

Application Number	13/1685/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	26th November 2013	Officer	Mr Amit Patel
Target Date	21st January 2014		
Ward	Queen Ediths		
Site	241 Hills Road Cambridge CB2 8RW		
Proposal	Demolition of existing 3 bedroom property, construction of 3no. townhouses with associated parking, bin and cycle storage, landscaping.		
Applicant	Mr Czes Sobanda 241 Hills Road Cambridge CB2 8RW		

SUMMARY	<p>The development does not accord with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">-The development will be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area, particularly Hills Avenue.-The development will have a detrimental impact upon the neighbouring ground floor flat at Homerton Court.-The development fails to provide good quality living accommodation for future occupiers.
RECOMMENDATION	REFUSAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site is located on the northern corner of Hills Road and Hills Avenue, on the eastern side of Hills Road. The site presently accommodates a two storey residential dwelling, which is located in the north-east corner of the site.
- 1.2 The existing property is finished in white render to the ground floor and red tiles to the first floor under a hipped roof. To the east is a flat roof garage. The remainder of the site, to the south and west of the property, is amenity space, which is

largely screened from Hills Road by mature trees and a timber fence, which is approximately 1.8 m in height. There are three protected trees along the Hills Avenue boundary and one on the Hills Road boundary.

- 1.3 To the north of the site is Homerton Court, a 3 storey building which accommodates approximately 10 residential flats. This property is finished in red brick and has projecting bay window features on both the front and rear of the property. To the east, the application site is separated from the garden of 237 Hills Road by a narrow access path, which provides access to the rear of Homerton Court. The garden of No.237 is again very mature and the presence of large trees close to the boundary means that the application site is largely obscured from it.
- 1.4 On the southern corner of Hills Road and Hills Avenue is Alliance Court. This is a development of residential flats. The building line of the blocks of flats respects the established building line of Hills Avenue and provides car parking and garages to the rear of the site, away from the road frontage. To the west, on Hills Road, are large detached and semi-detached residential properties situated on spacious plots, with car parking to the front. Many of these properties have hedging and fences along their front boundaries, which screen them from Hills Road.
- 1.5 Hills Road is a busy arterial road, which carries vehicular traffic to Addenbrookes Hospital and south towards Haverhill and Linton. The surrounding area is predominantly residential with some educational institutions nearby. The site is not located in a Conservation Area, nor are there any listed buildings or Buildings of Local Interest in close proximity to the site.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The application seeks planning permission for the demolition of the existing residential property and the construction of 3 houses (a pair of semis and a detached house), with associated car parking, cycle parking, waste storage and landscaping.
- 2.2 The buildings proposed are three storeys tall with shallow pitched roofs to the Hills Avenue frontage and steeped pitched roofs on the Homerton side. Each house would have 3/4 bedrooms. Bike and bin storage would be incorporated within

the ground floor footprint of each house. Parking for one car per dwelling is provided to the front of each house from Hills Avenue. Amenity space is provided mainly to the front of the easternmost units onto Hills Avenue. The westernmost unit would have a garden backing onto Hills Road.

2.3 The plans show the houses finished in a combination of red facing brick and buff render with a standing seam zinc roof to Hills Avenue and red plain clay peg tiles to Homerton Court. Each house would have a 1.5m balcony projecting towards Hills Avenue leading from a first floor living room area.

2.4 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:

1. Design and Access Statement
2. Tree Constraint Plan
3. Tree Protection Plan
4. Arboricultural Method Statement
5. Daylight and sunlight Assessment
6. Planning Support Statement
7. Pre-Development Tree Survey
8. Illustrative Plans
9. Plans

2.5 During the course of the application, the scheme has been amended in an attempt to address a number of concerns raised by third parties and consultees. The proposal as revised is described in paragraphs 2.2 – 2.3. The revisions have been subject to further consultation.

2.6 The application is brought before South Area Committee at the request of Councillors Swanson and Dryden for the following reasons:

Cllr Swanson

- o The proposal is similar to the previously refused scheme. If the application is minded for approval then I would like to call it in to South Area Committee for consideration under policy 3/4 of the local plan.

Cllr Dryden:

- o The application raises issues of character, context and amenity which need to be discussed at Committee.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
11/0507/FUL	Demolition of existing 3 bedroom property, construction of 6no apartments with associated car parking, bin, cycle storage and landscaping.	Refused

- 3.1 The previously refused scheme sought a single block containing 6 apartments. It was, like the current proposal, of three storey form but with a mansard roof. The apartment scheme measured:

-13m north to south and 31.4 m east to west.

