

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------|--------------|
| Application Number | 14/1382/FUL | Agenda Item | |
| Date Received | 12th September 2014 | Officer | Mr Sav Patel |
| Target Date | 7th November 2014 | | |
| Ward | Cherry Hinton | | |
| Site | Land Rear Of 268 Queen Ediths Way Cambridge Cambridgeshire | | |
| Proposal | Erection of a residential development consisting of 1 x 5 Bedroom House and 6 x 4 Bedroom Houses, along with internal access road, car and cycle parking and hard and soft landscaping. | | |
| Applicant | c/o Agent United Kingdom | | |

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| <p>SUMMARY</p> | <p>The development fails to accord with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed development would have an adverse urbanising impact on the rural qualities of the site and fundamentally change its character to the detriment of the wider landscape. - The proposal would result in a significant loss of trees which would have a detrimental impact on the character and visual appearance of the site. - The proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of adjoining residents and provide a poor level of amenity for future occupiers. |
| <p>RECOMMENDATION</p> | <p>REFUSAL</p> |

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site is located in the south-eastern corner of the City, on the southern side of Queen Edith's Way, close to the junction with Lime Kiln Road, which inclines from Queen Edith's Way. The site was a former chalk pit, which has been partly back-filled at the southern end of the site from spoil and fill from the construction of Addenbrooke's Hospital.
- 1.2 Queen Edith's Way is characterised as a suburban residential area consisting mainly of two storey detached and semi-detached dwellings with deep rear gardens and a good level of spacing between. The application site is located to the side (north-east) and rear (south) of No.268, which is a two storey detached dwellinghouse set back from the road. The site also adjoins the rear gardens of nos.252 to 266 Queen Edith's Way, which are two storey semi-detached dwellings with deep gardens. The garden depths of the dwellings that adjoin the site range from 71 metres (no.252) to 16 metres (no.268).
- 1.3 To the east is Lime Kiln Road which is a narrow rural road with limited footpaths and dense green verges on either side. There is no development along Lime Kiln Road. It is very much an exit and entry route into and out of the City from the south. The application site plays an important role in people's perception of having left the city and entering the countryside beyond.
- 1.4 The application site boundaries are defined by established tree and dense shrub planting which limits views into the site from Lime Kiln Road and Queen Edith's way, particularly during summer months. Within the site, it is generally unmaintained and left to nature. Recently some of the trees within the site have been removed. There is also a wide opening at the south end of the site from the top of Lime Kiln Road which allows uninterrupted views into the site. Access is restricted into the site from here by a metal fence.
- 1.5 The application site is not designated within any site constraint or formally allocated. However, part of the designated Green Belt runs along the southern boundary. To the south of the application site is a caravan park, which is located within the Green Belt and designated as an area of Protected Open Space (POS), and also within a 'Site of Special Scientific Interest' (SSSI). To the east is Lime Kiln Road and to the east of this is

Cherry Hinton Pit, which is designated as a SSSI, Local Nature Reserve (LNR), POS and is also within the Green Belt. To the north of Cherry Hinton Pit (and north-west of the application site) is an area of land known as Lime Kiln Close (also known as East Pit) which is designated as an area of POS, LNR, and is within the Green Belt.

- 1.6 The site contains several individually protected trees made up of two group tree protection areas. The group protection areas are located along the eastern boundary with Lime Kiln Road and at the southern end of the site. There are eight individually protected trees, which are located in the northern and southern sections of the site.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 Planning permission is sought for residential development on the site consisting of seven three-storey flat roof detached dwellings (one x 5bed unit and six 4bed units) including vehicular and pedestrian access, car parking, bins and cycle storage and roof mounted PV panels. The proposal also includes hard and soft landscaping. The proposed access would be created from Queen Edith's Way adjacent to the side of no.268. A separate pedestrian access is also included which would snake through the existing trees adjacent (east) to the vehicular access.
- 2.2 The layout of the accommodation within the proposed dwellings provides the main living space at first floor level with bedrooms on the second floor. Each dwelling would have undercroft parking for one vehicle on the ground floor including a separate bedroom/study with en-suite and utility room. Plots 4, 5, 6, and 7 would also benefit from two tandem parking spaces to the side of each dwelling. Plots 4, 5, 6 and 7 would include a separate cycle store, the rest would be provided within the undercroft.
- 2.3 Each property would have access to a private garden area to the rear, adjacent to the rear boundaries of the dwellings in Queen Edith's Way. However, plot 7 would also benefit from additional garden land to the south and a second floor terrace on the southern elevation. The proposed residential development would create 1150sqm of floorspace on a site that is 0.3 hectares.

