

Application Number	13/1360/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	13th September 2013	Officer	Mr John Evans
Target Date	8th November 2013		
Ward	Newnham		
Site	89 Barton Road Cambridge CB3 9LL		
Proposal	Erection of 2.5 storey dwelling following demolition of existing bungalow		
Applicant	Mr James Crickmore 70 Fen Road Chesterton Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB4 1TU		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is no policy basis to resist the loss of the existing bungalow. Its demolition falls within the scope of 'permitted development'. 2. The replacement dwelling reflects the size and scale of adjacent residential properties and is appropriate in this context. 3. No significant adverse impact on the amenities of adjacent residential properties.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site relates to a detached single storey bungalow situated on the southern side of Barton Road. The existing bungalow has a relatively deep rectangular footprint, covering over half of the plot.
- 1.2 Either side are two storey detached dwellings set within rectangular plots. To the south is Bolton's Pit Lake.

1.3 The site is not within a Conservation Area. Bolton's Pit Lake is a site of Local Nature Conservation Importance and a County Wildlife site. The site falls within Flood Risk Zone 3.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

2.1 Permission is sought for the demolition of the bungalow and the erection of a new two storey dwelling. The new dwelling has an eaves height of 5.3m and an overall ridge height of 8m.

2.2 The proposed house will be constructed with red brickwork and will have a red clay roof tile.

2.3 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:

1. Design and Access Statement
2. Flood Risk Assessment

2.4 The application is brought before Committee at the request of Councillor Rod Cantrill for the following reasons, and because third party representations have been received:

I have reviewed the revised plans and remain concerned that the application may still have issues relating to massing. If you are minded to approve under delegated authority, I would like to request that the application comes to committee on the same planning grounds as the previous application.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
13/0975/FUL	Erection of 2.5 storey dwelling following demolition of existing bungalow	Withdrawn
C/73/0511	Erection of one detached single-storey dwelling unit	Approved

4.0 PUBLICITY

4.1 Advertisement: No
Adjoining Owners: Yes

Site Notice Displayed:

No

5.0 POLICY

5.1 See Appendix 1 for full details of Central Government Guidance, Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN		POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Plan 2006	Local	3/3 3/4 3/7 3/10 3/11 3/12 4/3 4/4 4/6 4/13 4/16 5/1 8/2 8/4 8/6

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
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) National Planning Practice Consultation

	<u>Area Guidelines:</u> Suburbs and Approaches Study: Barton Road
--	---

5.4 Status of Proposed Submission – Cambridge Local Plan

Planning applications should be determined in accordance with policies in the adopted Development Plan and advice set out in the NPPF. However, after consideration of adopted plans and the NPPF, policies in emerging plans can also be given some weight when determining applications. For Cambridge, therefore, the emerging revised Local Plan as published for consultation on 19 July 2013 can be taken into account, especially those policies where there are no or limited objections to it. However it is likely, in the vast majority of instances, that the adopted development plan and the NPPF will have considerably more weight than emerging policies in the revised Local Plan.

For the application considered in this report, the following policies are of relevance:

- Policy 55 – Responding to Context
- Policy 56 – Creating successful places
- Policy 57 – Designing new buildings
- Policy 69 – Protection of sites of local nature conservation importance
- Policy 71 – Trees

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

6.1 The Highway Authority has no comment to make on this application.

Head of Refuse and Environment

6.2 No objections subject to ground contamination and construction hours related conditions.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

- 6.3 We recommend that the building is well landscaped with trees to reduce the visual dominance on immediate neighbours. We recommend two trees are incorporated into the front garden to positively contribute to the public realm. We also recommend strategic trees/hedges are included into the rear yard to prevent overlooking of neighbouring gardens.

Environment Agency

- 6.4 No objections subject to a floor level condition.

English Heritage

- 6.5 After examining all the records and other relevant information and having carefully considered the architectural and historic interest of this case, the criteria for listing are not fulfilled. 89 Barton Road is not therefore recommended for listing.