- 3.2 The scheme for town houses measures:

-11m north to south and 27.5m east to west.

- 3.3 The proposed dwellings do not appear to be significantly different in their scale or footprint to the refused scheme. 11/0507/FUL for 6 apartments was refused on 8 grounds, the first four and the last in my view remaining pertinent this proposal. The grounds were: character; sunlight and daylight; overbearing; amenity for future occupiers; trees; cycle parking; waste provision; and lack of S106

- 3.4 The decision notice for the previously refused application 11/0507/FUL is attached to this report as Appendix 1, together with a couple of plans for comparison purposes.

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	3/1 3/4 3/7 3/8 3/10 3/11 3/12 4/4 5/1 5/14 8/1 8/2 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 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) National Planning Practice Consultation

	<u>Citywide:</u> Open Space and Recreation Strategy Cambridgeshire Design Guide For Streets and Public Realm Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments
	<u>Area Guidelines:</u> Suburbs and Approaches Study: Hills 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 in the emerging Local Plan are of relevance:

Policies: 50, 52, 55, 56, 57, 59, 65, 68, 71, 80, 82.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

Original Comment

- 6.1 The proposal has two cars in tandem and therefore will cause problems if the inner car needs to access the highway. Being close to a main junction increased vehicle movements will increase the risk and obstruction of other users of the public highway. The highway authority recommends refusal.

Comment on Amended Scheme

- 6.2 The applicants have removed the tandem arrangement and there is no garage and only a single car parking space per dwelling. This overcomes the concerns of the highway authority. If the application is approved then conditions relating to driveway materials, gates, construction details, drainage, visibility splays and public utilities etc. in the highway are recommended.

Head of Refuse and Environment

- 6.3 The proposal is acceptable subject to conditions relating to construction hours and deliveries, piling, dust, noise insulation and waste.

Urban Design and Conservation Team

- 6.4 *Original Comment*

The Urban Design Team do not support the proposed application. The scale and proximity of the proposal results in the loss of daylight to habitable rooms within Homerton Court. The proposed three storey scale of the Hills Avenue frontage together with the unbalanced roof form and balconies are alien to the established character of Hills Avenue. As proposed the scheme fails to address the requirements of saved Cambridge Local Plan (2006) Policies 3/4 Responding to Context, 3/7 Creating successful places and 3/12 The Design of New Buildings.

Comment on Amended Scheme

Scale and massing

- 6.5 The overall height of the units has reduced slightly from 10.1m to 9.8m (measured to the top of the roof lights) but maintains the previous full three storey arrangement on the Hills Avenue

frontage. The asymmetric roof form with shallow pitched roofs on the south elevation (to Hills Avenue) and steep pitched roofs on the north elevation (backing onto the boundary with Homerton Court) have been retained creating an unbalanced roof form. We remain concerned that the three storey scale of the Hills Avenue frontage together with the roof form is alien to the established character of Hills Avenue.

Daylight and sunlight

- 6.6 The revised scheme locates Plot 2 0.6m further forward from the shared boundary with Homerton Court. As a result all of the windows within the south elevation of Homerton Court now achieve an Average Daylight Factor (ADF) result of 85% or greater and pass the ADF test. The shadowing impacts are acceptable and meet the requirements of the BRE guidance.
- 6.7 The proposed shadowing impacts to rear amenity space are acceptable when measured against the BRE guidance.
- 6.8 The position and size of the rear and side amenity spaces means these areas will be in permanent shadow, this remains a concern as habitable rooms face these spaces.

Elevations and materials

- 6.9 The revised scheme proposes a mixture of red facing brick and buff coloured render for the Hills Avenue and side elevations and cream render for the rear elevations of Plots 1 and 2. The rear elevation of Plot 3 is entirely red brick. Light red plain clay peg tile are proposed for the rear facing steep pitched roofs whilst the shallow roofs to Hills Avenue form zinc standing seam roofs. The former glazed balconies are now fully rendered. We support the revised approach to the proposed materials. We support the revised treatment of the 1st floor balconies. However the elevations are not acceptable given that the scale (3 storeys) is inappropriate to the established context on Hills Avenue.