- 2.4 The proposal includes the planting of new trees to replace those to be removed, retaining walls, and a 1.8 metre weldmesh fence along the eastern and south-east boundary. A stainless steel grid frame is proposed to the side of each dwelling to allow climbing plants. The front elevation of each dwelling has been designed with large glazed panel windows at the first and second floors.
- 2.5 The proposal would result in the loss of existing trees including five trees which are protected and replacement planting and landscaping within the site and around the proposed dwellings.
- 2.6 Amendments have been made to the proposal and additional information has been received in response to the technical comments made by County Highways, and our Urban Design Team and Landscape Officers. The proposal essentially remains the same in terms of appearance and amount. The amendments relate mainly to the access, boundary treatment, landscaping and footprint of the proposed dwellings. The additional information related to CGIs seek to demonstrate the visual impact of the development from the adjoining rear gardens of the dwellings in Queen Edith's Way.
- 2.7 Neighbours were also reconsulted on the proposed amendments. None of the amendments have addressed any of the concerns raised by local residents.
- 2.8 The amended plans and additional information have been carefully considered and assessed by consultees and their comments are set out in Section 6 of the report.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

No relevant planning history

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 3/2 3/3 3/4 3/7 3/8 3/11 3/12 4/1 4/2 4/3 4/4 4/6 5/1 8/1 8/2 8/3 8/4 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 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 Guidance | Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012) |

| | |
|--|--|
| | Planning Obligation Strategy (March 2010) |
| | <u>City Wide Guidance</u> Cambridge City Council (2011) - Open Space and Recreation Strategy 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 of relevance.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

6.1 First Comments:

The proposal proposes a shared surface for vehicles and pedestrians in the bellmouth, which would put pedestrians in direct conflict with turning vehicles. Recommend refusal due to impact upon safe and efficient operation of public highway. If this can be resolved with amendments then further supporting technical information will be required.

If the above issues are satisfied then conditions and informatives are recommended to ensure the access functions in a satisfactory manner.

6.2 Comments to amendments:

- All the issues raised previous have now been addressed.
- In terms of traffic generation from the site, the level of traffic associated with the development; anticipated to generate no more than 3-4 movements (two way) during peak hours, would not be significant enough to demonstrate significant detriment.

Head of Refuse and Environment

6.3 No objection to this application in principle subject to conditions and informatives relating to contamination, piling, construction hours, construction delivery hours and waste.

6.4 Comments to amendments:

No objection: all conditions and advice in previous comments remain.

Urban Design and Conservation Team

First Comments:

6.5 The proposed scheme fails to respond to the established site constraints and is harmful to the character and setting of the city in this location and as such is not supported in design terms.

Scale and massing

- Whilst the proposed units are a storey lower than the pre-application scheme concerns remain regarding the removal of the trees along the east, south and west site boundaries which will open up views into the site from all orientations. This would be unacceptable as it would change the established character of Lime Kiln Road.
- The angled layout, spacing between the units and close proximity to the western boundary would create an unacceptable sense of enclosure from the rear gardens of the dwellings in Queen Edith's Way

Elevations and materials

- The simple rectangular form of the units would be set into the western quarry face.
- The contemporary approach to materials and elevational treatment and form contrasts with the existing semi-detached houses in Queen Edith's Way.
- The proposed stainless steel grids and climbing plants are acceptable in design terms.
- The proposed materials whilst forming a contrast with the existing houses on Queen Edith's Way are acceptable in design terms.

Car parking, cycle and refuse storage

- The close proximity of the units and the arrangement of car parking spaces result in concerns with access to cycle parking and refuse storage.
- Driveways for plots 3, 4, 6 and 7 needs to be increased to 3.3 metres to address the access issue
- Vehicles accessing plots 4 and 7 may need to be reversed off the driveway of plots 4 and 7 to allow access to cycle and wheelie bins
- The cycle and refuse storage arrangements for plots 1-3 and 5-6 is acceptable in design terms.

Circulation

- Concerns with inadequate reversing distance/angle for driveways make manoeuvring difficult where a second car is parked (particularly where the road narrows to 4 metres in front of plots 1, 2, and 7) and will impact the streetscape.

Landscape and amenity space

- The proposed use of green weldmesh fencing along the southern and eastern boundaries is not supported as it would urbanise this rural approach and harm the character and appearance of Limekiln Road.
- Removal of trees from the southern and eastern boundaries will open up views into the site and is therefore unacceptable.
- Existing trees should be retained and enhanced where possible to reduce prominence of units
- Close proximity of the access road and proposed gabion wall may also impact the retention of the trees fronting Limekiln Road

- Concerns with the height of the proposed close boarded fence (1.8 metre high with 300mm high trellis panels above) along the western boundary.

6.6 Comments on amendments:

- The visuals submitted demonstrate the development would negatively change the character and appearance of Lime Kiln Road and so impact the setting of the city.
- The proposed boundary treatment would have an urbanising effect on Lime Kiln Road and harm the established character.
- The three CGIs submitted to show the proposed development in context do not give an accurate impression of the impact and none have been shown in winter months when trees are not in leaf.
- Concerns remain regarding the overlapping arrangement of units which creates the appearance of a solid wall of development.
- The limited rear gardens will put pressure to prune or fell trees which will further open up views over the rear gardens of the dwellings in Queen Edith's Way
- Previous concerns regarding the functional design of the scheme have been addressed.

