

<b>Application Number</b>	13/0210/FUL	<b>Agenda Item</b>	
<b>Date Received</b>	15th February 2013	<b>Officer</b>	Miss Catherine Linford
<b>Target Date</b>	12th April 2013		
<b>Ward</b>	West Chesterton		
<b>Site</b>	49 Arbury Road Cambridge CB4 2JB		
<b>Proposal</b>	Erection of seven 3 x bed terrace dwellings, along with the conversion and vertical sub-division of No.49 Arbury Road into two houses (1 bed unit and 1 x 2 bed unit), together with eight car parking spaces, cycle parking and associated landscaping (following the demolition of the existing garage buildings on site.		
<b>Applicant</b>	Mr c/o Agent		

SUMMARY	<p>The development does not accord with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The development would be oppressive and dominant and would have a significant detrimental impact on the occupiers of 20-28 Leys Road and 51 Arbury Road</li> <li>2. The development would unacceptable overshadow 20-28 Leys Road and 51 Arbury Road</li> <li>3. The proposed roof form would be an alien form in the locality and would have a detrimental impact on the character of the surrounding area</li> </ol>
RECOMMENDATION	REFUSAL

## **1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT**

- 1.1 The application site is situated on the southwestern side of Arbury Road and includes 49 Arbury Road on the street frontage (in residential use) along with the land behind this property and 51 Arbury Road, the house attached to No. 49. The site was most recently in use as a garage, but this use has now ceased. The site includes two buildings, and a row of garages abutting the common boundary with Leys Road. The two-storey building closet to No. 49 was used as an office and store, and the second building was used as a workshop.
- 1.2 The surrounding area is predominantly residential. To the northwest, is the attached neighbour 51 Arbury Road, which is a dwelling. To the southeast on the opposite side of the access road to the site there is a row of terraced houses. To the northwest and west are the houses on Leys Road, with the rear gardens of these houses backing onto the site.
- 1.3 The site is not within a Conservation Area.

## **2.0 THE PROPOSAL**

- 2.1 Full planning permission is sought to redevelop the site for residential use following the demolition of all the buildings on the site, with the exception of 49 Arbury Road. Permission is sought for the erection of 7 3-bed terrace dwellings, along with the conversion and vertical subdivision of 49 Arbury Road into 2 houses, together with 8 car parking spaces, cycle parking and associated landscaping.
- 2.2 The proposed terrace houses would stand along the common boundary with Leys Road backing onto these houses. The row would be split into three sections. Units 1-3, furthest from the street, would have pitched roofs with accommodation in the roof. The building would then step down to unit 4, which would have a flat roof. The building would then step up again and forward to units 5 and 6, with pitched roofs with accommodation in the roof, and then down to unit 7, which would be flat roofed.
- 2.3 The houses would stand 5m from the common boundary with Leys Road and would be 11.85m deep. At first floor level units 1-4 would step back at the front by 1.65m, and units 5 and 6

would step back 1.65m at the rear. Unit 7 would step back 3.3m at the rear. This would create a stagger in the terrace.

2.4 It should be noted that the neighbouring houses have not been depicted entirely accurately on the submitted plans, as the plans do not include the existing extensions to these properties. 51 Arbury Road is wider than shown on the plans, and many of the houses directly adjacent to the site on Leys Road have rear extensions making their rear gardens shorter than shown. For example, the rear garden of 26 Leys Road is 17.3m long and not 20.2m as shown.

2.5 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:

- 1 . Design and Access Statement
- 2 . Planning Statement
- 3 . Drainage Design Statement
- 4 . Preliminary Ecological Appraisal
- 5 . Foul and Utilities Assessment
- 6 . Tree Survey and Arboricultural Impact Assessment
- 7 . Transport Statement
- 8 . Ground Investigation Report

### **3.0 SITE HISTORY**

None relevant

### **4 . 0 PUBLICITY**

4.1 Advertisement:	Yes
Adjoining Owners:	Yes
Site Notice Displayed:	Yes

### **5.0 POLICY**

5.1 See Appendix 1 for full details of Central Government Guidance, East of England Plan 2008 policies, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 policies, Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