Reasons for decision

89 Barton Road, built in 1974 to the designs of Peter Lord of Austin Smith: Lord is not recommended for listing for the following principal reasons:

* Architectural interest: the degree of alteration within the building means it does not have the necessary special interest for a building of this date to meet the criteria for listing; however, the building is likely to have local interest for its design and the association with the Heffer family;

* Alteration: the removal of original features and the reconfiguration of internal partitions detracts from the architectural integrity of the building.

- 6.6 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:

28 Barton Road
32 Barton Road
34 Barton Road
53 Barton Road
79 Barton Road
83 Barton Road
87 Barton Road
89a Barton Road
91 Barton Road
93 Barton Road
97 Barton Road
34 Fulbrooke Road
38 Fulbrooke Road
3 Croftgate, Fulbrooke Road
14 Grantchester Road
16 Grantchester Road
20 Grantchester Road
33 Grantchester Street
119 Mawson Road
25 Tenison Avenue
St Marks Court
17 Gough Way
39 Stukeley Close
3 Raleigh Close
1a The Pond, CB6
77 Loompits Way, Saffron Walden
Coploe Rise, Ickleton, Saffron Walden
3 High Street, Haddenham
145 Kingston Road, Oxford
Hawson Court Lodge, Buckfastleigh
2 Freeman Court, St Ives
5 Long Crescent, Norwich
97 Berkeley Road, Bristol
29 Wellington Walk, Westbury on Trym, Bristol
1a Fieldside, Stretham
23 Vine Close, Stapleford
91 Prestbury Road, Cheltenham
45 Surbiton Hill Park, Surbiton
Langley House, High Street, Colne
3 East End Cottages, North Crawley, Newport Pagnall
172E Blackstone Road, London
119 Sutton Court, London
14 Boardwalk Place, London

333 Kennington Road, London
87 Wyatt Park Road, London
Flat 4, 144 Station Road, London NW4
62 Holly Drive, Waterlooville, Hampshire
Flat 2, 11 Cavendish Crescent South, Nottingham
Pannent, West End, Ampleforth, North Yorkshire
14-23-A304, Kamishinjo 2- Chome, Nakahara, Kawasaki City,
Japan
2-40-25, Izumi, Suginami, Japan

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Objections in Principle

- Loss of iconic, highly original delightful bungalow.
- Overdevelopment
- The bungalow is very rare, built in 1972 by architect Peter Lord.
- Houses should not impose themselves on the lake.
- Dangerous precedent.
- The development is out of keeping with the relaxed low key feel of the lakes surroundings.
- The bungalow appeals to older people, we need more such housing in Cambridge.
- The proposal exploits the site and existing footprint.
- The proposed development does not recognise the shared interests of the community.
- The building is a trophy house for someone who wants to flaunt wealth.
- This is a purely commercial venture driven by a desire to generate profit.

Design Issues

- Replacement building will dominate the lake.
- Out of keeping.
- Reduction in roof height is a small improvement.
- Bulky appearance remains.
- Proposal far too wide when viewed from Barton Road.
- The gap between 87 and 89 is narrow and less noticeable when 89 was a bungalow.
- The deep plan impacts on the amenity value of the lake.
- Any replacement should be no higher than 87 Barton Road and should not extend beyond the rear of that property.
- The proposal is 1020mm higher than 87 which is harmful.

- Three storey scale inappropriate immediately adjacent both boundaries.
- Tree planting required to minimise intrusion of the building.
- Unimaginative design.
- It is an enormous cube of heavy masonry.

Amenity Concerns

- 89a Barton Road will be overlooked.
- Privacy of 89a will be encroached upon.
- Deep footprint will result in a loss of light to 87 and 89 Barton Road.
- Overshadowing into habitable rooms of 87 Barton Road.
- The massive rectangular core of the house is oppressive.

Other Issues

- Loss of habitats.

7.3 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 The provision of a replacement dwelling accords with Local Plan Policy 5/1, housing provision.

8.3 The existing bungalow is not of special historic interest. English Heritage and the Council's Conservation Team do not consider

it worthy of inclusion on the national list of buildings as a Heritage Asset. There are no proposals to designate the bungalow a Building of Local Interest. The site is not within a Conservation Area, so its loss cannot be protected under planning legislation. Demolition of the bungalow falls within the scope of 'permitted development'.