Conclusion: Some of the concerns raised previously have been addressed. However, concerns remain regarding the removal of protected trees from the site boundaries and the potential views of the development from the rear gardens of the dwellings in Queen Edith's Way and Lime Kiln Road which is likely to significantly change this rural approach into the city.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Tree Team)

First comments:

- 6.7 Object to the scheme, as it does not sufficiently consider or respect the character of the area and the site's arboricultural constraints. Some loss of trees on the east bank is acceptable for arboricultural reasons provided adequate provision is made for replacement planting. The trees along this boundary have a combined value which is greater than the sum of its parts.

Concerns raised with the loss of trees that are not required to be removed and the impact the development will have on trees shown to retained both in terms of root damage and future pressure to remove trees that become oppressive.

- Loss of TPO'd trees will be detrimental to amenity and character of Lime Kiln Road.
- Concerns with the location and construction method of the footpath.
- Concerns that due to the significant level changes within the site it would need to be shown that the proposed raising/lowering of levels to achieve a manageable slope will not impact the root protection area of retained trees.
- Concerns with the number of trees proposed to being removed to accommodate usable outside space. This is not ideal. Tree along the boundaries with the dwellings in Queen Edith's Way provide a good screen and contribute significantly to the character of the area. Concerns with the future retention of the semi mature trees within some of the small plots, as they will not be defensible as they increase in size and dominate the back gardens.

Comments on amendments:

- 6.8 No additional comments received. I will report any further comments on the amendment sheet or orally at the meeting.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

First Comments:

- 6.9 Due to fundamental concerns over tree loss and effect on the character of the area the proposal is not supported.

General design principles

- Concerns with the level of amenity that would be provided given the land form and surrounding trees.
- Do not support the location of the pedestrian access for tree protection and desire line reasons.
- Access road may be difficult in accommodating waste collection.

Tree removal

- Do not support the removal of trees a number of which are TPO trees just to accommodate the proposed development

- The proposal to reduce the level of historic fill will force the loss of additional mature boundary trees against the back gardens with Queen Edith's Way

Landscape

- Do not support the ornamental hedge proposed for the entrance point boundary against Queen Edith's Way
- Do not support the use of green weldmesh fence along the southern and eastern boundaries as this would alter the character of this boundary.
- The proposal to infill gaps in the hedgerow with new hedges and trees is acceptable
- The proposed gabion wall adjacent to the eastern embankment is not supported as it would affect the rootzones of existing trees.
- The trees on the eastern boundary must be protected as losses will have a detrimental effect on the setting of the area, the character of Lime Kiln Road and the setting of the adjacent SSSI.
- Concerns with pressure to retain trees within the limited rear gardens of the proposed units.

6.10 Comments on amendments:

- The meandering footpath identified as no-dig construction and additional path provided to side of main access in the plans provided is not shown consistently on other plans.
- Support removal of weldmesh fencing in favour of more infill planting
- Concerns with use of Hornbeams which has a propensity to grow quite broad.
- Site will suffer from overshadowing of trees located at high level there boundary treatment will need to be carefully considered.
- Continue to have concerns with the need to remove additional trees, particularly those with TPOs.
- Whilst it is accepted that the site is not designated, it does form a boundary and buffer between several important sites, designations and use patterns.
- The proposed rear gardens are all shallow and small and will be quickly dominated by trees planted on boundaries and there will be subsequent pressure to fell trees in future.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Officer)

6.11 The proposed surface water drainage provision is supported in principle but will need to be tested. Therefore a surface water drainage condition is recommended.

6.12 Comments on amendments

Nothing more to add to original comments.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Nature Conservation Officer)

6.13 Satisfied with the level of survey conducted but notes the site was cleared of trees and scrub cover prior to survey undertaken. Due to fundamental concerns over tree loss, loss of habitat and wildlife corridors and negative impact on the overall character of the area the proposal is not supported.

Natural England

First comments:

6.14 No objection. Whilst the application site is located adjacent to Cherry Hinton Pit Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), the proposed development will not damage or destroy the interest features for which the site has been notified. The SSSI does not represent a constraint in determining the application.

The Ecology Report identifies the site has minimal biodiversity interest but some species of interest were found which suggests the site has potential to support habitat to compliment the SSSI and local wildlife sites. Therefore, as much of the existing habitat on site should be retain as possible to enhance and manage this for wildlife. Details of mitigation and enhance measures should be provided through a condition.

6.15 Comments on amendments

The proposed amendments relate to the layout and are unlikely to have a significantly different impact on the natural environment than the original proposal.

Wildlife Trust

- 6.16 The proposals are unlikely to have significant direct negative impacts on the nearby Cherry Hinton Chalk Pits SSSI or County Wildlife Sites although there may be some indirect impacts such as increased visitor pressure. However, management for nature conservation to form part of a linked habitat network would be a better option than housing development for this site.
- 6.17 Housing development in this location may compromise the ability to expand and link up the network of chalk grassland sites in this corner of Cambridge. Chalk grassland is a national and local priority habitat, and the chalk grassland sites in this area are part of the Cambridgeshire Chalk Living Landscape Scheme area (and previously recognised as a strategic network priority area in the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy).

Access Officer

Concern that the visually impaired would not have a pavement to follow and this would then endanger them from the movements of motor vehicles.

