : J.Hurst

Date 18 June 2009

Suggested Conditions:

1. Full details of the proprietary roof glazing system including material(s), edge and flashing methods, etc. to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. Large-scale cross-section drawings may be appropriate to show details.

2. Full details of the roof/wall junction(s), including eaves, soffits, weathering, rainwater drainage, etc. are to be submitted to and agreed in writing by the LPA.

3. **LB9 (low-pitched roof details)**

No metal-clad or other non-traditional roofs are to be erected until full details thereof, including materials, colours, surface finishes and relationships to rooflights or other rooftop features have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be implemented in accordance with that agreed.

Reason: to avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003, policy P7/6 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10)

4. Full details of all planted ["green"] roofs to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA.

5. Full details of the glass type(s) to be used in windows/doors/screens/roofs or other glazed features to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. It may be necessary to submit samples to discharge this Condition.

6. Samples of timber boarding are to be submitted to the LPA for approval for type, surface [sawn, planed, etc.] and surface finish [paint or stain] or self-colour.

Comments:

This has been the subject of extensive informal discussion with the agents.

See P/C/09/0390/LBC for comments. Differing Conditions for the NoD for the PP for the new-build are above.

Amendments:

Received:

Case Officer:

Respondent:

Date:

Comments:

Discharge of conditions:

Received:

Case Officer:

Respondent:

Date:

Comments: