

Application Number	14/1634/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	20th October 2014	Officer	Miss Sophie Pain
Target Date	15th December 2014		
Ward	Romsey		
Site	151-155 Vinery Road Cambridge CB1 3DW		
Proposal	Demolition of the existing dwelling houses and the erection of a terrace and semi-detached dwellings and creation of new access.		
Applicant	Mr Tim Dean		

SUMMARY	<p>The development does not accord with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> It introduces an alien built form, which would diminish the openness of the immediate locality and detract from the prevailing character and appearance of the area; <input type="checkbox"/> It creates an unacceptable sense of enclosure and loss of privacy for the occupiers of 147 and 159 Vinery Road and 222 - 230 Ross Street; and <input type="checkbox"/> It would give rise to an unacceptable level of noise and disturbance associated with both the proposed terraced and semi-detached dwellings and the associated traffic movements into an existing garden environment.
RECOMMENDATION	REFUSAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

1.1 151 & 155 Vinery Road are neighbouring two storey detached properties situated on the western side of Vinery Road. This section of Vinery Road is one-way, and the site is situated on the stretch of road between the bend in Vinery Road and Coldhams Lane to the north. The surrounding area is

predominantly residential, with the area of housing to the south and east of the site differing in character to the area to the north.

- 1.2 The properties at this end of Vinery Road all have their own individual design, as a result of piecemeal development over the last century. These range from bungalows, terraced masionettes, Victorian properties and in the case of 151 Vinery Road a Dutch Gable. For this reason, the character of the area is varied.
- 1.3 Properties immediately to the south of the site (No. 147, 149) are two storey semi-detached houses with pitched roofs and buff facing brickwork at ground floor and white/cream render at first floor. To the north of the site lies three red brick pitched roof bungalows (159, 161 Vinery Road and No. 248 Coldham's Lane), whilst immediately opposite lies a two storey flat roof apartment block (Nos. 188-196) constructed in red facing brick and dark brown timber weatherboarding.
- 1.4 The application site is rectangular in shape and includes part of the garden belonging to 149 Vinery Road to the south in order to deliver the proposed development. It should be noted that 153 & 157 do not exist on Vinery Road. The numbering is 147, 149, 151, 155, 159 Vinery Road on the western side.
- 1.5 The site is not within a Conservation Area or the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ).

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 Full planning permission is sought for the construction of three, two storey, three bedroom terraced houses, and two pairs of two storey semi-detached houses, following demolition of the existing two detached properties.
- 2.2 The three terrace houses (plots 1-3) are to be situated at the front of the site, in the same position as the detached properties. These houses would be part 2.5 storey, part single storey. The height of these properties will be 600 mm lower than the existing property at 155 Vinery Road and will incorporate a bedroom and en-suite in the roof. At the rear, the property will step down to a single storey flat-roof extension. To the south of the houses an access road would be constructed,

leading to two pairs of semi-detached houses at the rear of the site.

- 2.3 The two pairs of semi-detached houses (plots 4-7) would be situated to the west of the proposed terraced properties, within the existing gardens of 149, 151 & 155 Vinery Road. These properties are 2.5 storeys in height, with two bedrooms proposed within the roof that will be served by rooflights. To the rear of these properties are a single storey flat roof extension.
- 2.4 The site includes 7 car parking spaces – three off Vinery Road at the front of the terrace and four to the rear of the site in a small car parking court, one for each of the semi-detached properties. These four spaces abut the common boundary with the gardens of the proposed terraced properties. Individual bike stores are proposed for each of the properties and for the terrace properties, the bin stores included within these. For the two pairs of semi-detached properties, the bin store is proposed adjacent to the carport in a communal bin store. No visitor car parking spaces are proposed.
- 2.5 As part of this application, a number of amendments have been submitted, that have been re-consulted upon. These were submitted following comments from officers. These include the following:
- Scale and massing of Plots 4-7 has been reduced. The depth of these units has been reduced and the garden lengths increased by 900mm. The eaves and overall height has been lowered by 400mm.
 - The car port layout has been revised and a separate area for the storage of bins for Units 4-7 introduced and this arrangement is considered to work well.
 - The individual cycle stores provided for each of the units have been increased in size and paving has now been provided to ensure that these are all easily accessible.
 - The shadow study has been updated to reflect the revisions and an additional study for 17:00 has been included.
 - The lower portion of the first floor windows on the frontage of Plots 1-3 has been obscure glazed.
 - A ground floor window has been introduced to the flank elevation of Plot 1 to increase surveillance over the access route.

- Arrangement of windows on rear elevation of Plots 1-3 revised and a 600mm clear wall space has been provided to enable storage of furniture.
- The vertical window at first floor level on the frontage of Plots 4 and 7 has been obscure glazed.
- The materials have been identified on the elevations. Details regarding eaves/soffits, water goods and window reveals can be conditioned and this is standard procedure.

2.6 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:

1. Design and Access Statement
2. Planning Statement
3. Shadow Study

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
C/86/0545	Erection of a single storey extension to 149 Vinery Road	Permitted
C/68/0684	Detached 3 bedroom dwelling house for applicants occupation at 151 Vinery Road	Permitted

History for 155 Vinery Road Only

Reference	Description	Outcome
C/97/0883	The erection of a detached bungalow (Class C3).	Refused
C/97/0865	Demolition of existing house and erection of a terrace of 3 houses (Class C3).	Refused
C/95/0502	Outline permission for one bungalow (C3).	Refused and appeal dismissed
C/94/1000	SINGLE STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION TO CREATE LIVING ROOM, GARAGE AND UTILITY ROOM AT EXISTING HOUSE (C3).	Approved

C/91/0495	ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY DWELLING AND GARAGE.	Refused
-----------	--	---------

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, 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 3/10 3/12 4/13 5/1 8/2 8/6 8/10

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework March 2012 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014 Circular 11/95 Ministerial statement (1 December 2014) by Brandon Lewis Minister of State for Housing and Planning (Department of Communities and Local Government)
Supplementary Planning	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007)

Guidance	Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012)
	<u>City Wide Guidance</u> Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)

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, there are no policies in the emerging Local Plan are of relevance/the following policies in the emerging Local Plan are of relevance:

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Engineering)

- 6.1 Overall the proposal should have no significant impact on the public highway, should it gain the benefit of planning permission, subject to the incorporation of recommended conditions and informatives.

Head of Refuse and Environment

- 6.2 Overall there is no objection to the application in principle subject to the incorporation of recommended conditions and informatives.

Streets and Open Spaces (Drainage Engineer)

- 6.3 The proposal has a large increase in impermeable area and the use of permeable paving to mitigate some of this is welcomed. However, a minimum of 20% reduction in peak flow leaving the proposed development is required and therefore a condition has been recommended should the application benefit from planning permission.

Urban Design and Conservation

11th December 2014

- 6.4 The submitted amendments are acceptable in design terms and have addressed our previous concerns. The application is therefore supported in Urban Design and Conservation terms.

27th November 2014

- 6.5 The proposed arrangement and scale and massing of Plots 1-3 on the Vinery Road frontage is generally supported subject to identified amendments to the elevations.

Plot 4 is concealed behind the rear garden fence and garage of No. 149 resulting in a poor outlook from the ground floor study room windows as well and overlooking impacts from the 1st floor bedroom windows. The existing garage (located towards the rear of No. 149) conceals the unit from the private driveway reducing the legibility of this unit.

Streets and Open Spaces (Landscaping)

11th December 2014

- 6.6 The amended scheme has addressed many of our concerns and as a result we are prepared to support the proposals. There is a marked lack of landscape proposals and we will

expect the submission of a landscape scheme through the conditions process.