## 5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003	P6/1 P9/8 P9/9
Cambridge Local Plan 2006	3/1 3/4 3/7 3/12 5/1 5/14 8/6 8/10 10/1

## 5.3 Relevant Central Government Guidance, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework March 2012 Circular 11/95 Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010
Supplementary Planning Documents	Sustainable Design and Construction Waste Management Design Guide Planning Obligation Strategy
Material Considerations	<u>Central Government:</u> Letter from Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (27 May 2010) Written Ministerial Statement: Planning for Growth (23 March 2011)

	<p><u>Citywide:</u></p> <p>Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment</p> <p>Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2005)</p> <p>Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan</p>
--	---

### **Cambridgeshire County Council (Engineering)**

- 6.1 It is likely, therefore that this proposal will generate residential parking demand on-street in competition with existing residential uses, but this is not anticipated to result in any significant adverse impact upon highway safety.
- 6.2 For the number of dwellings proposed the Highway Authority would normally seek adoption of the highway serving the site, however, the layout of the access and internal accessway is not adequate to serve as a public highway.

### **Urban Design and Conservation Team**

- 6.3 The height of the proposed scheme is accepted but the scheme had design failings relating to landscaping, materials and the location of the cycle and bin stores. The change in roof heights create a visual break.

### **Landscape**

- 6.4 The positioning of the cycle and bin store would create a long, unbroken and hard edge to the site with no relief or softening. There is limited information relating to the public realm and landscaping.

### **Environmental Health**

- 6.5 No objection. Conditions are recommended relating to construction hours, delivery hours, dust, noise insulation, and contaminated land.

## County Archaeologist

- 6.6 The site lies in an area of high archaeological potential and therefore a programme of investigation should be required by condition.

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 objecting to the application:

- 11 Arbury Road
- 33 Arbury Road
- 39 Arbury Road
- 42 Arbury Road
- 47 Arbury Road
- 51 Arbury Road
- 54 Arbury Road
- 61 Arbury Road
- 18 Leys Road
- 20 Leys Road
- 22 Leys Road
- 24 Leys Road
- 26 Leys Road
- 28 Leys Road

- 7.2 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations supporting the application:

- 32 Arbury Road
- 45 Arbury Road
- 36 Havenfield, Arbury Road
- 18A Leys Road
- 238A Milton Road
- 376 Milton Road

- 7.3 The representations can be summarised as follows:

### Objections

- Overdevelopment
- Dominance
- Overbearing

- The neighbouring properties are shown inaccurately on the plans
- Loss of light and overshadowing
- Out of character
- Overlooking and loss of privacy
- Insufficient parking spaces
- On collection day the bins would block the pavement and look unsightly
- No communal space

### Support

- Local housing is needed

7.4 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. Car and cycle parking
6. Third party representations
7. Planning Obligation Strategy

### **Principle of Development**

8.2 Policy 5/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan states that proposals for housing development on windfall sites will be permitted subject to the existing land use and compatibility of adjoining uses. The surrounding area is predominantly residential and therefore the principle of residential development here is accepted. However, the acceptability of the design of the development and the potential impact on the occupiers of neighbouring properties will be assessed later in this report.

- 8.3 In my opinion, the principle of the development is acceptable and in accordance with policy 5/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