Car parking, cycle and refuse storage

- 6.10 The revised scheme removes the garages altogether and proposes a smaller internal 'storage' area for cycles and refuse bins. Whilst this approach now provides the necessary cycle

and refuse storage, the storage areas still have the appearance of garages (due to the width and treatment of the doors). The small size and close proximity of the car parking spaces at the front of the units will result in parked cars limiting access to the cycle and refuse store, cars will therefore need to be reversed off the drive in order to gain access to cycles and refuse bins.

- 6.11 The configuration of the boundary treatment to Hills Avenue (1.8m close bordered fence) and the 'garage' doors limits opportunities for surveillance of the street. An external cycle and refuse store should be provided within the front gardens in order to improve access. The storage areas should form habitable rooms and provide improved surveillance of the street.

Conclusion

- 6.12 Whilst the revisions to the materials are acceptable, the Urban Design Team do not support the proposed application. The proposed three storey scale of the Hills Avenue frontage and unbalanced form is alien to the established character on Hills Avenue.
- 6.13 The proposed cycle and refuse stores are difficult to access and will result in cars needing to be reversed off the driveway. The 'garage' door treatment of the stores together with the 1.8m close bordered fence limit opportunities for surveillance of the street.
- 6.14 As proposed the scheme fails to address the requirements of Cambridge Local Plan (2006) Policies 3/4 Responding to Context, 3/7 Creating Successful Places and 3/12 The Design of New Buildings.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Tree Team)

Original Comment

- 6.15 Objection: The proposal will have a detrimental impact upon the existing trees and is therefore unacceptable.

Comment on Amended Scheme

- 6.16 No formal comments have been received. If comments are received I will report them on the amendment sheet or orally at the meeting.

Cambridgeshire Constabulary (Architectural Liaison Officer)

Original Comment

- 6.17 The alignment of the door is a concern as there will be no natural surveillance of the front door and could lead to criminal activity. The underground storage of the bins is not likely to be used.

Comment on Amended Scheme

- 6.18 The amended scheme addresses the concern raised about natural surveillance of the front door and by removing the internal garage and having this as a bins and cycle store is welcomed.

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:

- ☐ 7 St Margrets Square
- ☐ Flat 3 Homerton Court
- ☐ Flat 5 Homerton Court
- ☐ Flat 7 Homerton Court
- ☐ Flat 9 Homerton Court
- ☐ 7 Alliance Court
- ☐ 15 Alliance Court
- ☐ 238 Hills Road

- 7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- ☐ Does not respect the building line of Hills Avenue;
- ☐ Loss of light to the amenity area of Homerton Court due to the close proximity of the proposed building to Homerton Court;

- ☐ There will be significant overshadowing to Homerton Court
- ☐ External materials do not match the traditional character of the area
- ☐ Servicing the site will be difficult
- ☐ The design does not reflect the character of anything in the area
- ☐ The plot can accommodate only one dwelling due to the constraints
- ☐ Mobile phone reception

Additional Comments

- ☐ The proposal is not different to the previous application and drawings and the impact is still the same.

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. Trees
4. Residential amenity
5. Refuse arrangements
6. Highway safety
7. Car and cycle parking
8. Third party representations
9. Planning Obligation Strategy

Principle of Development

8.2 The provision of higher density housing in sustainable locations is generally supported by central government advice contained in National Planning Policy Framework. Policy 5/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 allows for residential development from windfall sites, subject to the existing land use and compatibility with adjoining uses, which is discussed in more detail in the amenity section below. The proposal is therefore in compliance with these policy objectives.

8.3 Local Plan policy 3/10 sets out the relevant criteria for assessing proposals involving the subdivision of existing plots. Such proposals will not be permitted where:

- a) there is a significant adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties, through loss of privacy, loss of light, an overbearing sense of enclosure and the generation of unreasonable levels of traffic or noise nuisance;
- b) they provide inadequate amenity space, vehicular access arrangements and car parking spaces for the proposed and existing properties;
- c) where they detract from the prevailing character and appearance of the area;
- d) where they adversely affect the setting of Listed Buildings;
- e) where there is an adverse impact upon trees, wildlife or architectural features within or close to the site;
- f) where development prejudices the comprehensive development of the wider area, of which the site forms part.

8.4 The scheme represents a 'windfall' development and could not form part of a wider development in accordance with 3/10 (f), nor are there any listed buildings in close proximity to the site in accordance with 3/10 (e). The character and amenity sections of policy 3/10 are considered in the relevant subsections below.