12th November 2014

- 6.7 While the comments above apply throughout, we feel that the proposed scheme is an overdevelopment of the site. A reduction of units, particularly within the grouping to the rear of the site, would provide each unit with more amenity space, better circulation and threshold space and would allow the carport adequate room for manoeuvring bins around parked cars. It would also allow more room for adequate tree and shrub planting.
- 6.8 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:

Objections

- 147 Vinery Road

Neutral

- 248 Coldhams Lane

- 7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Residential Amenity

- Plot 4 will create overshadowing to the majority of the garden of 147 and that there will be overlooking of the house and garden causing a loss of privacy;
- Noise will increase especially in the gardens as well as the proposed driveway creating and increase in pollution;

Car Parking

- Concerns that the proposed development will cause additional parking pressures for on-street parking, which is already under pressure.

7.3 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations:

Support

- 71 Lucerne Close (Relative lives at 135 Vinery Road)
- 150, 179 & 196, Coldhams Lane
- 95 Brampton Road
- 127 Vinery Road
- Cambridge Christadelphians, 184 Vinery Road

7.4 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Experience of the new development at Vinery Park has demonstrated an improvement to the street scene;
- Provision of good quality family accommodation;
- Good use of large and mostly unused private gardens;
- That the construction process should ensure that there is no disruption to the services at the Christadelphian Hall

7.5 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. Highway safety
5. Car and cycle parking
6. Refuse Storage
7. Third party representations
8. Planning Obligation Strategy

Principle of Development

- 8.2 Policy 5/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) states that proposals for housing on windfall sites will be permitted subject to the existing land use and compatibility with adjoining uses.
- 8.3 Paragraph 53 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 (NPPF) identifies that local planning authorities should consider the case for setting out policies to resist inappropriate development of residential gardens, for example where development would cause harm to the local area. Within the adopted local plan policy 3/10 addresses the acceptability of sub-dividing existing residential plots. The policy permits additional dwellings within existing residential curtilages provided six tests are met. The tests concerning comprehensive development and listed buildings are not relevant in this instance. I consider the remaining four tests, which concern neighbour amenity, amenity space and access, the character of the area, and trees, under the relevant headings below. This policy supports the guidance contained within paragraph 53 of the NPPF.
- 8.4 A material consideration to this application are two applications for 155 Vinery Road that have both been refused and dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate. Both applications sought permission for a detached bungalow but in different positions. C/002/95 sought permission for a bungalow within the rear garden, while C/97/0883/OP sought it at the front of the development on the street frontage. The 1995 application was refused for reasons relating to the loss of residential amenity due to noise and disturbance within what is presently a quiet garden area and that the proposed development would be a precedent for similar piecemeal backland development that would cumulatively erode the character of the area. The Inspector upheld both of these reasons.
- 8.5 While I appreciate that these previous applications were for one part of the current application site, the scale of development of a single bungalow in the rear garden environment of one existing property, 155 Vinery Road, was considered to be out of character for the area and gave rise to concerns about the impact on surrounding residents. Given that this application seeks 4 houses within the rear gardens of 3 existing properties,

these matters are therefore relevant to this application and need to be considered within the relevant sections of this report.

- 8.6 The proposed terrace of three houses at the front of the site, will be built in the same location as the existing pair of detached properties. The footprint of these three houses is very similar and therefore, these houses are to be built on previously developed land. It is my opinion, that these houses are acceptable in principle. The design of these houses and their potential impact on the residential amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings will be addressed under the appropriate headings below.
- 8.7 The rear portion of the site (ie the area where the pair of semi-detached houses will stand, along with part of the access road and car parking spaces) is not 'previously developed land' and forms the existing gardens of three residential properties.
- 8.8 In my opinion, the principle of the development presents no conflict with policy 5/1, and the consideration of paragraph 53 of the NPPF and policy 3/10 need to be considered against the relevant tests, which are addressed under the headings below.

