

Application Number	15/0031/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	19th January 2015	Officer	Michael Hammond
Target Date	16th March 2015		
Ward	Queen Ediths		
Site	90 And 92 Wulfstan Way Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 8QH		
Proposal	Erection of two new dwellings to the rear of 90 and 92 Wulfstan Way.		
Applicant	Mr Steve Geoghegan 4A Fanshawe Road Cambridge CB1 3QZ And Mrs Saville 41 Newport Mews, Brighton Road Worthing BN11 2HN		

SUMMARY	The development is contrary to the Development Plan for the following reasons: 1) The proposed sub-division of the plot would detrimentally harm the character of the surrounding area, contrary to policy 3/10 of the Local Plan (2006).
RECOMMENDATION	REFUSAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site, no.90 and 92 Wulfstan Way, is comprised of two, two-storey residential semi-detached properties situated on the west side of Wulfstan Way. The site is situated to the south-east of the city and is positioned to the east of Mowbray Road.
- 1.2 The gardens of the properties have been sub-divided, with the western half of the rear gardens occupied by a large single-storey outbuilding which is accessed to the west along Hulatt Road.

1.3 The surrounding area is residential in character and is formed primarily of two-storey semi-detached properties.

1.4 There are no site constraints.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

2.1 The proposal, as amended, seeks full planning permission for the erection of two one-bedroom dwellings on the land to the rear of 90-92 Wulfstan Way.

2.2 The existing outbuilding that occupies the garden land would be demolished.

2.3 The proposed dwellings have been designed in a semi-detached style, two-storeys high and designed with front facing dormer windows. Car parking would be accessed along Hulatt Road to the west. Cycle parking and waste storage is provided in the south-east and north-east corners of the plots, with outdoor amenity space at the rear of the proposed dwellings. The gardens would be 5.8m deep.

2.4 The proposed dwellings would be attached and identical in design, measuring 2.9m to the eaves, 6.1m to the ridge, designed in a ridge roof style with tiles and brick externally.

2.5 The following amendments have been made to the original drawings:

- Relocation of bins/ bike stores.
- Reduction in height and removal of first floor windows.
- Addition of first floor front dormer windows.
- Insertion of velux window roof lights on rear elevation.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

3.1 There is no relevant planning history for this site.

4.0 PUBLICITY

4.1 Advertisement:	No
Adjoining Owners:	Yes
Site Notice Displayed:	No

5.0 POLICY

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

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

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

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

Central Government Guidance	<p>National Planning Policy Framework March 2012</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014</p> <p>Circular 11/95</p> <p>Ministerial Statement (1 December 2014) by Brandon Lewis Minister of State for Housing and Planning (Department of Communities and Local Government)</p>
Supplementary Planning Guidance	<p>Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007)</p> <p>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012)</p>
	<p><u>City Wide Guidance</u></p> <p>Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)</p>

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.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

- 6.1 No objection: No information on impact on parking for existing dwelling. May impose additional demands on on-street parking.

Head of Refuse and Environment

- 6.2 No objection, subject to conditions.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

Original comments (29/01/2015)

- 6.3 The proposed development is broadly acceptable on landscape grounds.

Prior to issuing full support, however, we require details of the bike and bin stores proposed.

Second comments (09/03/2015)

- 6.4 No objection.

Drainage

- 6.5 There is no flood risk issue associated with this application.

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:

- 92 Wulfstan Way

- 7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Loss of light
- Overshadowing
- Overlooking
- Reduction in garden space

- 7.3 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations can be inspected on the application file.

8.0 ASSESSMENT

- 8.1 From the consultation responses and representations received and from my inspection of the site and the surroundings, I consider that the main issues are:

1. Principle of development
2. Context of site, design and external spaces
3. Residential amenity
4. Refuse arrangements
5. Highway safety
6. Car and cycle parking
7. Third party representations
8. Planning Obligation Strategy

Principle of Development

- 8.2 Policy 5/1 supports residential development on windfall sites subject to the existing land use and compatibility with existing land uses. There is no conflict with this policy. Policy 3/10 supports the use of sub-divided residential curtilages for new development only if the proposal causes no harm to neighbour amenity or the character of the area, and provides acceptable amenity space, car and cycle parking and waste storage. I explain below that in my view the proposal does cause harm to the character of the area.
- 8.3 In my opinion, whilst the principle of residential development on this site is acceptable, I believe it is in conflict with policy 3/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 for the reasons as set out below.

Context of site, design and external spaces

- 8.4 The proposed design, scale and associated works of the proposed dwellings are generally reflective of properties in the surrounding area and are individually in keeping with the character of the area.
- 8.5 However, I consider that the sub-division and subsequent development of this plot would be harmful to the character of the area. Properties along Wulfstan Way to the north are characterized by long open rear gardens, with small ancillary outbuildings accessible to the west along Hulatt Road.
- 8.6 By sub-dividing this garden land and subsequently developing it for residential development, the character of the rear garden area will be altered significantly. None of the rear gardens of properties along Wulfstan Way to the north have been sub-divided into separate residential plots, and so the introduction of this type of development of this height would detract from it. The introduction of residential development on this site could open up the sub-division of similar plots nearby along Wulfstan Way which would remove the open tranquil feel of these long rear gardens and transform the context of the site. Members need to be conscious of this when determining this application as these two plots could potentially pave the way for frontage all the way along Hulatt Road.

