
| | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------|---------------|
| Application Number | 09/0204/FUL | Agenda Item | 8.2 |
| Date Received | 20th March 2009 | Officer | Miss Amy Lack |
| Target Date | 15th May 2009 | | |
| Ward | Queen Ediths | | |
| Site | 115 - 117 Mowbray Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 7SP | | |
| Proposal Applicant | Erection of two bungalows. Mr Edward Durrant 117 Mowbray Road Cambridge CB1 7SP | | |

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 Located on the eastern side of the road 115 and 117 Mowbray Road are the northernmost two of a row of four, two storey, terrace dwellings, characteristic of the dwellings along Mowbray Road which is predominantly comprised of two storey terrace and semi-detached properties.
- 1.2 The application site relates to the rear gardens of 115 and 117 Mowbray Road fronting onto a spur of Hulatt Road which runs parallel to Mowbray Road. This end of Hulatt Road is an exception to the predominantly surrounding two storey residential in the area locating a cluster of terrace bungalows to the east and northeast.
- 1.3 The site is not allocated in the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) nor does it fall within a City of Cambridge Conservation Area. The site falls outside the controlled parking zone.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 This application seeks permission for the erection of a pair of detached bungalows in the rear gardens of 115 and 117 Mowbray Road fronting onto Hulatt Road.
- 2.2 Built on an 'L' shaped plan the dwellings sit asymmetrically to one another, are detached from one another but would have the appearance of a pair of semi-detached bungalows. The mass

toward the front of the site accommodates an open plan living room and kitchen has a shallow mono pitched roof with a maximum ridge height of approximately 3.2 metres falling to an eaves height of 2.5 metres. This element is linked via a flat roof corridor section, 2.7 metres in height, which leads to a larger flat roofed mass to the rear which accommodates a bathroom and a bedroom. This element measures approximately 3 metres in height. All these measurements are approximate given the slight discrepancies in dimensions on the submitted plans, as a rule the overall height of the proposed dwellings would read at about 3 metres.

- 2.3 One car parking space is proposed to the front of each dwelling. Refuse storage is indicated to the side of each dwelling behind the allocated car parking space. No provision is shown for cycle parking on the submitted plans.
- 2.4 The application is accompanied with a Design and Access Statement

3.0 SITE HISTORY

None relating to either dwelling address.

4.0 PUBLICITY

- 4.1 Advertisement: No
Adjoining Owners: Yes
Site Notice Displayed: No

5.0 POLICY

5.1 Central Government Advice

- 5.2 **PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development (2005):** Paragraphs 7 and 8 state that national policies and regional and local development plans (regional spatial strategies and local development frameworks) provide the framework for planning for sustainable development and for development to be managed effectively. This plan-led system, and the certainty and predictability it aims to provide, is central to planning and plays the key role in integrating sustainable development objectives. Where the development plan contains relevant policies, applications for planning permission should be determined in line with the plan,

unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

5.3 Planning Policy Statement 3 (PPS 3) Housing : Sets out to deliver housing which is: of high quality and is well designed; that provides a mix of housing, both market and affordable, particularly in terms of tenure and price; supports a wide variety of households in all areas; sufficient in quantity taking into account need and demand and which improves choice; sustainable in terms of location and which offers a good range of community facilities with good access to jobs, services and infrastructure; efficient and effective in the use of land, including the re-use of previously developed land, where appropriate. The statement promotes housing policies that are based on Strategic Housing Market Assessments that should inform the affordable housing % target, including the size and type of affordable housing required, and the likely profile of household types requiring market housing, including families with children, single persons and couples. The guidance states that LPA's may wish to set out a range of densities across the plan area rather than one broad density range. 30 dwellings per hectare is set out as an indicative minimum. Paragraph 50 states that the density of existing development should not dictate that of new housing by stifling change or requiring replication of existing style or form. Applicants are encouraged to demonstrate a positive approach to renewable energy and sustainable development.

5.4 Circular 11/95 – The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions: Advises that conditions should be necessary, relevant to planning, relevant to the development permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects.

5.5 Circular 05/2005 - Planning Obligations: Advises that planning obligations must be relevant to planning, necessary, directly related to the proposed development, fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind and reasonable in all other respect.