Context of site, design and external spaces

- 8.9 The properties at this end of Vinery Road all have their own individual design which range from bungalows, terraced masionettes, Victorian properties and in the case of 151 Vinery Road a Dutch Gable. For this reason, there is no distinctive character within the area. The two properties that will be demolished as part of these proposals contribute to the variety of the street, but are not of any specific architectural merit to warrant their retention. The proposal to replace these buildings with a terrace of three properties is considered to be acceptable and would not be out of character with the surrounding area, and could be considered as a positive visual impact upon the street scene.
- 8.10 The proposed development incorporates two pairs of semi-detached properties to the rear of the site, which is presently garden land belonging to 149, 151 & 155 Vinery Road. The layout of development in this area is back to back properties which front onto Vinery Road and Ross Street. As existing the back to back distances between these properties are

approximately 60 m. Within the residential block that is boarded by Coldhams Lane to the north, Vinery Road to the east, Vinery Park to the south and Ross Street to the west, there is little development within the rear gardens of these properties apart from ancillary outbuildings and sheds.

- 8.11 The one exception to this is to the south of the application site on the corner of Vinery Road and Vinery Park. A small residential development, similar to this application, a terrace to the front and semi-detached properties to the rear, was granted planning permission in 2012 and has recently been completed. However, the context of that site is considered to be different to the proposed development due to its proximity with Vinery Park, which is a built up residential cul-de-sac that is in close proximity to the boundary of the approved development. The layout of properties in that area has a tighter urban grain and are situated on smaller plots, unlike the application site and the surrounding properties.
- 8.12 The appeal decision makes reference to the fact that in the main, the structures within the gardens of this block of properties are peripheral, leaving the central garden area comparatively undisturbed. From my site visit, this remains the situation nearly 20 years later. The proposal, like the appeal proposal seeks to introduce new residential development into the heart of this area, which detracts from the character of the area. For this reason, it is considered that the proposal to incorporate new residential development to the rear of the application site conflicts with policy 3/10 (c) and in doing so, the intrusion of development within the garden environment detracts from the character and appearance of the area.
- 8.13 Notwithstanding the above comments, the Urban Design Team identified in the application as submitted that the proposed contemporary approach to design would require a high degree of finish and quality of materials in order to ensure that this development would be a positive contribution to the local area. Therefore, as part of the amendments to the application, some changes were made to identify the materials on the drawings and improve fenestration of the front and side elevations of the terraced properties. The comments from Urban Design colleagues also included a suggestion that chimneys should be incorporated onto the terrace properties at the front in order to break up the roofline and that key details such as eaves and

soffit details are included on the drawings. These have not been included, but if planning permission were forthcoming, these items could be conditioned.

- 8.14 Despite the changes that have been made to the design of the proposed development and the fact that other elements could be conditioned as necessary, the application has failed to address the principal concern that the proposed development introduces a built form into the rear garden environment which is an incongruous form that detracts from the prevailing character and appearance of the area and for this reason does not comply with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/10 criterion (c).

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.15 Due to the location of the houses and their orientation it is my opinion that the neighbouring properties which may be potentially affected by the proposals are the dwellings to the south 147 & 149 and to the north 159 Vinery Road as well as adjoining properties in Ross Street, to the west of the application site. I consider that matters relating to overlooking, noise, over bearing sense of enclosure and loss of light are relevant to this application.

Overlooking

- 8.16 With regard to properties in Ross Street, the proposal will result in four gable ends facing the gardens and properties of 222 – 230 that will each have 2 windows at first floor, each serving bedroom 1. The first floor window to window distances are approximately 34 m. Despite this distance, and the extent of mutual overlooking between properties on Ross Street, I am of the view that the impact of the new houses on the privacy of 222-230 Ross Street is unacceptable. There is little screening along this boundary, as it has been removed, and in my view, the creation of directly facing first floor windows at this distance where no face-to-face overlooking currently exists, would result in a loss of privacy for the Ross Street occupiers.

- 8.17 The front elevations of plots 4-7 have windows at first floor that serve bedroom two. Where the window is closest to a neighbouring property, ie on plot 4 and 7, the vertical first floor window has been obscure glazed to protect the amenity of neighbouring properties at 147 & 159. However, there remains another window that although located further from the adjoining boundary, will still allow some views into these neighbouring gardens. Like the relationship with the Ross Street properties, the proposed development is allowing face-to-face overlooking with these neighbours, where none exists at present.
- 8.18 For these reasons I consider that the proposed development would cause a level of overlooking into the neighbouring properties that is unacceptable and that this would conflict with policy 3/10 criterion (a) of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