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 in objection to the application:

- 140 Queen Edith's Way
- 226 Queen Edith's Way
- 232 Queen Edith's Way
- 234 Queen Edith's Way x 4
- 239 Queen Edith's Way
- 242 Queen Edith's Way
- 244 Queen Edith's Way
- 248 Queen Edith's Way
- 249 Queen Edith's Way
- 252 Queen Edith's Way
- 258 Queen Edith's Way

- 260 Queen Edith's Way x 2
- 262 Queen Edith's Way
- 266 Queen Edith's Way
- 269 Queen Edith's Way
- 273 Queen Edith's Way x 2
- 277 Queen Edith's Way
- 279 Queen Edith's Way
- 23 Kelsey Crescent x 2
- 119 Coleridge Road x 2
- 6 Finches Close (Stapleford) x 2
- Letter from Barton Willmore on behalf of 256 to 266, 232 to 252, 239 and 273 Queen Edith's Way.

7.2 Julian Huppert MP has also made representations, which are reflected in the third party comments.

7.3 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations in support to the application:

- 268 Queen Ediths Way
- Bailey Fisher Executive Search, St John's Innovation Centre, Cowley Road

7.4 The representations in objection can be summarised as follows:
Principle:

- The interpretation of 'white land' does not promote development
- The proposal is contrary to policy 3/2 (Setting of the City) – degradation of the urban edge
- Sites such as this should be preserved
- There is no need for additional housing in Cambridge
- Development on garden land is resisted by the NPPF
- The proposal is contrary to policies 3/4 and 3/7 of the Local Plan

Highway safety:

- Concerns with highway safety from additional access on Queen Edith's Way and impact this would have on cyclist and pedestrians crossing the access
- Increase intensification of traffic movements at busy junction
- Increase damage to the road surface with more car movements
- Queen Edith's Way and Lime Kiln Road junction is an accident black spot and introduction of more traffic

movement is likely add to this to the detriment of the local residents

- The application site is not within 'easy walking distance' of the city centre
- Concerns with safety during construction work and vehicles accessing and leaving the site

Contamination:

- Concerns with content of land fill at southern end of site and ensuring any contaminants are not washed into surrounding drains.

Public consultation:

- Lack of public consultation from the developer with affected neighbours

Trees:

- The developer has taken down mature trees

Character:

- The proposal undermines the character of the area, protection of green space and urbanising a city edge causing lighting and noise pollution
- Concerns with the density of development which would be at odds with the character of the area
- Inappropriate design for a suburban area
- The site has become naturalised over the past decades
- The proposal would be entirely out of character with Lime Kiln Road which has no dwellings along it
- The proposed development would be visible from Lime Kiln Road and residents of the dwellings in Queen Edith's Way
- Concerns with the precedent this development would set for more development on the adjoining land
- Unacceptable erosion of the green boundary which separates the city limits from the rural approach
- The proposed development is incongruous with surroundings
- The proposed choice of materials would create an oppressive appearance to the detriment of the outlook from the dwellings in Queen Edith's Way
- Seven three storey executive houses within a densely packed site is incompatible with its surroundings
- Overdevelopment of the site

- The proposed development has an urbanised appearance which is more appropriate to a city centre location rather than a suburban rural fridge
- Front elevation is over fenestrated which is incompatible with its surroundings

Residential amenity:

- The development will introduce overlooking of existing houses, loss of privacy, loss of light in daylight, and further noise and night time nuisance
- The proposed wall of development will create overlooking and overshadowing and loss of natural light
- The proposal would introduce a large amount of artificial lighting
- The proposal would create an overbearing sense of enclosure
- Plot 4 will overshadowed by the walnut tree in the rear garden of no.260 resulting in the garden of plot 4 being in shade a lot of the time

Ecology, Landscape and Trees:

- Unacceptable impact on the wildlife and environment of this site
- The site's trees and hedges provides habitat for a number of animals even though some of the trees have been removed by the applicant
- The development would result in an increase in pets (particularly cats) which prey on birds and small mammals that use the site and adjoining SSSI and nature reserve
- The development would have an adverse impact on nature conservation locally and not mitigation measures have been proposed to contribute to enhancement of biodiversity
- The site was mowed and strimmed before the ecology surveyors assess the site
- Significant loss of trees within the site and impact on trees and root system close to the site boundaries from excavation
- The ecology report does not address the effects from light spillage on the nature reserve

Drainage:

- Impact from surface water drainage as a result from excavation of trees

Amendments:

- The amendments do not address the concerns raised

- 7.5 The representations in objection can be summarised as follows:
- The proposal would provide family housing in a mature, sympathetic setting
 - Shortage of family housing within the City and large number of new developments being built are for smaller apartments with limited amenity space
 - The site is within a central location and close to school, shops and public transport
 - Proposed dwellings within an attractive landscape setting and designed extremely sensitively for the site
 - The land is within the development envelope and answers a housing need
 - The proposal offers a pleasant and harmonious grouping for the houses
 - The proposal preserves a high degree of existing nature of the site and in some aspects enhances it.

