

Application Number	15/0299/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	20th February 2015	Officer	Miss Catherine Linford
Target Date	17th April 2015		
Ward	West Chesterton		
Site	8 College Fields Woodhead Drive Cambridge CB4 1YZ		
Proposal	Change of use from house in multiple occupation (C4) to form large house in multiple occupation (sui generis) including extension, internal alteration and erection of bin store.		
Applicant	Honey-Ward Settlements Trust 2010		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed use would not have a detrimental impact on neighbouring properties subjecting to a condition limiting the occupation of the house to nine people; <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed extension and bin store would not have a detrimental visual impact; and <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed extension and bin store would not have a detrimental impact on neighbouring properties.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

1.1 8 College Fields is a 2.5 storey, detached house situated on the northeastern side of College Fields, which is off Woodhead Drive. The surrounding area is predominantly residential and the site is not within a Conservation Area or the Controlled Parking Zone.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

2.1 Full planning permission is sought for change of use from a small House in Multiple Occupation (C4) (up to six occupants) to a large house in multiple occupation (sui generis) (seven or more occupants), which includes the conversion of the garage into living accommodation; single storey rear extension to the side of the existing garage; and a bin store to the rear adjacent to the common boundary with 9 College Fields. Nine bedrooms would be provided.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

None relevant.

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 3/14 4/13 5/7 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
Supplementary Planning Guidance	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007)
	<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 that are of relevance.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

- 6.1 The application form states that two parking spaces are provided within the site and that this level of provision will remain unchanged. The parking spaces are unable to access the highway independently, which is impractical for use as provision for an HMO. No additional provision is made for the proposal, which may generate additional parking demand. The development may therefore impose additional parking demands upon the on-street parking on the surrounding streets and, whilst this is unlikely to result in any significant adverse impact upon highway safety, there is potentially an impact upon residential amenity which the Planning Authority may wish to consider when assessing this application.

Head of Refuse and Environment

- 6.2 No objection, subject to a condition restricting construction hours and an information regarding housing standards.
- 6.3 The above responses are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the consultation responses can be inspected on the application file.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

- 7.1 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations:
- 7 College Fields
 - 9 College Fields
 - 10 College Fields
 - 11 College Fields
 - 12 College Fields
 - 15 College Fields
 - 42 College Fields
- 7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:
- Lack of parking – cars already park on the pavement causing a dangerous obstruction for pedestrians and the emergency services

- The proposal would contravene the original planning permission (C/1060/89) and covenants which prevent garages from being converted
- Impact on the drainage system
- Bins will be left on the pavement
- Links to public transport are average and not high quality as stated by the applicant
- Increase in noise and disturbance
- Overlooking No. 7 from the converted garage

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. Car and cycle parking
6. Third party representations

Principle of Development

8.2 Policy 5/7 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) states that the development of properties for multiple occupation will be permitted subject to a) the potential impact on the residential amenity of the local area; b) the suitability of the building or site; and c) the proximity of bus stops and pedestrian and cycle routes, shops and other local services.

8.3 The site is close to public transport routes and it is my view that the proposals, therefore, comply with part c) of policy 5/7 of the Local Plan. Parts a) and b) of policy 5/7 are addressed below in paragraphs 8.5-8.13.

Context of site, design and external spaces

- 8.4 The proposed single storey extension would not be visible from the street and it is my opinion that it would not have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the house. I consider it to be visually acceptable. As the garage is set back from the street it is my view that the replacement of the garage door with a window would be acceptable.
- 8.5 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 3/14.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.6 The proposed extension and conversion of the garage would result in one additional window at the rear, looking into the garden of the house. There would be no additional overlooking of neighbouring properties.
- 8.7 The proposed floorplans show nine bedrooms and the applicant has confirmed the house would be occupied by nine people. A house can be let to up to six people without the need for planning permission, and I have therefore assessed the impact of three additional people. In my opinion, the impact of these additional people in terms of noise and disturbance would not be significant and it is my view that the occupation of the house by nine people is acceptable. Some of the rooms may be large enough to accommodate two people, and it is possible that the house could be occupied by up to 18 people. As the surrounding area predominantly consists of family houses it is my view that such an intensive use of the property could have a significant detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbours. I therefore recommend that the occupancy of the house is limited to nine people by condition (3).
- 8.8 The house is currently let to less than six people and I understand that bins are left on the pavement for prolonged periods of time. This is unsightly and it is my view that it could be rectified if there was an appropriate plan in place. I recommend that a management plan is required by condition (4).

- 8.9 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 and 3/7.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

- 8.10 The occupiers would share a communal garden, which is acceptable.
- 8.11 In my opinion the proposal provides an appropriate standard of residential amenity for future occupiers, and I consider that in this respect it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/7 and part c) of policy 5/2.

Refuse Arrangements

- 8.12 A bin store is proposed in the rear garden. This is acceptable.
- 8.13 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

Car and Cycle Parking

- 8.14 The proposal would result in the loss of the garage. The Highway Authority have commented that the proposal is unlikely to have a significant adverse impact on highway safety. The driveway can accommodate two cars parked in tandem. The Highway Engineer considers this to be impractical. There will be difficulties with maneuvering but it is my view that the impact of this would not be significant. In my opinion the additional occupants would not place such a strain on on-street parking spaces to warrant refusal of the application. I consider the arrangement to be acceptable.
- 8.15 A cycle store is proposed in the rear garden, which is acceptable.
- 8.16 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10.

Third Party Representations

Issue raised	Response
Lack of parking – cars already park on the pavement causing a dangerous obstruction for pedestrians and the emergency services	This is addressed in paragraph 8.11.
The proposal would contravene the original planning permission (C/1060/89) and covenants which prevent garages from being converted	Condition 8 of planning permission C/1060/89 states that the garages shall be used for the parking of cars only. If this application was approved it would override this condition. Covenants are not a planning consideration.
Impact on the drainage system	This is not a planning consideration.
Bins will be left on the pavement	This is addressed in paragraph 8.7.
Links to public transport are average and not high quality as stated by the applicant	This is addressed in paragraph 8.3.
Increase in noise and disturbance	This is addressed in paragraph 8.6.
Overlooking No. 7 from the converted garage	This is addressed in paragraph 8.5.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 In my opinion, the proposed extension would not have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the house or on neighbouring properties. It is my view that the proposed use would not have a significant detrimental impact on neighbouring properties. I recommend that the application is approved subject to conditions.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as listed on this decision notice.

Reason: In the interests of good planning, for the avoidance of doubt and to facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

3. The house shall be occupied by no more than nine people at any one time.

Reason: A more intensive use would need to be reassessed in interests of the amenity of neighbouring properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 3/7)

4. Prior to occupation as a sui generis House in Multiple Occupation a management plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The management plan shall include an arrangement for bringing the bins to the kerbside for collection and returning them to the store. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 5/7 and 3/7)