Noise

- 8.19 The location of these properties within the rear garden environment will increase the noise experienced by residents in the surrounding area. The 1995 appeal decision gave considerable weight to the fact that the insertion of a bungalow into the garden area would increase the activity both of occupants and vehicles, which would seriously detract from the quiet garden atmosphere which neighbours could reasonably expect to enjoy. Given that a greater number of dwellings are proposed as part of this application, this will naturally lead to a larger number of occupant and vehicle movements, which will affect a greater number of residents due to the larger site area. For this reason, I consider that the proposed development would cause a detrimental impact on the level of amenity that the residents surrounding the application site should reasonably enjoy and that this would conflict with policy 3/10 criterion (a) of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

Over-bearing Sense of Enclosure

- 8.20 The immediate area has some ancillary buildings that are appropriate in scale to domestic outbuildings.
- 8.21 The proposed semi-detached properties are located to the rear of the existing site, 43 m into the site when measured from the boundary of the site with Vinery Road. The form of these buildings include a pitched roof whose ridgeline runs east to

west. To the north, plot 7 is offset from the boundary with 159 by 1.3 m and to the south plot 4 is offset from the boundary with 147 by 2.5 m. Overall, the height of these buildings are 5.7 m to the eaves and 8.3 m to the ridge.

8.22 To the west, properties in Ross Street are presented with four gable ends that reach 8.3 m in height. The amendments to the application included that the depths of the rear gardens have been increased by 900 mm, which means a reduction in the depth of the buildings. The rear gardens of Plots 4 & 5 are now shown to be approximately 8m deep whilst the rear gardens of Plots 6 & 7 are 9m deep. This measurement is to the rear elevation of the proposed single storey. The distance between the common boundary and the two storey rear elevation is between 12.5 m and 14 m. The gardens of Ross Street are less than half the length of those on Vinery Road.

8.23 Given the scale and orientation of the proposed properties relative to their neighbours on the north, south and west boundaries the new houses will create a considerable sense of enclosure, which does not currently exist in any form. I do not consider that it is acceptable to create this in an area that is presently an open residential garden area and that the consequence of this is that the neighbouring properties will lose the level of amenity that they should reasonable expect to enjoy from their properties and gardens. For this reason, I consider that the proposed development conflict with policy 3/10 criterion (a) of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

Overshadowing

8.24 In order for officers to fully consider the impact of the proposed development upon neighbouring properties, additional shadow studies were requested. These shadow studies show that the proposed development will lead to increased overshadowing of the adjacent rear garden of No. 159 Vinery Road on the 20th March/23rd September. The proposed site and adjacent gardens are in full shadow on the 21st December 2014 at 17:00.

8.25 The BRE Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A guide to good practice (2011 second edition) paragraph 3.3.7 requires that neighbouring properties continue to receive in excess of two hours of continuous sunlight on the 21st March once the proposed development has been complete. The

amended shadow study identifies that this requirement will be met and for this reason the level of overshadowing to adjacent gardens that will be produced as a result of this proposed development is considered acceptable in design terms.

- 8.26 The occupant/owner of 147 Vinery Road has concerns that proposed dwelling on plot 4, adjacent to their boundary will overshadow their garden. Given that the proposed house is to the north of 147, there will not be a loss of light or overshadowing of the garden.
- 8.27 I do not consider that the proposed development would conflict with policy 3/10 criterion (a) of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 with respect to overshadowing.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

- 8.28 There is some concern that due to the proximity of plot 4 to the rear garden boundary of 149 Vinery Road (approximately 3.6m) this would result in a poor outlook from the ground floor study room window. However, this window does wrap around to the southern elevation of the building and on balance it is considered to be acceptable.
- 8.29 I do not consider that there are any other concerns regarding the quality of the development for future occupiers. In my view, the amenity space and outlook provided for future occupiers of the proposed houses is acceptable.