### **Context of site, design and external spaces**

- 8.4 This area of the City is suburban in character and is predominantly residential. This section of Arbury Road mainly consists of terrace houses with long rear gardens, with the exception of 51 Arbury Road (the attached neighbour to No. 49), which has a very small rear garden. Leys Road, which backs onto the site, mainly consists of semi-detached houses, with those houses directly behind the site having relatively short rear gardens.
- 8.5 Notwithstanding my views on the impact of the development on neighbouring properties, which is discussed later in the report, given the scale of the existing properties surrounding the site the proposed scale of development is, in my view, in character with the surrounding area. The scheme takes a contemporary approach to the proposed materials and elevational treatment with materials used to break up the bulk of the building and this, in my opinion is an acceptable approach.
- 8.6 Originally, the terrace of houses was one long, unbroken mass. The Urban Design and Conservation Team raised concerns about this, and the application was subsequently revised. The revised application includes a stagger in the heights of the houses, which creates a visual break in the terrace, and does help to reduce the mass of the building to a degree. However, the proposed roof form, which includes pitched roofs and flat roofs is very unorthodox and it is my view that the development will be a very alien form in the area. In my opinion, the alterations to the design to reduce its impact on neighbouring properties results in a scheme that would be poorly related to its context and out of character with the area and in my view it would have a negative impact on the setting.
- 8.7 Concern has been raised regarding the location of the proposed cycle and bin stores as they would create a long, unbroken and hard edge to the site with no relief or softening. Ideally, cycle and bin stores should be provided 'on plot'. Their proposed location is not ideal, but it is my view that they would not be so visually detrimental as to warrant a reason for refusal.



- 8.8 Unit 9 at the front of the existing building would have a small garden area to the front, enclosed by a brick wall. This would provide a threshold space for this unit and improve the streetscene. A narrow area of threshold space is also proposed along the would provide an area for planting and soften the appearance of the entrance.
- 8.9 The proposed site plan indicates a shared space route into the site with 'tarmac with gravel rolled in' for the site entrance and 'tegula pavers' for the front of the units. The proposed treatment of the shared surface area is excessively 'hard' with few opportunities for any additional planting to the front thresholds of units, which would help soften the scheme. If the application were to be recommended for approval a landscaping scheme could be required by condition, and I therefore am of the opinion that this could not be a reason to refuse the application.
- 8.10 The design of the proposed scheme is broadly acceptable with the exception of the roof design, which would result, in my opinion, in the scheme being out of character with the area and contrary to Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 3/12.

### **Residential Amenity**

#### Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.11 The neighbouring properties which may be potentially affected by the proposals are 20-28 Leys Road, to the northwest; 51 Arbury Road to the northeast; and 47 Arbury Road to the southeast.

#### *Impact on 20-28 Leys Road*

- 8.12 The proposed houses would stand to the southeast of 20-28 Leys Road, 5m from the common boundary with these houses, at the end of their rear gardens. These gardens are relatively short, but currently feel more spacious due to the open outlook to the rear. The submitted plans show these gardens to be in excess of 20m in length, but the plans do not show the rear extensions to these houses, and these gardens are in fact closer to 17m in length

- 8.13 It is my firm view that due to the suburban character of the area and the outlook currently experienced by the occupiers of these properties this would not be acceptable. In my opinion, when viewed from the gardens of the houses on Leys Road the development would feel very oppressive and dominant. As the proposed houses would stand to the southeast of the neighbouring properties it would cast shadow over the gardens of these houses in the afternoons. This, in my view, would exacerbate the oppressive feel and increases my concern.
- 8.14 The rear elevation of the houses includes windows at first floor level, which would serve bedrooms and bathrooms. If this application were to be recommended for approval, a condition could be added requiring the bathroom windows to be obscure glazed, and requiring the bedroom windows to be partially obscured. It is, therefore, my view that it would be unreasonable to refuse the application on this basis.

*51 Arbury Road*

- 8.15 The proposed houses would stand to the southwest of this neighbour at the end of a small garden. The proposed house closest to this boundary would be two storeys in height with a flat roof, and at its closest point would stand 1m from the common boundary with this neighbour. In my opinion, when viewed from this property the proposed houses would be oppressive and dominant for this neighbour also, for the same reasons as expressed for Leys Road. Due to the orientation of the buildings, the proposed houses would cast shadow over this neighbour in the afternoons. As the rear garden of 51 Arbury Road is so small, this overshadowing would, in my view, have a significant detrimental impact on the occupier of this property's ability to enjoy their garden, and the rear portion of their house. It would also exacerbate the oppressive and dominant feel.
- 8.16 No windows are proposed on the side elevation of the proposed building and therefore there would be no potential for direct overlooking of this neighbour.

*47 Arbury Road*

- 8.17 The proposed houses would stand to the northwest of this neighbour, 6.2m from the common boundary to the side of No. 47. As the proposed houses would be to the side of this

neighbour they would not be directly visible from the house and, therefore, in my opinion, would not make the occupiers of this property feel hemmed in. Due to the orientation of the houses they would not overshadow this neighbouring property until late in the day, and I do not consider this would be significant.