- 7.6 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. Context of site, design, external spaces
2. Trees and Nature Conservation
3. Residential amenity
4. Refuse arrangements
5. Highway safety
6. Car and cycle parking
7. Third party representations
8. Planning Obligation Strategy

Context of site, design, external spaces

Setting of the City

- 8.2 The application site is an undeveloped parcel of semi-rural land that, in this context, forms an important visual green buffer between the residential development along Queen Edith's Way, edge of the city and protected countryside beyond. To the south of the site is the Green Belt and to east is a SSSI and a Local Nature Reserve. Whilst the application site is not designated, it plays an important role in this location in terms of forming part of an important habitat and ecological corridor and therefore has an important functional relationship with the adjacent designated sites. The character of the site is therefore a significant factor of the site's special quality.
- 8.3 The site has many trees; several of which are protected, dense shrub planting along the boundaries and a land form which provides habitat for a variety of wildlife. The site provides an important transition point between the urban edge and rural countryside.
- 8.4 In my view, the character and setting of the site would be significantly and adversely eroded as a result of the scale and amount of development proposed. The domestication of the site through the introduction of residential development would urbanise this semi-rural enclave and detract from its character. The proposed residential development of large family style houses and associated works would not only appear out of context but would also adversely change the character of this edge of city site.
- 8.5 The proposed development and loss of trees would also change the character and appearance of the site from Lime Kiln Road by introducing a form of development which currently does not exist. Views into and out of the site from Lime Kiln Road would be affected by the scale and amount of development.
- 8.6 The site is located on the south-eastern edge of the city. Therefore policy 3/2 (Setting of the City) is an important consideration. The policy states that development will only be permitted on the urban edge if it conserves or enhances the setting and special character of Cambridge and the biodiversity, connectivity and amenity of the urban edge is improved.

- 8.7 The proposed development, in my view, fails to comply with this policy, as it would not conserve or enhance the setting and special character of the urban edge. The development would introduce a form of development that would significantly alter the setting and character of this edge of city location. The applicant is proposing to remove a significant number of established trees and boundary vegetation. However, work to clear some of the trees within the southern section of the site has already been carried out. Whilst the applicant is proposing to carry out replacement planting, this would not only take time to mature but would also not effectively screen the development. The loss of trees and vegetation along the south, east and western boundaries would further open up views into the site, emphasising its change from semi-rural land to a fully developed suburban extension of Cambridge. In my view, the overriding visual and physical damage that would occur from the extensive erosion of established trees, loss of established vegetation and harm to the character of the site and area outweighs the benefits of providing housing.
- 8.8 The domestication of this naturalised green space by introducing a form and scale of development, as proposed, would appear alien and out of context. The proposal would therefore conflict with policy 3/4 (Responding to Context) which requires development to demonstrate that has responded to context and taken key characteristics of the surroundings.

Design

- 8.9 In terms of design, the applicant is proposing development that is of a contemporary design in the form of rectangular flat roof boxes, most of which are partially set into the western land bank. Plot 7 would be on a plateau on the southern end of the site and therefore be prominent from Lime Kiln Road and the Green Belt to the south.
- 8.10 The design of the proposed dwellings is in stark contrast with the traditional semi-detached two storey pitched roof dwellings along Queen Edith's Way. Whilst it could be argued that an isolated site such as this could allow for a contrasting/bespoke design, I do not consider the design or scale to be appropriate or respectful of the site's qualities or its contextual relationship with the surrounding landscape. The proposed blocky design,

dark choice of materials and large glazed panelling is more akin to an urban city centre context than this semi-rural setting. The design also has not drawn any inspiration to its setting and fails to sympathetically assimilate into the site would further emphasis the detrimental impact on the character and appearance of this site, and on views into the site from Lime Kiln Road and rear gardens of the dwellings in Queen Edith's Way, particularly at night but also in winter months.

- 8.11 I also have concerns with how this would affect the setting of the SSSI and Local Nature Reserve. Therefore, in my view, the proposal fails to comply with policies 3/2 and 3/4 and 3/12 of the Local Plan.

Trees and Nature Conservation

- 8.12 The proposal would result in the significant loss of established trees, many of which are protected by TPO's. The Tree and Landscape Officers are concerned with the amount of tree removal proposed and the impact this would have on the amenity and character of Lime Kiln Road. The trees at the southern/western fringe serve to delineate an established wildlife corridor connecting the mature gardens and playing fields along Queen Edith's to the LNR, the SSSI and the wider countryside.
- 8.13 Whilst the proposal includes some replacement planting of trees along the eastern and western boundary in amongst retained trees, these are likely to cause overshadowing of the garden areas of many of the proposed dwellings. This could result in pressure on future residents to significantly prune or potentially remove these trees which would open up the boundaries of the site. The Tree Officer has concerns about the impact development would have on the trees to be retained in terms of root damage and future pressure to remove trees that become oppressive. The proposed level of tree removal would, in my view, conflict with policy 4/4 (Trees), which does not permit development which would involve the felling, significant surgery or potential root damage to trees of amenity or other value unless the public benefits outweighs the current and future amenity value of the trees. I do not consider the public benefits from the proposed development would outweigh the significant damage and detrimental impact that would arise from the loss

of the existing trees and the potential impact on the root system of those that are being retained.