Context of site, design and external spaces

- 8.4 The key design issue is the detailed design and appearance of the new dwelling in its setting.
- 8.5 The footprint of the proposed new dwelling can be comfortably accommodated within the rectangular plot. The new house is set in from the common boundaries of numbers 87 and 89a Barton Road by 1m, to ensure it will not be unduly cramped or constrained in its setting. The overall footprint of the proposed new house is a reduction of the sprawling plan form of the existing bungalow. Given that the proposed house includes a single storey rear extension, I consider it reasonable to recommend removal of permitted development rights.
- 8.6 The scale, mass and height of the proposed new house is similar to its immediate neighbours 87 and 89a Barton Road. The front elevation is articulated with a front gable feature which is typical of the suburban architecture in the vicinity. The proposed new dwelling is unobtrusive and will harmoniously integrate with the existing Barton Road street scene.
- 8.7 While I recognise the local concern regarding the two storey form of the new house (with accommodation in the roofspace), it is the existing bungalow which is an anomaly in the street. The proposed new dwelling is entirely in keeping with the siting, scale and massing of the suburban residential context.
- 8.8 The proposed materials reflect the prevailing context and can be agreed through the imposition of planning condition 2.

External spaces and the impact on Bolton's Pit Lake

- 8.9 I note concerns regarding the visual intrusion of the proposed new house on the lakeside setting, which is an area of Local Nature Conservation Importance. The proposed new house respects the rear two storey building line of 87 and 89a Barton

Road and will in my view have no adverse impact on the setting of the lake. Part of the character of the lake are the two storey buildings which frame the perimeter, so the proposed building will have a very similar visual impact to its immediate neighbours 87 and 89a Barton Road. The imposition of a suitable planning condition can ensure that additional tree planting is provided, to positively contribute to the character and appearance of the lakeside.

- 8.10 The existing bungalow is the anomaly because its footprint covers over 50% of the plot, in close proximity to the lake. The overall amount of footprint will be reduced through the redevelopment which will make a positive contribution to the lakeside setting.
- 8.11 In my opinion the design of the replacement dwelling is acceptable and will not adversely affect the character and appearance of the street scene or lakeside scene and is therefore compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12 and 4/6.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.12 The proposed new house will have some impact on number 87 Barton Road to the east. It projects 2m beyond the main two storey front elevation of 87 Barton Road. Given there is a distance of over 2m separating 87 Barton Road and the proposed new house, this will not result in harmful overshadowing or loss of light. The overall plan depth of the new house is otherwise very similar to the flank elevation of 87 Barton Road.
- 8.13 The relationship of the new house with 89a Barton Road is much improved compared with the existing bungalow. The sprawling length of the bungalow is reduced by over 4m which will result in an improved relationship with this property. The main two storey core of the proposed building is positioned over 3m from the common boundary, which is an acceptable relationship.

8.14 Both number 87 and 89a Barton Road will have a much improved outlook from their upper windows from the removal of the unsightly flat roof of the existing bungalow.

8.15 In my opinion the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and I consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 3/12.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

8.16 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

8.17 There is ample space for waste and recycling storage on the plot. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

Car and Cycle Parking

Car Parking

8.18 Sufficient car parking is retained on the front drive and with the internal garage.

Cycle Parking

8.19 Cycle parking is provided within the internal garage, which accords with Council's adopted standards. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10.

Third Party Representations

8.20 I have summarised the issues raised in the table below:

Issue	Report Section
Loss of iconic, highly original delightful bungalow.	Paragraph 8.3