5.6 East of England Plan 2008

SS1 Achieving sustainable development

T9 Walking, cycling and other non-motorised transport

T14 Parking

ENV7 Quality in the built environment

WM8 Waste management in development

5.7 **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003**

Planning Obligation Related Policies

P6/1 Development-related Provision

P9/8 Infrastructure Provision

5.8 **Cambridge Local Plan 2006**

3/1 Sustainable development

3/4 Responding to context

3/7 Creating successful places

3/11 The design of external spaces

3/10 Sub-division of existing plots

3/12 The design of new buildings

4/13 Pollution and amenity

5/1 Housing provision

8/2 Transport impact

8/4 Walking and Cycling accessibility

8/6 Cycle parking

8/10 Off-street car parking

8/18 Water, sewerage and drainage infrastructure

10/1 Infrastructure improvements

Planning Obligation Related Policies

3/8 Open space and recreation provision through new development

5/14 Provision of community facilities through new development

10/1 Infrastructure improvements (transport, public open space, recreational and community facilities, waste recycling, public realm, public art, environmental aspects)

5.9 **Supplementary Planning Documents**

Cambridge City Council (May 2007) – Sustainable Design and Construction: Sets out essential and recommended design considerations of relevance to sustainable design and construction. Applicants for major developments are required to submit a sustainability checklist along with a corresponding sustainability statement that should set out information indicated in the checklist. Essential design considerations relate directly to specific policies in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. Recommended considerations are ones that the council would like

to see in major developments. Essential design considerations are urban design, transport, movement and accessibility, sustainable drainage (urban extensions), energy, recycling and waste facilities, biodiversity and pollution. Recommended design considerations are climate change adaptation, water, materials and construction waste and historic environment.

5.10 Material Considerations

Cambridge City Council (2004) – Planning Obligation Strategy: Sets out the Council's requirements in respect of issues such as public open space, transport, public art, community facility provision, affordable housing, public realm improvements and educational needs for new developments.

Cambridge City Council (2006) - Open Space and Recreation Strategy: Gives guidance on the provision of open space and recreation facilities through development.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Engineering)

- 6.1 Recommend that the application be refused on the grounds of highway safety for the development fails to provide adequate vehicle to vehicle visibility for vehicles using the access.
- 6.2 If approved conditions requiring a footway with a minimum width of 2metres across the frontage; visibility splays at the vehicular accesses; dimensions of the proposed car parking spaces on site must be 2.5metres by 5metres clear of the highway; and spaces paved in bound material.

Head of Environmental Services

- 6.3 At the time of writing this report I await comments from Environmental Health. These shall be summarised on the amendment sheet or reported verbally to committee.
- 6.4 The above responses are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the consultation responses can be inspected on the application file.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

7.1 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations in objection:

- 119, Mowbray Road, Cambridge
- 191, Cambridge Road, Great Shelford, Cambridgeshire

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- The development will be out of character with the prevailing pattern of development, mainly two storey semi-detached properties
- This part of Mowbray road is characterised by large rear gardens;
- No similar backland developments along this part of Mowbray Road which will erode and be harmful to the character of the area;
- The proposed dwelling extends hard to the boundaries with limited amenity areas resulting in a cramped form of development;
- If allowed this will set precedent for similar development along the road;
- Concern with regard to impact upon Horsechestnut tree on the boundary with 119 Mowbray Road;
- External amenity limited for prospective occupiers and predominantly given over to cars; and
- This represents the worst form of backland development.

7.3 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations in support:

- 12, Gilpin Place, Cambridge CB2 8DB

7.4 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Smaller residential dwellings which offer amenities such as off street parking and private gardens are in short supply. These would provide welcome accommodation as an alternative to flats.

7.5 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations can be

inspected on the application file.