- 8.18 The units would have windows at first floor level mainly serving bedrooms. The only unit that would potentially have direct views into the most private part of No. 47's garden (ie the part closest to the house) would be unit 7. This unit has one bedroom at the front of the house. This room would have two windows – one would have direct views into the neighbouring garden and one would have only oblique views. If this application were to be recommended for approval, a condition could be added requiring the window with direct views to be obscure glazed. It is my opinion, that this would make it acceptable.
- 8.19 In my opinion the proposal does not respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site as the proposed houses would be oppressive and dominant when viewed from 20-28 Leys Road and 51 Arbury Road, and would overshadow 51 Arbury Road to an unacceptable degree. I therefore consider that it does not comply with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 3/7.

#### Amenity for future occupiers of the site

- 8.20 Units 8 and 9, would be within the existing building face onto Arbury Road, and it is highly likely that future occupants will be subjected to a high level of road traffic noise. Due to high traffic levels along Arbury Road it would not be possible to maintain good or reasonable internal noise levels with the windows open, and therefore mechanical ventilation would be required. If the application were to be approved, details of this could be required by condition.
- 8.21 Historically, the site has been used as a car workshop, for coal storage, and as a brick and tile works, and there is the possibility of infilled ground (after the brick and tile operations ceased). Anecdotal evidence indicates that an underground fuel tank is still on the property, and there is also an above ground waste oil tank and possibly asbestos and oils and lubricants on site. Environmental Health are of the opinion that

further investigation is required, and if the application were to be recommended for approval, this information could be required by condition.

- 8.22 In my opinion the proposal provides a high-quality living environment and an appropriate standard of residential amenity for future occupiers, and I consider that in this respect it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12.

### **Refuse Arrangements**

- 8.23 On bin collection day, the applicant proposes that the refuse lorry will reverse into the site to collect and empty the bins from the individual stores along the common boundary with 47 Arbury Road. It is unclear whether the access road will be of sufficient weight bearing construction to allow the refuse vehicle to reverse in, and confirmation of the construction would be required by condition if the application were to be recommended for approval, along with details of the bin stores
- 8.24 In my opinion the proposal would be compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12, subject to a condition requiring further details.

### **Car and Cycle Parking**

#### Car Parking

- 8.25 One car parking space would be provided for each of the terrace houses, with no car parking spaces proposed for the subdivided existing building. Appendix C (Car Parking Standards) explains that outside the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) a maximum of two car parking spaces should be provided for each dwelling. The explanatory text to policy 8/10 explains that the City Council promotes lower levels of private car parking in order to encourage modal shift, particularly at non-residential developments and where good public transport accessibility exists. This proposal is for residential development but the site is close to amenities and public transport routes. Therefore, it is my view that it would be unreasonable to refuse the application due to a lack of car parking spaces, although I appreciate that the situation is not ideal.

## Cycle Parking

- 8.26 Appendix D (Cycle Parking Standards) of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) states that at least one secure, covered cycle parking space must be provided for each bedroom. It is proposed that individual cycle stores are provided for each house, along the common boundary with 47 Arbury Road. This meets the standards and is acceptable.
- 8.27 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10.

## **Planning Obligations**

- 8.28 The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 have introduced the requirement for all local authorities to make an assessment of any planning obligation in relation to three tests. If the planning obligation does not pass the tests then it is unlawful. The tests are that the planning obligation must be:

- (a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- (b) directly related to the development; and
- (c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

In bringing forward my recommendations in relation to the Planning Obligation for this development I have considered these requirements. The Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) 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 and relevant Supplementary Planning Documents. The proposed development triggers the requirement for the following community infrastructure:

## Open Space

- 8.29 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 outdoor sports facilities, indoor sports facilities, informal open space and provision for children and teenagers. The total contribution sought has been calculated as follows.

