

Application Number	15/1855/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	6th October 2015	Officer	Rob Brereton
Target Date	1st December 2015		
Ward	Trumpington		
Site	1 Fitzwilliam Road Cambridge CB2 8BN		
Proposal	Demolition of existing building and construction of six new dwellings and associated access and landscaping		
Applicant	Fitzwilliam Road (Cambridge) LLP		

SUMMARY	<p>The development does not accord with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>The scale, bulk and design of the proposal constitute overdevelopment of the site which will not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation area.</p> <p>The use of the rooms, position and substantial amount of glazing used on the upper floors (first to third) on the rear facade of the proposal all contribute to the unacceptable loss of privacy and an unacceptable sense of enclosure to the occupiers of No. 3 Fitzwilliam Road and No. 21 Clarendon Road.</p> <p>The proposed development would endanger the health of two trees with TPO status</p>
RECOMMENDATION	REFUSAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

1.1 The site is situated on the northern side of the junction of Clarendon Road and Fitzwilliam Road. The area of the site is 0.1 hectares in extent (0.23 acres). It is a corner plot and contains a late C20th brick building on three storeys under a slate roof. In 1948, the home was taken over by the Children's Society (formerly the Waifs & Strays Society) then from 1951 was run by Barnardo's. In 1972, the property was acquired by

Cambridgeshire & Isle of Ely County Council as a hostel for working-age boys, adapting the existing building. On the 14th September 1993, planning permission was granted to demolish the home and build a replacement hostel, which was implemented and the present building at 1 Fitzwilliam Road was constructed. The building is currently vacant.

- 1.2 It lies in the very south eastern corner of the Brooklands Avenue Conservation Area, which was designated in 2002. The Appraisal defines Nos. 3-9 Fitzwilliam Road (which are immediately to the west of the site) as Buildings of Local Interest. It states that this group is an austere but imposing terrace that dominates the street. The impact that the subject property makes to the character of the area remains undefined, but it is fair to describe its contribution as neutral.
- 1.3 There are no listed buildings in the vicinity and as such the conservation concern relates to the impact of the proposed work on the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area.

Across the road from the site lies the substantial contemporary development of Kaleidoscope, which has been the subject of major redevelopment in recent years. This development is not located in a Conservation Area.

- 1.4 There are two mature sycamore trees with TPO status located at the front of the site facing the junction of Fitzwilliam Street and Clarendon Street. The site is also located within a controlled parking zone.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 Planning permission is sought for the demolition of the existing building and construction of six new dwellings and associated access and landscaping.
- 2.2 The proposal is for four townhouses and two apartments, all contained within one overall building. The townhouses all comprise 4 bedroom properties, with two fronting Clarendon Road and two fronting onto Fitzwilliam Road. The two apartments form the junction between the townhouses. The ground floor apartment is a two bed property and the first floor

apartment is a 3 bedroom property. The townhouse units are labelled T1, T2, T3 and T4 and the apartments A1 and A2.

- 2.3 Each of the townhouses is three storeys with rooms in the roof, similar to many properties in the area. The nature of the sloping roof and its set back provides the impression of a three storey dwelling with rooms in the roof. Vehicle access is taken at ground level down to a basement parking area. This area has six car parking spaces and bicycle storage.
- 2.4 Regarding private amenity space, this comprises private back gardens for each of the townhouses whilst the apartments have private balconies to provide their amenity space.

Amendments

- 2.5 After much discussion the agent on behalf of the applicant amended the scheme. Amendments included:

Building line

- 2.6 The building line of the proposal was recessed to be in line with the front of No. 21 Clarendon Road with only the bay piers T3 and T4 units projecting beyond. The building line of the proposal is also more consistent with the building line of Fitzwilliam Road. Only the bays of units T1 and T2 projected forward of this building line.