8.0 ASSESSMENT

8.1 From the consultation responses and representations received and from my inspection of the site and the surroundings, I consider that the main issues are:

1. Principle of development
2. Context of site, design and external spaces
3. Residential amenity
4. Refuse arrangements
5. Highway safety
6. Car and cycle parking
7. Third party representations
8. Planning Obligation Strategy

Principle of Development

8.2 Policy 5/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) explains that provision is to be made for an increase of 12,500 dwellings over the period 1999-2016, and while it is recognised that most of these will be from larger sites within the urban area and urban extensions, development of additional residential units on sites such as this will be permitted subject to the existing land use and compatibility with adjoining uses, which is assessed in the sections below within the main body of the report. However, policy 3/10 *Sub-division of existing plots* advises that residential development within the garden area or curtilage of existing properties will not be permitted if it would;

- a. have a significant adverse impact upon the amenities of neighbouring properties, through loss of light , loss of privacy an overbearing sense of enclosure and the generation of unreasonable levels of traffic or noise nuisance;
- b. provide inadequate amenity space, or vehicular access arrangements and parking spaces of the proposed and existing properties;
- c. detract from the prevailing character and appearance of the area;

- d. adversely affect the setting of Listed Buildings, or buildings or gardens of local interest within or close to the site;
- e. adversely affect trees, wildlife features or architectural features of local importance located within or close to the site; and
- f. prejudice the comprehensive redevelopment of the wider area of which the site forms part.

8.3 Considering the proposal in each case I will address the above listed criteria (a, b, c and f) which I believe apply in this instance in turn;

- a. the proposed dwellings are approximately 12.5 metres at their maximum depth, sited on a 15 metre deep plot. This sees the proposed dwellings offering a separation distance of 16.5 metres, measured at their closest point to existing dwellings 115 and 117 Mowbray Road, the proposed set only 0.6 metres off the common boundary with these existing properties. I believe that the introduction of two built forms (which will be read as one owing to their proximity to one another), with the footprint and mass detailed on the submitted plans, into the rear gardens of 115 and 117 Mowbray Road, would result in a significant loss of amenity currently enjoyed by the occupiers of the existing dwellings. While I acknowledge the development is only single storey I believe it would dominate and unreasonably enclose those neighbours and cause a material change and reduction in outlook. There would also be a significant loss of rear garden space to the existing properties which this proposal will sub-divide.
- b. Given the dimensions of the proposed plot and the footprint of the dwellings proposed, I do not believe that it is possible, in terms of space, to provide adequate amenity for the proposed dwellings, which are required to make provision for cycle and refuse storage in addition to the onsite car parking which is detailed. I acknowledge the justification for the layout in the Design and Access Statement and in the letter of support received, which argues that small affordable dwellings which offer on site parking and a small amount of easily maintained external

amenity space are a welcome change from flats; however, while I agree with this argument in principle, I think the proposal fails to demonstrate that it can achieve this in a successful way. The only space remaining as private outdoor amenity space is courtyard area to the side of each property which equates to less than 5metres square.

Refuse storage is detailed on the submitted plans but cycle parking is not. The one bedroom units are only required to make provision for one cycle as a minimum, however, this must be both secured and covered and to satisfactorily achieve this will significantly encroach into this already limited external space demonstrating the failure of the proposed development to recognised the constraints of the site.

- c. The introduction of a pair of dwellings into this rear garden area would detract from the prevailing character and appearance of the area. The site is currently a residential garden and although not of any particular merit to the character of the area given the high close boarded fence along the eastern boundary to Hulatt Road screens it from the outside of the site, it nonetheless serves to contribute to the open feel provided by the rear gardens to the dwellings along Mowbray Road. When viewed from Hulatt Road these gardens, all similar in size, provide a reasonable separation distance between the built form of Mowbray Road and Hulatt Road which along this section run parallel to one another. The erosion of this space by introducing a built form would detract from the prevailing character and appearance of the area and close down a space which currently has a feeling of openness.

- f. The development of this site in isolation from the rest of the rear garden plots to west of this section of Hulatt Road could seriously prejudice the comprehensive development of the rest of the immediate surrounding area. The application fails to demonstrate that the proposal would not pose a threat to achieving a comprehensive approach should the adjacent plots came forward for development in the future and as such I do not believe that the benefits of two additional dwellings outweigh the potential to erode this area and result in a incomprehensive pattern of development.