8.30 The application proposes the erection of seven three-bedroom houses, and the subdivision of one three-bedroom house into one one-bedroom house and one two-bedroom house. The net total of additional residential units is eight. 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 provision for children and teenagers are not required from one-bedroom units. The totals required for the new buildings are calculated as follows:

<b>Outdoor sports facilities</b>					
Existing total bedrooms	New total bedrooms	Net additional bedrooms	Assumed net additional persons	£ per person	<b>Total £</b>
3	24	21	21.5	238	<b>5117</b>

<b>Indoor sports facilities</b>					
Existing total bedrooms	New total bedrooms	Net additional bedrooms	Assumed net additional persons	£ per person	<b>Total £</b>
3	24	21	21.5	269	<b>5738.50</b>

<b>Informal open space</b>					
Existing total bedrooms	New total bedrooms	Net additional bedrooms	Assumed net additional persons	£ per person	<b>Total £</b>
3	24	21	21.5	242	<b>5203</b>

<b>Provision for children and teenagers</b>					
Existing total bedrooms	New total bedrooms	Net additional bedrooms not in 1-bed units	Assumed net additional persons not in 1-bed units	£ per person	<b>Total £</b>
3	24	21	20	316	<b>6320</b>

8.31 Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure the requirements of the Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) and the Cambridge City Council Open Space Standards Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation (2010), I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003) policies P6/1 and P9/8, Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/8 and 10/1 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010 and the Cambridge City Council Open Space Standards Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation (2010)

#### Community Development

8.32 The Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) requires that all new residential developments contribute to community development facilities, programmes and projects. This contribution is £1256 for each unit of one or two bedrooms and £1882 for each larger unit. The total contribution sought has been calculated as follows:

<b>Community facilities</b>			
Type of unit	£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
1 bed	1256		
2-bed	1256	1	1256
3-bed	1882	7	13174
4-bed	1882		
<b>Total</b>			<b>14430</b>

8.33 Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure the requirements of the Planning Obligation Strategy (2010), I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003)

policies P6/1 and P9/8, Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 5/14 and 10/1 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010.

### Waste

- 8.34 The Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) requires that all new residential developments contribute to the provision of household waste and recycling receptacles on a per dwelling basis. As the type of waste and recycling containers provided by the City Council for houses are different from those for flats, this contribution is £75 for each house and £150 for each flat. The total contribution sought has been calculated as follows:

<b>Waste and recycling containers</b>			
Type of unit	£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
House	75	8	600
Flat	150		
<b>Total</b>			<b>600</b>

- 8.35 Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure the requirements of the Planning Obligation Strategy (2010), I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003) policies P6/1 and P9/8, Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7, 3/12 and 10/1 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010.

### Household Recycling Centres

A network of Household Recycling Centres is operational across the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough area. Continued development will put pressure on the existing facilities and require expansion of the network. Financial contributions are required in accordance with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012). These contributions vary according to the nature and scale of the proposed development and will be based on any additional costs for the relevant local authority arising out of the need for additional or improved infrastructure, which is related to the proposed development.

The contributions are calculated as follows:



<b>Notes for Milton</b>		<b>Source</b>																								
4 sites x £5.5 million	= £22 million infrastructure costs	Cost per site sourced from Mouchel Parkman indicative costs 2009.																								
total catchment households	= 115,793 households	WMT Recycling Centre Catchment Tables  CCC Mid 2009 Dwelling Figures																								
new households	= 24,273 new households within catchment	Cambridgeshire County Council Housing trajectory to 2025 as of Dec 2010																								
<p><b>Total developer contribution towards Recycling Centre Infrastructure =</b></p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 40%;">Infrastructure costs in catchment</td> <td style="width: 10%; text-align: center;">X</td> <td style="width: 20%;">New households in catchment</td> <td style="width: 10%;"></td> <td style="width: 10%;"></td> <td style="width: 10%;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: right;">Total No. households in catchment</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: right;"><u>£22m</u> 115,793</td> <td style="text-align: center;">X</td> <td style="text-align: center;">24,273</td> <td style="text-align: center;">=</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">£4,611,730</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="4">Total developer contribution per household</td> <td style="text-align: center;">=</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£190</td> </tr> </table>			Infrastructure costs in catchment	X	New households in catchment				Total No. households in catchment						<u>£22m</u> 115,793	X	24,273	=		£4,611,730	Total developer contribution per household				=	£190
Infrastructure costs in catchment	X	New households in catchment																								
Total No. households in catchment																										
<u>£22m</u> 115,793	X	24,273	=		£4,611,730																					
Total developer contribution per household				=	£190																					

The net gain is 8 dwellings and therefore the contribution required is £1520.