Refuse Arrangements

- 8.30 Individual bin stores are proposed for plots 1-3 at the front of the site and these are located in the rear gardens of each of the properties. The proposal would be for the occupants to move these to the kerbside at front of the property on collection days. This is considered to be acceptable by the Environmental Health officers.
- 8.31 The proposed bin stores for plots 4-7 are located in a communal bin store to the south of the car parking spaces. There is then an area on the southern boundary that allows bins to be stored on collection day. The construction of the access road will be engineered so that it can take the weight of the refuse truck. This proposal is considered to be appropriate.

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

Highway Safety

8.33 The highway authority have confirmed that the proposed development will have no significant impact on the public highway providing that conditions are imposed that ensure that the visibility spaces as shown on the drawings are retained.

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

Car and Cycle Parking

8.35 Appendix C (Car Parking Standards) of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) states that for houses of this size, no more than two off-street parking spaces for each house should be provided. In total, seven off-street parking spaces are proposed. The Planning Statement submitted as part of the application explains that the three frontage parking spaces on Vinery Road will serve each of the three terraces house, one space for each house. There are four car parking spaces proposed at the rear of the site, again, one for each of the semi-detached properties. No visitor car parking is provided on site, but Vinery Road is not a controlled parking zone. While I appreciate that during drop off and pick up at St Philip's School to the south of the site residents experience congestion, this site is located further to the north and as such any on-street parking by visitors is unlikely to exacerbate the existing situation sufficiently to warrant refusal of this application. On-site car parking provision is below the maximum standards, but considering the site's location and the Government's aim to reduce dependence on the private car, it is my opinion that it would not be reasonable to refuse planning permission on these grounds.

8.36 Appendix D (Cycle Parking Standards) of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) maintains that for houses of this size, at least three secure, covered cycle spaces must be provided for each house. It is proposed that each house will have an individual cycle store located within their rear gardens that will be able to accommodate three cycle spaces in each store. This meets the adopted standards and is acceptable.

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

Third Party Representations

8.38 The majority of points raised by third party representations have been addressed as part of the report. The outstanding concern is that the proposed driveway would increase pollution. I consider that as the driveway will serve 4 car parking spaces, an increase in air pollution would be limited.

Planning Obligation Strategy

8.39 As a result of the Ministerial statement (1 December 2014) by Brandon Lewis Minister of State for Housing and Planning (Department of Communities and Local Government) developer contributions on small-scale developers, for sites of 10-units or less, and which have a maximum combined gross floor space of 1,000 square metres, affordable housing and tariff style contributions should not be sought. The proposed development falls below this threshold and therefore it is not possible to seek planning obligations to secure community infrastructure in this case.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 The development of garden land would fail to have a positive impact upon the setting and would detract from the prevailing character and appearance of the area. The development is therefore an unacceptable plot subdivision, on garden land which is a low priority for development. REFUSAL is recommended.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE for the following reasons:

1. The introduction of the proposed two pairs of semi-detached properties into this backland site is unacceptable, because it introduces an alien built form, which would diminish the openness of the immediate locality and detract from the prevailing character and appearance of the area. The proposal has not therefore demonstrated that it has responded to its context or drawn upon key characteristics of the surroundings. For these reasons the proposal constitutes poor design in conflict with policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/10 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and guidance within paragraph 53 of the NPPF (2012).
2. Because of their height and relationship to the common boundaries to the north, south and west, the proposed semi-detached properties would create an unacceptable sense of enclosure for the occupiers of 147 and 159 Vinery Road and 222 - 230 Ross Street. Furthermore, because of the position and orientation of the first-floor windows on the rear elevations of plots 4 - 7, there would be a loss of privacy for the occupiers of 147 and 159 Vinery Road and 222 - 230 Ross Street. For both these reasons the proposal would be contrary to policies 3/4, 3/10 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.
3. The proposed development would give rise to an unacceptable level of noise and disturbance associated with both the proposed terraced and semi-detached dwellings and the associated traffic movements into an existing garden environment. This would result in an unacceptable loss of residential amenity to the adjoining occupiers, 147, 149 and 159 Vinery Road and 222-230 Ross Street. For these reasons the proposal constitutes poor design in conflict with policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/10 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).