The bungalow appeals to older people, we need more such housing in Cambridge.	The local plan offers no policy protection for bungalows. There is a need for all types of accommodation in Cambridge.
The proposed development does not recognise the shared interests of the community.	I do not agree. The modest replacement dwelling is very similar to adjacent buildings and will not adversely affect the character of the lakeside setting.
Proposed far too wide when viewed from Barton Road.	Paragraph 8.5
Any replacement should be no higher than 87 Barton and should not extend beyond the rear of that property.	The proposed new house is very similar in height as compared to its neighbours.
89a Barton Road will be overlooked.	The proposed first floor window in the flank elevation of the new house serves the stairs. There will be no harmful overlooking. The roof dormer in the flank elevation are high level windows above the stairs and will not cause overlooking.
Unimaginative design.	The design is modest and traditional, which is appropriate in this context.
The deep plan impacts on the amenity value of the lake.	I do not agree. The plan form closely follows adjacent buildings.
Loss of habitats.	Short term building work will inevitably cause some disturbance. Further tree planting will ensure biodiversity will be enhanced.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 There is no policy basis to resist the loss of the existing bungalow. The proposed replacement dwelling is modest in size and scale, similar to the prevailing context of detached

residential properties along Barton Road. There will be no adverse impact on the amenities currently enjoyed by neighbouring residential properties. APPROVAL is recommended.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 3/14)

3. Except with the prior written agreement of the local planning authority no construction work or demolition shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours to 1800 hours Monday to Friday, 0800 hours to 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

4. No development approved by this permission shall be COMMENCED prior to a contaminated land assessment and associated remedial strategy, being submitted to the LPA and receipt of approval of the document/documents from the LPA. This applies to paragraphs a), b) and c). This is an iterative process and the results of each stage will help decide if the following stage is necessary.

(a) The contaminated land assessment shall include a desk study to be submitted to the LPA for approval. The desk study shall detail the history of the site uses and propose a site investigation strategy based on the relevant information discovered by the desk study. The strategy shall be approved by the LPA prior to investigations commencing on site.

(b) The site investigation, including relevant soil, soil gas, surface and groundwater sampling, shall be carried out by a suitable qualified and accredited consultant/contractor in accordance with a quality assured sampling and analysis methodology.

(c) A site investigation report detailing all investigative works and sampling on site, together with the results of the analysis, risk assessment to any receptors and a proposed remediation strategy shall be submitted to the LPA. The LPA shall approve such remedial works as required prior to any remediation commencing on site. The works shall be of such a nature as to render harmless the identified contamination given the proposed end use of the site and surrounding environment including any controlled waters.

No development approved by this permission shall be OCCUPIED prior to the completion of any remedial works and a validation report/s being submitted to the LPA and receipt of approval of the document/documents from the LPA. This applies to paragraphs d), e) and f).

(d) Approved remediation works shall be carried out in full on site under a quality assurance scheme to demonstrate compliance with the proposed methodology and best practice guidance.

(e) If, during the works contamination is encountered which has not previously been identified then the additional contamination shall be fully assessed and an appropriate remediation scheme agreed with the LPA.

(f) Upon completion of the works, this condition shall not be discharged until a closure report has been submitted to and approved by the LPA. The closure report shall include details of the proposed remediation works and quality assurance certificates to show that the works have been carried out in full in accordance with the approved methodology. Details of any post-remedial sampling and analysis to show the site has reached the required clean-up criteria shall be included in the closure report together with the necessary documentation detailing what waste materials have been removed from site.

Reason: In the interests of amenities of future occupiers, Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13.

5. In the event of the foundations for the proposed development requiring piling, prior to the development taking place the applicant shall provide the local authority with a report / method statement for approval detailing the type of piling and mitigation measures to be taken to protect local residents noise and or vibration. Potential noise and vibration levels at the nearest noise sensitive locations shall be predicted in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228-1:2009 Code of Practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Due to the proximity of this site to existing residential premises and other noise sensitive premises, impact pile driving is not recommended.

Reason: In the interests of neighbouring amenity, Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13.

6. No development shall commence until a programme of measures to minimise the spread of airborne dust from the site during the demolition / construction period has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: In the interests of neighbouring amenity, Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13.

7. Floor Levels shall be set no lower than 10.99 metres above Ordnance Datum Newlyn.

Reason. To protect the development and its occupants from flooding in extreme circumstances, Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/16.

8. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no extensions, or additions or garages shall be erected other than those expressly authorised by this permission.

Reason: To protect the amenity of adjoining properties, and to prevent overdevelopment of the site. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 3/14)

9. No development shall take place until full details of soft landscape works and additional tree planting have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that suitable hard and soft landscape is provided as part of the development. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12)