8.36 Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure the requirements of the Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003) policies P6/1 and P9/8, Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7, 3/12 and 10/1 and the RECAP Waste Strategy 2012.

## Education

8.37 Upon adoption of the Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) the Council resolved that the Education section in the 2004 Planning Obligations Strategy continues to apply until it is replaced by a revised section that will form part of the Planning Obligations Strategy 2010. It forms an annex to the Planning Obligations Strategy (2010) and is a formal part of that document. Commuted payments are required towards education facilities where four or more additional residential units are created and where it has been established that there is insufficient capacity to meet demands for educational facilities.

8.38 Contributions are therefore required on the following basis.

<b>Pre-school education</b>					
Type of unit	Persons per unit		£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
1 bed	1.5		0		
2+- beds	2		810	8	6480
<b>Total</b>					<b>6480</b>

<b>Primary education</b>					
Type of unit	Persons per unit		£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
1 bed	1.5		0		
2+- beds	2		1350	8	10800
<b>Total</b>					<b>10800</b>

<b>Secondary education</b>					
Type of unit	Persons per unit		£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
1 bed	1.5		0		
2+- beds	2		1520	8	12160
<b>Total</b>					<b>12160</b>

<b>Life-long learning</b>					
Type of unit	Persons per unit		£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
1 bed	1.5		160		
2+-beds	2		160	8	1280
<b>Total</b>					<b>1280</b>

8.39 Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure the requirements of the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010, I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003) policies P6/1 and P9/8, Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 5/14 and 10/1 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010.

#### Monitoring

8.40 The Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) requires that all new residential developments contribute to the costs of monitoring the implementation of planning obligations. The costs are calculated according to the heads of terms in the agreement. The contribution sought will be calculated as \_150 per financial head of term and \_300 per non-financial head of term. Contributions are therefore required on that basis.

#### Planning Obligations Conclusion

8.41 It is my view that the planning obligation is necessary, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably in scale and kind to the development and therefore the Planning Obligation passes the tests set by the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.

### **9.0 CONCLUSION**

9.1 Due to its unorthodox design, scale and positioning the proposal would be out of character with the surrounding area and have a significant detrimental impact on the occupiers of 20-28 Leys Road and 51 Arbury Road. The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

## 10.0 RECOMMENDATION

### **REFUSE for the following reason/s:**

1. Currently, 20-28 Leys Road and 51 Arbury Road enjoy a relatively open outlook to the rear of their properties. Due to the proximity of the proposed terrace of houses to the common boundaries and their design, scale and bulk, it is my opinion that the proposed houses would be oppressive and overbearing. Due to the orientation of the buildings they would also overshadow the gardens of these neighbours. For these reasons it is my opinion that the proposed development is unacceptable as it would have a significant detrimental impact on the residential amenity of the occupiers of these dwellings, and their ability to enjoy their gardens. The proposals are therefore in conflict with policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006)
2. The proposed roof form, which includes pitched roofs and flat roofs is very unorthodox and the development will be a very alien form in the area. The alterations to the design to reduce its impact on neighbouring properties results in a scheme that would be poorly related to its context and out of character with the area and for these reasons the proposal does not comply with policies 3/4 or 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).
3. The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for public open space, community development facilities, education and life-long learning facilities, waste facilities, waste management and monitoring in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 3/8, 3/12, 5/5, 5/14, 8/3 and 10/1, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 policies P6/1 and P9/8 and as detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010, the Open Space Standards Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation 2010, and Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012

**2. In the event that the application is refused, and an Appeal is lodged against the decision to refuse this application, delegated authority is sought to allow officers to negotiate and complete the Planning Obligation required in connection with this development**