- 8.4 While the principle of the development complies with policy 5/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 the proposal is considered unacceptable, by failing to meet the tests of policy 3/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) with particular reference to criteria a, b, c and f of the above mentioned policy and as such I recommend that application be refused.

Context of site, design and external spaces

- 8.5 This proposal has gone some way in trying to sympathetically respect the character of dwellings at this end of Hullat Road in terms of its scale, however, the existing bungalow properties along the opposite side of Hulatt Road are all very uniform in character and the design of the proposed bungalows do not reflect this. As a result I do not believe the development will have a positive impact on their setting or the prevailing character of the immediate streetscape but will instead, appear out of keeping, heightened by their being the only buildings addressing the street of Hulatt Road from this side.
- 8.6 The subdivision of the rear gardens to 115 and 117 Mowbray Road will reduce the area currently enjoyed by almost half. This will result in a garden space uncharacteristic of the prevailing character of the area which is contrary to policy 3/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006, as mentioned above. This policy also addresses comprehensive development and states that residential development within the garden area or curtilage of existing properties will not be permitted if the development will prejudice the comprehensive development of the wider area of which the site forms part. This length of Hulatt road provides access to the rear gardens of a lengthy section of the eastern side of Mowbray Road. The applicant argues in the accompanying Design and Access Statement that there are only four properties that have direct access to the adopted highway of Hulatt Road at this end of Mowbray Road, however, existing footways, parking spaces and land ownership, are not necessarily obstacles to the comprehensive development of a the western side of Hulatt Road. As such, I believe that the development of this application site in isolation could seriously prejudice a comprehensive development of this street in the future. The application fails to demonstrate that the proposed dwellings would not pose a risk to achieving this and is more likely to set a precedent for a piecemeal approach to development in the area which will in turn erode the prevailing character of the street and wider surrounding area.

- 8.7 In my opinion the proposal is contrary with East of England Plan (2008) policy ENV7, and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/10 and 3/12.

Residential Amenity

- 8.8 The issue of residential amenity needs to be considered both from the perspective of the impact upon neighbouring residents/occupiers, but also in terms of the amenity the proposal would offer to prospective occupiers.
- 8.9 In order to safeguard the privacy of both the prospective and existing occupiers a 2metre high close boarded fence is proposed to demarcate the common boundaries with adjacent neighbouring properties and given that the proposal is only single storey I do not consider there to be any opportunities for mutual overlooking. Greater opportunities will be afforded to the existing dwellings 115 and 117 Mowbray Road to overlook the proposed bungalows from the rear rooms on the upper floors, however I am confident that the proposed fencing will sufficiently screen the proposal site and such views will be very limited and not significantly compromise the privacy of prospective occupiers.
- 8.10 However, despite measures successfully protecting neighbouring properties from overlooking, I do consider the presence of the proposed dwellings will create a very invasive relationship and permanent presence, at an extremely short distance for both 115 and 117 Mowbray Road, and to a lesser, but still relatively significant degree, 113 and 119 Mowbray Road. I believe this relationship is a consequence of an attempt to try to site too much development on too small a plot, which in turn is likely to compromise the quality of life of the potential occupiers through lack of space. It is the quality of life for the potential occupants which is of concern given the lack of a sufficient sized external amenity after provision for a cycle, refuse store and car parking space on site have been made. As such I am of the opinion that the proposal fails to respect the residential amenity of its neighbours and its prospective occupiers and as such consider it contrary to East of England Plan (2008) policy ENV7, East of England Plan (2008) policy ENV7, Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 3/7.

Refuse Arrangements

8.11 The submitted plans indicate refuse storage to the side of each dwelling sited behind the space allocated for the on site parking of one car. This arrangement further strengthens the argument above that the proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site for the manoeuvring of refuse to and from the street on collection days will be impeded by the parking of a car on site. However, despite this obstacle to the functionality of the site layout I am satisfied that there is adequate space here to accommodate the required amount of bins but given limited detail on the submitted plans suggest that further information of the storage facilities could be secured by way of the standard refuse condition should the application be approved. Subject to this I consider the proposal compliant with East of England Plan (2008) policy WM6 and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