- 8.14 Ecologically, the site's value is its relationship with the wider landscape consisting of Cherry Hinton Chalks Pits and the protected road side verges. These sites are on the chalk ridge and support scarce chalk flora as well as scrub and woodland habitat for a diverse array of birds. Invertebrates such as glow worms also occur. The mature gardens and playing fields along Queen Edith's way also offer a significant corridor for many species. Therefore the removal and clearance of the site to accommodate development would have an adverse impact on the existing trees and the site's ecological relationship with the wider landscape. Furthermore, no details of lighting have been provided to demonstrate what impact the development would have on nocturnal wildlife.
- 8.15 In my opinion the proposal is contrary to Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 4/4 which seeks to avoid creating new development which adversely affect the amenities of local residents or the character of the area and where it would involve the felling/potential root damage to trees of amenity value.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.16 Currently the residents in the dwellings in Queen Edith's Way which back onto the site have a pleasant rural edge of city outlook. The proposal would result in a line of development directly along the rear boundaries which would materially change existing residents' outlook.
- 8.17 The proposed line of development would create the appearance of a physical walled barrier, and would be visible amongst the trees, particularly at night when rooms are lit. The proposal would also introduce windows in the rear elevation of each proposed dwelling that would allow views over the rear gardens of the existing dwellings. The existing rear gardens are currently not overlooked from this side and whilst they are long, many of them appear to be well used backs. It is clear that the development will be very apparent from the existing rear gardens of the Queen Edith's Way dwellings. The impact from

overlooking would also be further exacerbated by the removal of existing boundary trees. Whilst boundary planting can help to mitigate overlooking in built up areas this is not a full proof solution especially for this site where no overlooking from buildings exists. I am of the view that the potential harm caused from overlooking and sense of enclosure would be significant and adversely affect the residential amenity of the adjoining neighbours.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

- 8.18 Each proposed dwelling would have access to a private garden area. Whilst the size of the gardens appear to be generally acceptable, they are not as generous as those that abut Queen Edith's Way dwellings. However, as the Council does not have any policies on minimum standards of amenity space, consideration must be given to the quality of the space being provided for future residents and how it relates to the proposed dwellings and surrounding context.
- 8.19 Many of proposed rear gardens would be enclosed by the canopies trees on the western boundary and those in the rear gardens of the dwellings in Queen Edith's Way that would overhang these garden areas. This would not only cause shading, particularly in summer months but would also pressure future residents to remove or significant cut back the trees. In my view, the quality of the private gardens of the proposed dwellings would be poor and not provide a high quality living environment for future occupiers. Similarly, the eastern boundary contains a variety of mature trees which would cause shading at the front of the proposed dwellings. Overall due to the existing land form and existing and proposed boundary planting, the proposed development would not provide a high quality environment for future occupiers. The scheme would retain none of the spacious qualities of the site or its surroundings.
- 8.20 In my opinion the proposal fails to adequately respect the residential amenity of its neighbours and would not provide a high quality living environment for future residents. The proposal is therefore contrary to Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 3/7.

Refuse Arrangements

- 8.21 Each proposed dwelling would have a dedicated bin store which accommodates the requisite numbers of waste receptacles. Following concerns with the functional practicality of the bins, this has now been addressed.
- 8.22 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

Highway Safety

- 8.23 Significant local concerns have been raised regarding the proposed access and junction, and potential increase in traffic movement from the site and onto the Queen Edith's Way. The County Highway Officer had also raised their concerns with the access dimensions, junction details and visibility. However, following amendments and further consultation, the Highway Officer is now satisfied with the technical highways issues and does not believe the proposed development would result in significant additional traffic movements from the site that would have an adverse impact on highway safety.
- 8.24 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Car and Cycle Parking

Car Parking

- 8.25 Each proposed dwelling would be provided with at least two car parking spaces. The Council's Car Parking Standards seeks 2 spaces for a dwelling with 3 or more beds. Therefore the proposal is compliant with the standards. The applicant has also provided swept-path plan for each proposed dwelling to demonstrate that a large family car would be able to manoeuvre into the parking space and turn out of and leave the site in forward gear.

Cycle Parking

- 8.26 The Council's Cycle Parking Standards seek 3 spaces for 4bed dwellings and 4 spaces for 5bed dwellings. Provision has been made for cycle parking for each dwelling. In view of this plots 1 to 3 would be provided with two cycle stands within the

undercroft of each plot. Whilst there appears to be space on the ground floor to accommodate additional cycle parking this has not been shown on the floor plans. Plots 4 to 7 are proposed to be provided with separate cycle stores on the ground floors. Whilst not completely compliant with the standards, there is enough space on the ground floor to accommodate the required level of cycle spaces. I am therefore satisfied with the cycle parking arrangements.