Massing

- 2.7 The width of the first floor was decreased, and one metre was taken off T1 and T4 respectively. This remains that the third floor is now further indented from both No. 21 Clarendon Road and No. 3 Fitzwilliam Road. Also the height of T4, the unit closest to No. 21 Clarendon Road, was decreased by 300mm.

Materials

- 2.8 The copper colour cladding to the corner has been taken to ground floor level. A mixture of glazed openings and spandrel panels has now been added to the third floor.

Elevations

- 2.9 On Fitzwilliam road the fenestration has been altered. Two small projecting brick band courses have been introduced across the front, sides and rear.

Amenity space

- 2.10 The proposed cycle store has been relocated to the basement carpark, giving more space to the rear gardens. An additional balcony space has been added to units A1 and A2.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
15/540/TTCA	T10 - European Larch: fell T11 - Silver Birch: fell	Approved subject to conditions
C/88/1020	Erection of 2 no. Timber storage sheds	Approved subject to conditions
C/87/1064	Erection of aviary to accommodate pet birds.	Approved subject to conditions
C/73/0062	Erection of two storey and single storey extensions to existing hostel	Approved subject to conditions
C/72/0279	Change of use from Residential Children's Home to Offices	Approved subject to conditions

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	3/2 3/3 3/4 3/7 3/10 3/11 4/3 4/4 4/9 4/11 4/12 4/13 4/14 4/16 5/1 5/3 5/10 5/11 8/1 8/2 8/3 8/5 8/6 8/9 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) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012) Planning Obligation Strategy (March 2010)
Material Considerations	<u>City Wide Guidance</u> Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010) Buildings of Local Interest (2005)
	<u>Area Guidelines</u> Brooklands Avenue Conservation Area Appraisal (2013)

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.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

6.1 NO OBJECTION

The Highway Authority had concerns with the original scheme. This regarded the ramp of the car park is only wide enough for a single vehicle at a time.

It is noted that the amended scheme does have an off street space sufficient for a vehicle to wait as another vehicle drives up the ramp. The Highway Authority found this amended scheme and the information provided by the applicant satisfactory to remove any concerns regarding highway safety.

Environmental Health

6.2 NO OBJECTION

There are no concerns with regards to 1 Fitzwilliam Road or the surrounding area. Pollution from the demolition and construction phases has the potential to affect the amenity of surrounding properties if not controlled. In the interests of amenity, therefore recommend the standard construction/ demolition/ delivery hours and dust conditions are recommended.

Urban Design and Conservation Team

6.3 OBJECTION

6.3.1 Comments regarding original scheme

The proposed development is a three storey brick structure with a fourth floor accommodated within a steeply sloping metal roof with a flat top. The scheme is considered inappropriate, from a conservation perspective. The height, depth and articulation are excessive.

The height is amplified by the very dark metal clad roof structure, which is as awkward as it is tonally inappropriate. This form of roof gathered popularity in a variety of large buildings during the late C20th. It is an ungainly approach to introducing a top floor whilst attempting to suggest a room in the roof. It is assumed the feature does not seriously try to suggest such a layout as it is rather contrived, partly because it involves a combination of dormers, vertical walls and roof clad in metal, but with the obvious employment of a large flat roof behind it. It is also unconvincing because it is so prominent. This cladding is so obtrusive that it does little to respect the existing dominance of the terrace to the west. On the north eastern corner the attempt to acknowledge the scale of the residential properties by hipping the metal roof simply pays lip service to the scale of the properties at its north, whilst the northern flank wall is almost as tall as the ridge at 21 Clarendon Road.

In terms of the depth of the building, oblique views looking south along Clarendon Road would show the projection of the blank brick wall adjacent to the domestic scale of property at 21. Not only is the proposed structure far taller than that adjacent, but it is deeper and projects towards the pavement beyond the building line of 21. Therefore, both its close proximity to, and height in comparison with, 21 results in a rather overbearing relationship. This is exacerbated by the lack of articulation, which gives it the air of an office block, particularly given its close proximity to the adjacent domestically scaled building.

