



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 December 2011

by **Mike Fox BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 6 January 2012

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q0505/A/11/2161524**

**190 Green End Road, Chesterton, Cambridge, CB4 1RN**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Anglia Accommodation Services against the decision of Cambridge City Council.
  - The application Ref 11/0127/FUL, dated 9 February 2011, was refused by notice dated 19 April 2011.
  - The development proposed is change of use from residential ground floor to A2 (financial and professional services).
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on housing provision in the city.

### Reasons

3. The appeal property is located within a mixed commercial and residential area. It has a ground floor unit occupied by an estate agent at the front and residential accommodation to the rear and above. The explanation to the Council's *Local Plan*<sup>1</sup> policy 5/4 states that housing land is a scarce and expensive resource, and that the retention of existing housing is as important as new provision in meeting the city's housing needs. Policy 5/4 therefore strictly controls development which would result in the loss of existing housing accommodation, which if unchecked, would cumulatively erode the city's housing supply. The proposal, which would result in the loss of one residential flat, would be contrary to this policy.
4. The appellant considers that the front part of the appeal property has been in commercial use for over 40 years and that the proposal would comply with one of the policy 5/4 exceptions criteria, namely b). This criterion requires the proposal to be a subsidiary part of a non-residential property, without any practical means of separate access being provided. Whilst the flat is a subsidiary part of a non-residential property, it has a separate, independent access to the rear, which means that the second part of criterion b) would not be satisfied by the proposed development. None of the other exceptions criteria would apply to the proposed development.

---

<sup>1</sup> Cambridge City Council *Local Plan* 2006.



5. The appellant refers to a planning permission which was recently refused for a new dwelling, to indicate that the need for new dwellings in the city is not as great as the Council suggests. As I am not aware of the detailed circumstances, I cannot give this evidence much weight. It is clear, however, that the reasons for refusal were linked to access and environmental considerations, so that decision is not directly comparable with the appeal proposal.
6. Whilst I note the appellant's assertion that it would still be possible to replace lost residential accommodation on the site with an equivalent amount of new residential floorspace, this is not the proposal before me. Regarding the Government's *Planning for Growth* agenda, one of its key elements is to increase housing numbers, which is reflected in the Council's decision. I have also noted the appellant's personal situation. The total of these considerations, however, does not outweigh the reasons that have led me to dismiss the appeal.
7. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

*Mike Fox*

INSPECTOR