Highway Safety

8.12 Cambridgeshire County Council as the Highway Authority has raised concern with regard to the failure of the proposal to provide adequate vehicle to vehicle visibility for vehicles using the access and therefore recommends refusal of the proposal on grounds of highway safety. As such I believe the proposal is contrary to East of England Plan (2008) policy T1 and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

8.13 The consultation response from the Highway Authority goes on to advise that should approval be granted contrary to their recommendation of refusal without such visibility splays, the developer should be required to provide a footway of a minimum width of 2 metres across the frontage of the site to allow any possible future development to be linked by footway to the local amenities. If the application is to be approved contrary to the recommendation of the Highway Authority this decision should be mindful as to whether there is sufficient space to make provision for a minimum width of 2metres, which I do not believe there is. If it can be demonstrated that there is adequate space this would almost certainly result in the parking of cars on site in the positions indicated on the plans overhanging this footway given the limited external amenity space. Reinforcing the argument in the above section of the report, *Context of site, design and external spaces*, that the proposal fails to recognise the constraints of the site

though overdevelopment, therefore failing to comply with policy 3/4 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

Car and Cycle Parking

- 8.14 The proposal is required to accommodate space for at least one cycle per dwelling to accord with the adopted Cycle Parking Standards (2004) as set out in Appendix D of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006). While I consider there to be adequate space on site to achieve this required provision in terms of access to the courtyard area and area to accommodate one cycle, details illustrating how this is to be achieved have not been submitted and I am concerned that given the very limited external amenity space afforded by the development for the prospective occupiers as to how secure and covered provision may be successfully achieved. Should this application have been recommended for approval I would suggest the imposition of a condition to ensure the submission of details to ensure this can be successfully achieved, so while I do not believe this constitutes an additional reason for refusal I am dubious as to whether this can be achieved while still leaving anything like appropriate amenity space. Subject to such a condition I consider the proposal compliant with the Council's supplementary planning guidance in the form of the Cycle Parking Standards (2004), East of England Plan (2008) policy T9, and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/6.
- 8.15 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with East of England Plan (2008) policies T9 and T14, and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10.

Third Party Representations

- 8.16 I believe the third party representations received, both in support and in objection to the proposal have been sufficiently addressed in the main body of the report.

Planning Obligation Strategy

- 8.17 The Planning Obligation Strategy (2004) provides a framework for expenditure of financial contributions collected through planning obligations. The applicants have indicated their willingness to enter into a S106 planning obligation in accordance with the requirements of the Strategy. The proposed development triggers the requirement for the following community infrastructure:

Open Space

- 8.18 The Planning Obligation strategy requires that all new residential developments contribute to the provision or improvement of public open space, either through provision on site as part of the development or through a financial contribution for use across the city. The proposed development requires a contribution to be made towards open space, comprising formal open space, informal open space and children's play areas. The total contribution sought has been calculated as follows.
- 8.19 The application proposes the erection of two, one-bedroom houses. No residential units will be removed, so the net total of additional residential units is two. A house or flat is assumed to accommodate one person for each bedroom, but one-bedroom flats are assumed to accommodate 1.5 people. Contributions towards children's play space are not required from one-bedroom units. The totals required for the new buildings are calculated as follows:

| Formal open space | | | | | |
|--------------------------|------------------|--------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------------|
| Type of unit | Persons per unit | £ per person | £per unit | Number of such units | Total £ |
| 1 bed | 1.5 | 360 | 540 | 2 | 1,080.00 |
| 2-bed | 2 | 360 | 720 | | |
| 3-bed | 3 | 360 | 1080 | | |
| 4-bed | 4 | 360 | 1440 | | |
| Total | | | | | 1,080.00 |

| Informal open space | | | | | |
|----------------------------|------------------|--------------|-----------|----------------------|---------------|
| Type of unit | Persons per unit | £ per person | £per unit | Number of such units | Total £ |
| 1 bed | 1.5 | 306 | 459 | 2 | 918.00 |
| 2-bed | 2 | 306 | 612 | | |
| 3-bed | 3 | 306 | 918 | | |
| 4-bed | 4 | 306 | 1224 | | |
| Total | | | | | 918.00 |

| Children's play space | | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------|--------------|-----------|----------------|---------|
| Type of unit | Persons per unit | £ per person | £per unit | Number of such | Total £ |

| | | | | | |
|--------------|-----|-----|------|-------|-------------|
| | | | | units | |
| 1 bed | 1.5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 2-bed | 2 | 399 | 798 | | |
| 3-bed | 3 | 399 | 1197 | | |
| 4-bed | 4 | 399 | 1596 | | |
| Total | | | | | 0.00 |

8.20 In the absence of a S106 planning obligation to secure the requirements of the Planning Obligation Strategy (2004), the proposal is in conflict with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003) policies P6/1 and P9/8 and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/8 and 10/1.