This is an altogether uncomfortable juxtaposition which does little to preserve the character of this residential side of the road. It is pertinent to note at this point the eastern edge of the

Conservation Area is drawn along the front gardens of those office buildings on the eastern side of Clarendon Road, and its southern edge runs along the centre of Fitzwilliam Road, omitting the new development to the south. So, whilst it is clear that the proposed development is taking its cues from across the road, it would be more appropriate to draw inspiration from the scale, articulation and rhythm of the properties between which it is to sit.

6.3.2 Comments regarding amended scheme

The amended drawings were submitted following comments made by the local authority - but the scheme continues to cause concern. Essentially, the massing remains excessive. From a conservation perspective this means that the structure will impose awkwardly upon the BLIs on Fitzwilliam Road, (no.s 3, 5, 7 and 9).

Whilst the glazed top floor has been recessed somewhat beyond the front and side elevation walls, the difference between it and the masonry is considered insufficient, and in combination with the overall height of the structure, will appear overbearing and rather abrupt.

The architectural language monolithic elevations clad in glass and gault brick is becoming locally distinctive in the city, but is not an architectural panacea - and should not necessarily be employed, particularly in sensitive settings. It is accepted that the immediate location, opposite properties outside the Conservation Area, which are of quite a different character and language, creates a complex architectural climate. Nevertheless, these buildings should not be used as exemplars. Rather, it is the sensitivities of the site, and the articulation and massing of the dwellings either side, which should inform the scale and form of any new development.

At the Clarendon Road end of the site, the relationship between the property at no.21 and the proposed block is uncompromising. The scale remains excessive and would therefore not preserve the character of the place. It is appreciated that several attempts have been made to mediate between no.21 and the new development, but the current scheme does not meet expectations.

At the Fitzwilliam Road end, the balance between horizontal and vertical rhythm is understandable, as it loosely reflects the form of the Victorian properties adjacent, but in its execution it is awkward, and the horizontal banding does not tie in with the Victorian bands adjacent. The result is jarring, to the general detriment of the place.

In summary, the conservation team does not support the current proposal as it would neither accord with s.72 of the Listed Buildings Act, the principles of the NPPF nor the Local plan, policies 3/4, (responding to context), or 4/11 (which effectively reiterates the requirements of the Act.)

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

6.4 OBJECTION

6.4.1 Comments regarding original scheme

- The arrangement of bikes, bins and circulation to the rear of the development is not functioning well. The cycle parking provision spacing does not comply with the Cycle Parking Guide for New Developments, Feb 2010 SPD in respect to spacing. We query whether some portion of the cycle parking could be moved into rear gardens. Has provision been allotted for visitor parking? This rear area must be functioning as needed prior to providing full support for the development.
- The bin stores provided for the units are displayed in “L” shapes which suggest one bin will always be relatively inaccessible unless you remove one or more bins first. The image supplied shows attractive timber bin stores with large swinging, lockable doors. We do not feel that this design plus the “L” shape will function and a review needs to occur to ensure that everything works.
- It is unclear why a large paved area exists to the front of unit T1. As there is an existing retained (or refurbished? Please clarify) wall and planting, it is unlikely that this will be used for parking therefore we would encourage the placement of

planting at the boundary edge shared with the neighbouring property and allow for a simple walk way as the other units have.

- We support the retention of the large existing trees at the frontage and sympathise that the structure has been located to avoid conflict with them. However, we feel the functionality of the block is compromised by its size and shape.
- We support the use of underground parking to avoid further congestion of the surrounding streets but colleagues in Highways have highlighted concerns with one-way at a time access which may lead to unexpected conflicts.

6.4.2 Comments regarding amended scheme

Adjustments have been made to the existing design in order to address concerns made against the initial submission. We feel that the problems encountered previously have been simply moved to other areas without addressing the fundamental issue of overdevelopment.

