



Public Document Pack

Cambridge City Council

SOUTH AREA COMMITTEE

Amendment Sheet

11 PLANNING APPLICATIONS *(Pages 1 - 4)*

SOUTH AREA COMMITTEE MEETING – 8 July 2010

Pre-Committee Amendment Sheet

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: 10/0485/FUL

Location: 102 Glebe Road

Target Date: 22 July 2010

To Note:

5 new representations received

Since the Committee report was published, letters have been received from the following residential properties:

81 and 83 Holbrook Road, 98 Glebe Road, 265, 267 and 269 Hills Road

The siting and design of the 2 dwellings proposed in this new application is identical to that previously submitted. Therefore the concerns raised are very similar to the previous application. I have summarised these representations below and **highlighted in bold** new points that have been raised in response to this latest application.

Objections in principle

- **The revised PPS3 now declassifies garden land from ‘brownfield’ and there is no presumption that it is necessarily suitable for housing.**
- **The proposal significantly reduces green space because of the enlarged footprint.**
- The majority of representations received are not against the development of 2 properties in principle.

Design concerns

- **Further windows in the future should require the consent of the planning committee.**
- Plot 1 should be reduced in scale. Reducing the height would ease visual impact for neighbours.
- Additional planting to the boundaries would be beneficial.
- Use of slate for the roofs is welcomed.
- Size of garages if of concern in relation to boundary of number 271 Hills Road and 83 Holbrook Road.

- Glass balconies are unsightly and will overlook neighbouring properties.

Amenity concerns

- **Plot 1 will directly look down into the private rear garden of number 267.**
- **Overbearing impact of dwelling and garage upon the garden of number 83 Holbrook Road**
- Proximity of the northerly dwelling to number 98 Glebe Road.
- Concerns regarding dormer windows in the roof of the new dwelling. To the south of the plot.
- Proximity of garage block to number 296 Hills Road.

Highway concerns

- **The access remains substandard. The revised access only achieves a 5m width to a depth of 7m because the measurement is taken to include the footway.**
- Problems associated with cars waiting on Glebe Road waiting to turn into the access.
- Increase in traffic generated from the proposal.

Officer Comments

- The access remains the key issue, forming the only reason for refusal of the previous scheme. The applicant has demonstrated that the minimum width of 4.5m can be provided at the entrance. I note that the measurement for the 10m depth of the access is taken from the highway kerb, but this would still give adequate space for 2 vehicles to pass. The County Highways Authority now withdraw their previous objection.
- The recently revised PPS 3 now declassifies gardens from the definition of brownfield land, and the national minimum density for new development has been removed. This notwithstanding, Local Plan policy 3/10 sets out the relevant criteria for assessing proposals involving the subdivision of existing plots, which recognises the important part of the character and amenity value gardens contribute to the City. As rehearsed in paragraph 8.7, given the relatively large site area the plot can comfortably carry 2 dwellings, which would be in character with their setting. The proposal accords with the tests for appropriate subdivision of plots that I have set out in paragraph 8.4.
- The impact upon number 83 Holbrook Road is covered in paragraph 8.13.
- In terms of future 'permitted development' for the new dwellings, condition 3 would prevent the construction of any windows or dormer windows without express planning permission.
- I appreciate that the proposed plot 1 will be more visible from the rear of number 267 Hills Road, but this does not in my view equate to harm. The proposed plot 1 is set at an oblique angle and is positioned 9m off the western boundary at its

closest point, which tapers to some 18m. The removal of the third level dormer windows has significantly reduced the likelihood of overlooking into the rear garden area. The distance between the rear of number 267 Hills Road itself and the new dwelling would be over 60m, which would mean any interlooking of windows is highly unlikely.

Planning Obligations Update

The applicant has submitted a signed Unilateral Undertaking for the required contributions set out within the report. Contributions towards County Education are not required.

Amendments To Text: No amendments.

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None.

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: 10/0248/FUL

Location: 54 Kelsey Crescent

Target Date: 2 July 2010

To Note: A further email has been received from an objector. It states:

“Dear Mr Whelan, Ms Joely Day has written to me to inform me about the Cambridge City Council, Planning Committee's meeting at Homerton College, on the 8th of July, to consider the planning application (retrospectively) by 54, Kelsey Crescent, Cherry Hinton. I am afraid I shall not be able to attend the meeting. I sincerely hope that my absence does not adversely prejudice my strong objections, raised in my letters, dated the 8th of Dec.2009 & 25th of May, 2010. Our estate is an open plan estate. No fence or wall is supposed to be higher than 18 inches. The 2 metre fences have ruined our once beautiful estate. There are others waiting for the outcome of the planning applications, before they too erect hideous fences. Best wishes.”

Amendments To Text:

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

DECISION:

This page is intentionally left blank