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

Third Party Representations

8.28 Significant local concerns have been received from the neighbour consultation process. Most of these have been addressed in my report. Those outstanding are addressed below:

| Objections | Response |
|---|---|
| No need for additional housing | There is a need for housing but, the Council has 5year housing land supply. The need does not outweigh the harm to the setting of the City. |
| Development on garden land is resisted by the NPPF | Para 53 of the NPPF states LPAs should consider policies to resist inappropriate development of residential gardens, but this is not 'garden' land. |
| Lack of public consultation | No formal public consultation was carried out but I understand some neighbours have been notified by the applicant. |
| 'White land' does not promote development | This is an outdated term. Any development on non-allocated sites still needs to adhere to the relevant policies in the adopted Local Plan. |
| Could set precedent for development on adjoining land | Each planning application is considered on its own merits. |
| Damage to public highway | Any damage to a public highway is a County Highway matter. |
| Site not within easy walk of the city centre | The site is not within easy walking distance of the city centre. However, |

| | |
|--|---|
| | the site is close enough to the local centre in Cherry Hinton. There are also cycle lanes and bus stops close to the site to enable access into the city centre. |
| Ecological report does not address effects from light spillage | Agree. Without this information it is difficult to determine what impact the lighting from the proposed development would have on the nocturnal wildlife. |
| Amount of artificial light | As above. |
| Impact on surface water drainage as a result of excavation of trees | The proposal would be to discharge surface water via infiltration which is supported by our drainage officer who has also recommended a detailed surface water condition. |
| Concerns from contaminates from land fill being washed into surrounding drains | As above. |
| Increase in pets could harm bird and small mammals on the site | This is not a material planning consideration. |

Planning Obligation Strategy

Planning Obligations

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

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

In bringing forward my recommendations in relation to the Planning Obligation for this development I have considered

these requirements. The Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) provides a framework for expenditure of financial contributions collected through planning obligations. The applicants have indicated their willingness to enter into a S106 planning obligation in accordance with the requirements of the Strategy and relevant Supplementary Planning Documents.

- 8.30 The proposed development is not categorised as a ‘major’ planning application because it is less than 10 dwellings. It is categorised as a ‘major’ for S106 purposes because of the gross floor area the proposed development exceeds 1000sqm. 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 6 four-bedroom houses and 1 five bedroom house. 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 | | |
| 4-bed | 4 | 238 | 952 | 7 | 6664 |
| Total | | | | | 6664 |

| 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 | | |
| 4-bed | 4 | 269 | 1076 | 7 | 7532 |
| Total | | | | | 7532 |

| 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 | | |
| 4-bed | 4 | 242 | 968 | 7 | 6776 |
| Total | | | | | 6776 |

| 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 | | |
| 4-bed | 4 | 316 | 1264 | 7 | 8848 |
| Total | | | | | 8848 |

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 J1256 for each unit of one or two bedrooms and J1882 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 | | |
| 4-bed | 1882 | 7 | 13174 |
| Total | | | 13174 |

- 8.35 Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure the requirements of the Planning Obligation Strategy (2010), I am satisfied that the proposal accords with 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 | 7 | 525 |
| Flat | 150 | | |
| Total | | | 525 |

8.37 Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure the requirements of the Planning Obligation Strategy (2010), I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7, 3/12 and 10/1 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010.

Household Recycling Centres

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

8.39 The adoption of the Waste Management Design Guide SPD requires a contribution to be made in relation to all new development where four or more new residential units are created. Policy CS16 of the adopted Minerals and Waste Core Strategy requires new development to contribute towards Household Recycling Centres (HRCs) consistent with the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide SPD.

8.40 For new development in Cambridge the relevant HRC is located at Milton. The following table sets out how the contribution per new dwelling has been calculated for the Milton HRC.

| Notes for Milton | Infrastructure/households | Source |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| 4 sites at £5.5 million | £22 million | Cost per site sourced from Mouchel Parkman indicative costs 2009 |
| Total catchment (households) | 115,793 | WMT Recycling Centre catchment |

| | | |
|---|----------|---|
| | | tables CCC mid 2009 dwelling figures |
| New households | 24,273 | CCC housing trajectory to 2025 as of December 2010 |
| <u>Infrastructure costs</u> | | |
| Total number of households in catchment | | x New households in catchment |
| <u>£22 million</u> 115,793 | x 24,273 | = £4,611,730 |
| Total Developer Contribution per household = £190 | | |

The net gain is 7 therefore the necessary contribution towards HRC is $190 \times 7 = £1330$.

- 8.41 Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure the requirements of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012), I am satisfied that the proposal accords with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Development Plan (Core Strategy Development Plan Document July 2011) policy CS16.

Education

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

8.43 In this case, seven additional residential units are created and the County Council have confirmed that there is insufficient capacity to meet demand for pre-school education/primary education/secondary education/lifelong learning Contributions are not required for pre-school education, primary education and secondary education for one-bedroom units. Contributions are therefore required on the following basis.