8.5 There is no objection in broad principle to residential development, but the detailed elements of the proposal have to be assessed against the criteria of policies 3/4, 3/10 and 3/12 of Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

Context of site, design and external spaces

Hills Avenue

8.6 Hills Avenue is the main frontage to the site. The existing house is accessed from Hills Avenue and so are the proposed houses. This is the public face of the site and, in my view, the scale, density and layout of the site should reflect the character and

context of properties along Hills Avenue. I would define the character and context of Hills Avenue as a leafy low density suburb of Cambridge with substantial detached houses set in large, well landscaped gardens, set back from the road. Properties are mainly of two storey form with rooms in the roof and with traditional hipped or gable ended roofs.

- 8.7 The proposed development would contrast significantly with this character. The width of footprint occupied by the three dwellings would be significant and this would be compounded by the depth of the dwellings coming very close to Hills Avenue, the three storey height and the unusual asymmetrical roof form which is very shallow on the Hills Avenue side. The combined footprint of the dwellings have resulted in a limited depth to the private gardens which for two of the properties front onto Hills Avenue, with three car parking spaces set immediately off the pavement. The car parking adds to the clutter and visual impact on the street where the general characteristic is for soft open front areas, where car parking is set away from the public realm. As such, the scheme is far removed from the informal, leafy nature of the existing site or that of comparable dwellings along Hills Avenue. It would appear as a very dominant built form compressed onto the site, cluttered with cars and fencing with an alien private garden arrangement abutting the road. This would all result in a very obtrusive built form out of character and context with its surroundings.
- 8.8 I give little weight to the fact that this scheme has a slight gap between the proposed pair of semis and the detached house. This is narrow at 1.4m and would not be appreciable from oblique views up and down the street.
- 8.9 I appreciate that the apartment blocks of Homerton Court and Alliance Court, to the north and south respectively, are larger than the proposed development, but they are set back from the street by approximately 15 m and on much larger plots, which allows those sites to carry the scale of the respective buildings much more comfortably and allows them to be readily absorbed into the street scene.

Hills Road

- 8.10 I am also concerned regarding the extent to which the building projects forward, west towards Hills Road. It would align itself with the front building line of Homerton Court which itself staggers round the corner. Whilst the impact onto Hills Avenue is a key issue, I am concerned that the three storey footprint would be too intrusive onto Hills Road and that too little regard has been given to adequately turning the corner, especially given the height of the asymmetrical roof and its steep pitch that would be appreciable from Hills Road. I recognise that the mature tree planting to be maintained on the Hills Road frontage/corner, will provide screening when looking directly at the site from across Hills Road, but there are still views when travelling south and to a lesser extent north on Hills Road. In my opinion, any development of the site needs to respect the staggered character and form of development across this corner, not unlike the existing house. The extent of the three storey projection westwards also has implications for residential amenity which I deal with later in this report.

Precedent

- 8.11 The applicant has provided examples of other development sites in the locality which they think are comparable and justify their proposal. In my view, some of these developments are successful and some are not. Some of these sites have been granted in a different policy context and some of the sites are not comparable at all. It is noticeable in this part of Cambridge suburbia that the character of roads running perpendicular to Hills Road changes from low density to high density the further into Cambridge one travels. As members will be aware, officer advice is that each application should be treated on its own merits and I see no difference with this proposal to any other.

Summary

The proposal is contrary to Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/10 and 3/12.

Trees

- 8.12 A tree survey has been undertaken and submitted with the application. The Arboricultural Officer considers that there could be pressure to remove the remaining trees which are retained, as the retained trees will shade the usable amenity

space of the westernmost house and are a feature of Hills Road. The tree officer objects to the proposed layout but considers that the development of the plot would be acceptable with greater consideration of the tree constraints.