Community Development

8.21 The Planning Obligation Strategy (2004) requires that all new residential developments contribute to community development facilities, programmes and projects. This contribution is £1085 for each unit of one or two bedrooms and £1625 for each larger unit. The total contribution sought has been calculated as follows:

| Community facilities | | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------|----------------------|----------------|
| Type of unit | £per unit | Number of such units | Total £ |
| 1 bed | 1085 | 2 | 2170.00 |
| 2-bed | 1085 | | |
| 3-bed | 1625 | | |
| 4-bed | 1625 | | |
| Total | | | 2170.00 |

8.22 In the absence of a S106 planning obligation to secure the requirements of the Planning Obligation Strategy (2004), the proposal is in conflict with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003) policies P6/1 and P9/8 and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 5/14 and 10/1.

9.0 RECOMMENDATION REFUSE for the following reason/s:

1. The proposed development, because of the subdivision of the site to accommodate an additional two dwellings with associated requirements for car parking, cycle parking, bin storage and amenity space, in the rear gardens of 115 and 117 Mowbray Road, would result in a development which would appear contrived, cramped and out of character with the surrounding area on this rear garden plot. This demonstrates a failure of the development to respond to the context of the site and its constraints and the development is therefore contrary to East of England Plan (2008) policy ENV7 and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/10.
2. The proposed development would unreasonably erode the existing rear garden space and create a visually intrusive form that would detract from the prevailing character and appearance of the area, failing to positively enhance the townscape and failing to respond to the local context or recognise the constraints of the site. The development is therefore contrary to policy ENV7 of the East of England Plan (2007) and policies 3/4 and 3/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).
3. The proposed development fails to provide adequate vehicle to vehicle visibility for vehicles accessing both proposed dwellings. This situation is likely to lead to conflict between car drivers, other road users and pedestrians demonstrating a failure of the development to take account of the site context. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies 3/4, 3/10 and 8/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and PPS 1 Delivering Sustainable Development.

4. The development of this application site in isolation would seriously prejudice a comprehensive development of the western side of this section of Hulatt Road in the future. The application fails to demonstrate that the proposed dwellings would not pose a risk to achieving a comprehensive approach should the adjacent plots come forward for development in the future, and it is considered that the proposal would set a precedent for a piecemeal approach to development in the area which would in turn erode the prevailing character of the street and wider surrounding area. As such the development fails to accord policy ENV7 of the East of England Plan (2008) and with policy 3/10 of Cambridge Local Plan (2006).
5. The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for public open space and community development facilities, in accordance with the following policies, standards and proposals: policies 3/8, 5/14 and 10/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006), policies P6/1 and P9/8 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003), as detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy (2004) and Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation of Open Space Standards (2006).

INFORMATIVE: In the event that an appeal is lodged against a decision to refuse this application, DELEGATED AUTHORITY is given to Officers to complete a section 106 agreement on behalf of the Local Planning Authority, in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Obligation Strategy.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985

Under Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972, the following are background papers for each report on a planning application:

1. The planning application and plans;
2. Any explanatory or accompanying letter or document from the applicant;
3. Comments of Council departments on the application;
4. Comments or representations by third parties on the application as referred to in the report plus any additional comments received before the meeting at which the application is considered; unless

(in each case) the document discloses 3 exempt or confidential information.

5. Any Structure Plan, Local Plan or Council Policy Document referred to in individual reports.

These papers may be inspected by contacting John Summers (Ext.7103) in the Planning Department.



09/0204/FUL
115 - 117 Mowbray Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 7SP

Intentionally Blank Page