| Pre-school education | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------|--|-----------|----------------------|-------------|
| Type of unit | Persons per unit | | £per unit | Number of such units | Total £ |
| 1 bed | 1.5 | | 0 | | |
| 2+-beds | 2 | | 810 | 7 | 5670 |
| Total | | | | | 5670 |

| Primary education | | | | | |
|--------------------------|------------------|--|-----------|----------------------|-------------|
| Type of unit | Persons per unit | | £per unit | Number of such units | Total £ |
| 1 bed | 1.5 | | 0 | | |
| 2+-beds | 2 | | 1350 | 7 | 9450 |
| Total | | | | | 9450 |

| Secondary education | | | | | |
|----------------------------|------------------|--|-----------|----------------------|--------------|
| Type of unit | Persons per unit | | £per unit | Number of such units | Total £ |
| 1 bed | 1.5 | | 0 | | |
| 2+-beds | 2 | | 1520 | 7 | 10640 |
| Total | | | | | 10640 |

| Life-long learning | | | | | |
|---------------------------|------------------|--|-----------|----------------------|------------|
| Type of unit | Persons per unit | | £per unit | Number of such units | Total £ |
| 1 bed | 1.5 | | 160 | | |
| 2+-beds | 2 | | 160 | 7 | 640 |
| Total | | | | | 640 |

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

Monitoring

8.45 The Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) requires that all new developments contribute to the costs of monitoring the implementation of planning obligations. It was agreed at Development Plans Scrutiny Sub- Committee on 25 March 2014 that from 1 April 2014 monitoring fees for all financial and non-financial planning obligations will be 5% of the total value of those financial contributions (up to a maximum of £50,000) with the exception of large scale developments when monitoring costs will be agreed by negotiation. The County Council also requires a monitoring charge to be paid for County obligations in accordance with current County policy

8.46 For this application a monitoring fee of £2,175.95 is required to cover monitoring of Council obligations plus the County Council monitoring fee and the monitoring fee associated with the provision of public art.

Planning Obligations Conclusion

8.47 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 proposed development is for seven three storey detached dwellings with vehicular and pedestrian access on an area of land rear of 268 Queen Edith's Way. The application site is naturalised green space that forms part of the rural setting of the City and which is bound by established and mature trees and vegetation. The site provides an important transition from the adjacent SSSI, Local Nature Reserve and Green Belt to the residential development on Queen Edith's Way. Therefore the development of this site would significantly change and harm

the character of this edge of city land and how it relates to the wider landscape through its urbanisation.

- 9.2 The proposed development would also result in the significant loss of trees including trees with TPOs that play an important role in the appearance and character of this site. The trees have significant amenity value which should be protected.
- 9.3 The proposed development would also introduce a form of development that would create overlooking of the existing private gardens. Furthermore, due to the angled layout of the development which has been dictated by the site constraints, it would result in the appearance of a visual 'walled' barrier from the rear gardens of the dwellings in Queen Edith's Way. This would result in a poor outlook and sense of enclosure on the existing residents. There are also significant concerns with the impact on the residential amenity of future occupiers due to the land form and boundary trees which would overhang and be within close proximity to the front and rear elevation of the proposed dwellings. Due to the size of the gardens for the proposed dwellings, there is likely to be pressure on pruning and felling of boundary trees, which would further open views over the existing rear gardens.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE for the following reasons:

1. The introduction of development on this edge of city site, which has an important role in providing a buffer and transition between the urban environment and designated protected sites to the east and south, would, by virtue of its incongruous scale, intrusive and unsympathetic design and angled layout of the buildings, have a significantly detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the site, and setting of the city. The proposed design would also appear out of character with the existing built form along Queen Edith's Way and in doing so introduce an alien form of development adjacent to Lime Kiln Road. For these reasons the proposed development is in conflict with policies 3/2, 3/4, and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006), and government guidance the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

2. The proposed development would result in the loss of five trees which are protected by Tree Preservation Orders and several others trees along the eastern and southern boundary which are group protected. As a group these trees make a significant contribution to the character of this edge of city site. Given the limited size of the amenity space associated with the houses it is likely that future residents will be pressured into having to remove/reduce the size of these and other trees. The removal of trees from the site would expose the development to both the surrounding area and the dwellings to the west in Queen Edith's Way. In so doing, the development would have a detrimental effect on the character of the site and the contribution it makes to the wider setting of the city and would adversely affect the residential amenity of occupiers in Queen Edith's Way. The development would be contrary to policies 3/4, 3/7 and 4/4 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and Government Guidance in section 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
3. The proposed development would due to the angled layout of dwellings and scale of development, create a walled barrier which would enclose the rear gardens of dwellings in Queen Edith's Way and have an adverse effect on outlook from these dwellings. The rear elevation of the proposed dwellings would also contain windows which would directly overlook the rear gardens of the existing dwellings such that it would have an adverse impact on the residential amenity of the existing residents in terms of overlooking and loss of privacy. The proposed development would create an adverse sense of enclosure on the existing residents and cause loss of privacy to gardens that are not currently overlooked. For these reasons, the proposed development conflicts with policies 3/4 and 3/7 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

2. Unless prior agreement has been obtained from the Head of Planning, in consultation with the Chair and Spokesperson of this Committee to extend the period for completion of the Planning Obligation required in connection with this development, if the Obligation has not been completed by 30 March 2015, or if Committee determine that the application be refused against officer recommendation of approval, it is recommended that the application be refused for the following reason(s):

The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for public open space, community development facilities, education and life-long learning facilities, waste facilities, waste management and monitoring in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 3/8, 3/12, 8/3 and 10/1 Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012

3. 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