- 8.13 I do not consider that these concerns are insurmountable. Adequate protection could be given to the trees through the imposition of appropriate planning conditions, either requiring retention, thinning or new planting to accord with policy 4/4 of the Cambridge Local Plan.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

Daylight and Overshadowing

- 8.14 Homerton Court has secondary windows in the south elevation facing the site and a primary bay window on the western side. The secondary windows serve deep plan living rooms and kitchens and are positioned on this elevation to receive light and provide limited additional outlook. Care needs to be taken regarding the scale and massing of the proposal close to these windows. The revised scheme has tried to reduce the impact on the south facing windows by providing a distance to the boundary of between 1.5m to 2.5m but this is of limited value, given that the proposal is longer and higher than the existing building and it is due south of Homerton Court.
- 8.15 Due to concerns regarding light, the applicants have submitted a daylight and sun light study which has been revised following a re-siting of the scheme. This shows that the light impact meets the requirements of the BRE Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A guide to good practice (2011). The Council's Urban Design Officer has reviewed the assessment and concluded that the impact is acceptable. This is mainly due to the orientation of the affected rooms in Homerton Court being east-west and the principal windows being in these elevations.

Enclosure

- 8.16 I am concerned that the relationship of the proposed development to Homerton Court would be very poor, particularly the ground floor unit adjacent to the site. When on site I noted

that the existing building sits relatively comfortably on the plot when viewed from the rear and front garden spaces and from the downstairs side passage and ground floor kitchen/dining room.

- 8.17 This relatively comfortable relationship of built form would be drastically altered if the application were allowed. The combined footprint of the new units and their scale, compounded by the steep and long pitched roofs would have a dominating impact from views south from the north and south garden areas and from the ground floor kitchen/dining room window in Homerton Court. To my mind, the relationship of built form represents a failure to properly take into account the amenity of neighbouring properties as a constraint. In my opinion, the sheer scale and massing of the houses so close to the boundary would be visually dominating. Whilst I appreciate views east-west would remain, the existing property affords a degree of spaciousness and amenity to the south which the proposed scheme does not.
- 8.18 I am of the view that given the orientation of the proposed development to Homerton Court, its position close to the common boundary and its overall scale and massing, that it would adversely affect the neighbouring properties and it would appear dominant and overbearing and that the proposal therefore conflicts with policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/10a and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan.

Overlooking

- 8.19 There are first floor bathroom windows and second floor roof light windows serving en-suites in the north elevation of each house. These could be controlled by condition to be obscure glazed and any opening to be 1.7m above floor level. I consider that this would alleviate any harm from overlooking from these windows.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

- 8.20 There is amenity space around each dwelling. The easternmost two dwellings would have front garden depths of 7.5m and 6.5m, whilst the westernmost dwelling would have a private garden of similar dimensions to its footprint. For four bedroom family houses, the main garden depths for the two easternmost houses are very small and the amenity spaces are exposed to

the road and would not feel, to the user, particularly secure. However, the Council does not have minimum external space standards for private gardens, so I am not minded to refuse the application on this basis.

8.21 However, such is the tightness of the site that the amenity of the future occupants of the central house would, in my view, but unduly compromised. Unlike either of the houses to the east and west, the central house has its kitchen area and side patio sited immediately adjacent to the three storey form of Homerton Court and side gable of the detached house (only 5m from the 3 storey form of Homerton). Outlook from the kitchen in particular, which would be a well-used space, would be dominated by Homerton Court and would be completely shaded. I appreciate that the ground floor plan of these units is open and that the living rooms would be on the first floor with a balcony facing south, but this doesn't dissuade me from concluding that, in the round, the level of amenity for future occupiers of this property would be unduly compromised by Homerton Court. This would be compounded by the limited and exposed private garden to the road. This would not be a high quality living environment for future occupiers.

8.22 In my opinion the proposal does not provide an appropriate standard of residential amenity for future occupiers, and I consider that in this respect it is not compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7, 3/10 and 3/12.

Refuse Arrangements

8.23 The revised scheme now incorporates bins and bike storage within the former garage area and this is acceptable.

8.24 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12

Highway Safety

8.25 The proposal has been amended to remove the tandem parking arrangement. The revision has satisfied the concerns of the local highway authority and the proposal is now considered acceptable in highway safety terms.

- 8.26 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Car and Cycle Parking

Car Parking

- 8.27 Each property is to have its own dedicated parking. There will be a loss of on-street parking as a result of the cross-overs but this is off set with the dedicated parking on site.

Cycle Parking

There is ample cycle parking with the previous garage areas for each property. There is ample room to accommodate bikes and this is acceptable.

- 8.28 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10.

Third Party Representations

- 8.29 The third party comments have been addressed in the report above. The issue regarding the mobile phone reception is not a matter which could be reasonably used to refuse this application.