- 8.7 The indicative drawings provided attempt to show the similarities between the proposed development in terms of scale and design to that of no.121 Hulatt Road, positioned to the south of the application site. However, I do not consider this nearby property to set a precedent for the development of the rear garden space of nos.90-92 Wulfstan Way. This is because the relationship between nos.90-92 and the proposed dwelling is noticeably different to the relationship between nos.94-96 Wulfstan Way and no.121 Hulatt Road. Nos.94-96 are set at a right angle compared to the other properties to the north along Wulfstan Way, and so no.121 was developed to the west side of nos.94-96, and not developed directly to the rear of these properties, as is proposed in this scheme. As a result, the sub-division proposed in this application is entirely different and not comparable to the existing development of no.121.
- 8.8 I consider that the sub-division of this plot in this manner would detract from the character of the area and is contrary to Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/10 criterion (c).

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

Overlooking

- 8.9 The original drawings of the proposed scheme included first floor rear windows which would have overlooked the neighbouring properties along Wulfstan Way.
- 8.10 However, the amended drawings have removed the original first floor rear windows and replaced these with velux roof lights which do not offer any visual outlook into the amenity spaces of these neighbouring properties.
- 8.11 The proposed first floor side window on the south elevation is obscure glazed and does not offer any visual outlook that compromises the privacy of no.121 Hulatt Road.
- 8.12 The first floor front dormer windows that look out to the west of the site do not lead to the loss of privacy at no.17 Hulatt Road as there are no windows on the side elevation of this neighbouring property.

Enclosure

- 8.13 Nos.88, 90 and 92 Wulfstan Way to the east are positioned approximately 19m from the proposed dwellings. While the proposal would be visible from the rear outlooks of these neighbouring properties, I consider the extensive separation distance coupled with the relatively modest height of 6.9m to be sufficient as to not detrimentally enclose or visually dominate any of these neighbouring properties to such an extent as to warrant refusal.
- 8.14 There are no important visual outlooks on the relevant side elevations of nos.121 and 17 Hulatt Road and so I consider that the proposed dwellings would not be perceived as visually enclosing from either of these neighbouring properties.

Overshadowing

- 8.15 The proposed dwellings would inevitably lead to some overshadowing of the western half of rear gardens of nos.88 and 86 Wulfstan Way in the afternoon. However as the majority of garden space and the rear elevations of these properties will be unaffected in relation to access to light, I consider this minor loss of light to be acceptable.
- 8.16 I note that concerns have been raised from no.92 Wulfstan Way regarding loss of light caused by the proposed dwellings. However, similar to the preceding paragraph, the proposed dwellings would only lead to a minor loss of sunlight in the rear gardens of nos.90 and 92 during late afternoon hours, and so I do not consider that this loss of light will detrimentally harm residential amenity to such an extent as to warrant refusal of the application.
- 8.17 The proposed dwellings would have no detrimental overshadowing impact on no.17 Hulatt Road in the morning hours as there are no windows or amenity areas that rely on access to light from the east.
- 8.18 No.121 Hulatt Road is positioned directly to the south of the application site and so will be unaffected by the proposed dwellings in terms of access to light.

- 8.19 In my opinion the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and I consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/12.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

- 8.20 The application provides two one-bedroom homes with outdoor amenity space with a depth of 5.8m and adequate parking provision. The site is located in a sustainable location, with adequate cycle provision, close to services and facilities in the immediate area, as well as within walking distance to nearby bus stops. In my opinion the proposal provides a high-quality living environment and an appropriate standard of residential amenity for future occupiers, and I consider that in this respect it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12.

Refuse Arrangements

- 8.21 Adequate refuse arrangements have been provided for each dwelling with easy access for residents to and from the kerbside on Hulatt Road. The Environmental Health team are satisfied with the level of provision and the refuse arrangements overall.
- 8.22 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

Highway Safety

- 8.23 The Highway Authority has not raised any objections to the proposed scheme in terms of highway safety. The proposed dwellings do not alter any existing vehicular access and so there will be no implications in this regard.
- 8.24 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Car and Cycle Parking

- 8.25 The proposed scheme would create two new parking spaces which would be accessed from Hulatt Road and I consider this level of parking provision appropriate for the application site.

- 8.26 Cycle parking for four spaces has been provided externally at the rear of the site and I consider this type and level of cycle provision to be acceptable for the proposed development.
- 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 The third party representations have been addressed in the main body of this report.

Planning Obligation Strategy

Planning Obligations

- 8.29 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. This also applies to all residential annexes and extensions. The proposed development falls below this threshold 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 rear garden setting of Wulfstan Way properties 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 semi-detached properties into this backland site is unacceptable, because it introduces a level of development which would diminish the openness of the immediate locality and detract from the prevailing character and appearance of this suburban area. For these reason the proposal is in conflict with policies 3/4, 3/10 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and guidance within paragraph 53 of the NPPF (2012).