Planning Obligations

- 8.30 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. Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP) : Waste Management Design Guide provides advice on the requirements for internal and external waste storage, collection and recycling in new residential and commercial developments. 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

- 8.31 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.
- 8.32 The application proposes the erection of 3 three-bedroom houses, so the net total of additional residential units is 2. 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:

Outdoor sports facilities					
Type of unit	Persons per unit	£ per person	£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
studio	1	238	238		
1 bed	1.5	238	357		

2-bed	2	238	476		
3-bed	3	238	714	2	1428
4-bed	4	238	952		
Total					1428

Indoor sports facilities

Type of unit	Persons per unit	£ per person	£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
studio	1	269	269		
1 bed	1.5	269	403.50		
2-bed	2	269	538		
3-bed	3	269	807	2	1614
4-bed	4	269	1076		
Total					1614

Informal open space

Type of unit	Persons per unit	£ per person	£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
studio	1	242	242		
1 bed	1.5	242	363		
2-bed	2	242	484		
3-bed	3	242	726	2	1452
4-bed	4	242	968		
Total					1452

Provision for children and teenagers

Type of unit	Persons per unit	£ per person	£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
studio	1	0	0		0
1 bed	1.5	0	0		0
2-bed	2	316	632		
3-bed	3	316	948	2	1896
4-bed	4	316	1264		
Total					1896

- 8.33 In the absence of a S106 planning obligation to secure the requirements of the Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) and in accordance with the Cambridge City Council Open Space Standards Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation (2010), the proposal is in conflict with 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

- 8.34 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:

Community facilities			
Type of unit	£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
1 bed	1256		
2-bed	1256		
3-bed	1882	2	3764
4-bed	1882		
Total			3764

- 8.35 In the absence of a S106 planning obligation to secure the requirements of the Planning Obligation Strategy (2010), the proposal is in conflict with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 5/14 and 10/1 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010.

Waste

- 8.36 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:

Waste and recycling containers			
Type of unit	£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
House	75	2	150
Flat	150		
Total			150

- 8.37 In the absence of a S106 planning obligation to secure the requirements of the Planning Obligation Strategy (2010), the proposal is in conflict with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7, 3/12 and 10/1 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010.

Monitoring

- 8.38 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

- 8.39 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 The proposal would not adequately respond to the character and appearance of the area. It would unduly enclose and dominate the ground floor neighbouring property in Homerton Court. It would fail to provide a high quality living environment for future occupiers. It would not secure the necessary planning obligations to ensure compliance with the Councils SPD.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE for the following reason/s:

1. By virtue of their footprint relative to the area of the site, the combined height and depth of the houses and the consequent relationship to both Hills Road and Hills Avenue, the dwellings would be an intrusive and overly dominant residential form, out of character with, and detrimental to, the relatively spacious residential surroundings representing an over-development of the site. This is a tightly constrained site and has inadequate space for buildings of this footprint and height to sit comfortably. In addition, the introduction of car parking and enclosed private amenity space to the front, would add to the visual clutter to the street and appear out of character. The building line does not respect the more generous setback of buildings along Hills Avenue and the three storey development brings the development too close to Hills Road, allowing the asymmetrical roof form to appear uncomfortably juxtaposed against Homerton Court. As a consequence, the proposal is inappropriate for its context and fails to take opportunities available for improving the character and quality of the area, and would be contrary to policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/10 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and government guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
2. The scale and position of the proposed development, close to the common boundary with Homerton Court would have an overbearing impact upon the occupants of the flats on that side of Homerton Court, particularly the ground floor flat and would detract from the enjoyment that neighbouring residents should expect to enjoy from their properties. In so doing, the development fails to respond positively to the site context and its constraints. The development is contrary to policies 3/4, 3/10 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and advice in National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

3. The residential amenity of the future occupants of the central house would be unduly compromised. The central house has its kitchen area and side patio sited immediately adjacent to the three storey form of Homerton Court and side gable of the detached house. Outlook from the kitchen in particular, which would be a well-used space, would be dominated by Homerton Court and would be completely shaded. This would be compounded by the limited and exposed private garden to the road. This would not be a high quality living environment for future occupiers. The proposal does not provide an appropriate standard of residential amenity for future occupiers, and is contrary to Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7, 3/10 and 3/12.
4. The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for public open space, community development facilities in accordance with the following policies, 3/7, 3/8, 3/12, 4/2, 5/14, 6/2, 8/3, 8/5 and 10/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006; and as detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010 and Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation of Open Space Standards 2011.

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