- The above ground cycle storage has been removed from the rear communal collection area and moved to the basement and further separated into individual user locations. Whilst this is desirable in one respect of freeing up the rear of the communal area, it is a poor arrangement to have cycles and vehicles both using the ramp and may result in conflicts. Also as the basement is gated, a cyclist is less likely to wait for this service and more likely to lock up a cycle wherever available such as railings. It is best to have the cycle storage at ground floor level and convenient to use. Visitor spaces must be provided in some capacity too, but we feel this could go on some of the large paved frontages.
- The area which was formerly cycle storage has been reconfigured to be bin storage. There is an issue with it not particularly fitting in well as the bins in the sharpest corner will be difficult to access and the structures create a pinch point at the exit where all the bins will have to filter through to reach the bin collection point. No formal collection point

has been identified so we have used the assumption that it will be to the side of the main driveway access. It appears that this could be well over 40m for some bins and contravenes the Recap Waste Management SPD.

- We support the retention of the large existing trees at the frontage and sympathise that the structure has been located to avoid conflict with them. However, we feel the functionality of the block is compromised by its size and shape.

6.4.3 Conclusion:

Landscape does not feel that the amendments have gone far enough to demonstrate that a well-designed and functional scheme will be provided. The servicing and access continues to be compromised by the development itself. We feel this compromise has arisen out of overdevelopment of the site. The proposal does not accord with Local Plan Policies 3/4 Responding to Context; 3/11 The Design of External Spaces and 3/12 The Design of New Buildings

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Tree Team)

6.5 OBJECTION

Comments regarding amended scheme

While the condition of many of the trees on site is such that they would not normally be considered as reasonable constraints to development (under the recommendations set out in BS5837) and losses are therefore accepted, there are concerns regarding the lack of space available for replacement planting. Notwithstanding the scale of the buildings opposite in relation to the plot sizes, properties on the west side of Clarendon Road, north side of Fitzwilliam Road and east side of Shaftsbury Road are characterised by their large gardens and the space available for soft landscaping. The scale of the building, especially the basement significantly decreases the space available for replacement tree planting. In addition the scale of the basement will impact on the RPA of the two TPOd trees on the frontage especially as their main rooting area is within the site. The proposal will therefore have a significant and detrimental impact the site's contribution to the character of the area.

There has been a recent and separate tree work application to remove T10 and T11 on safety grounds. This was accepted but replacement planting was required. This replacement planting should be in the northeast corner of the site to mitigate the losses here. Any approved planning proposals should incorporate these replacement trees.

Archaeology

- 6.6 It is noted that this area is an area of high archaeological potential and conditions have been recommended accordingly.
- 6.7 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 to this application over two periods of consultation.

- 1 Clarendon Road
- 3 Clarendon Road
- 5 Clarendon Road
- 21 Clarendon Road
- 17 Clarendon Road
- 19 Clarendon Road
- 3 Fitzwilliam Road
- 5 Fitzwilliam Road
- 7 Fitzwilliam Road
- Flat 1, 5 Fitzwilliam Road
- 8 Aberdeen Square
- 4 Glenalmond Avenue
- 6 Glenalmond Avenue
- 20 Brooklands Avenue
- 3 Shaftesbury Road
- Brooklands Avenue Area Residents' Association
- City Councillor of Trumpington Zoe O'Connell

7.2 The representations of those supporting the proposal can be summarised as follows:

- Contemporary design fits in well with the conservation area, through its scale, massing and choice of materials.
- Basement parking will ease on street parking pressures.
- Re-use of vacant plot for family housing is welcomed.
- Location is highly sustainable and in line with NPPF.
- The applicant has a strong track record in building low energy and low carbon homes.

7.3 The representations of those objecting to the proposal can be summarised as follows:

7.3.1 Out of character with the Conservation Area and overdevelopment of site

- The existing building was designed to allow view of the interior of the Conservation Area. This is not the case with this proposal.
- Overdevelopment of site.
- The design is wholly out of context with the terrace of houses on the northern side of Fitzwilliam Road.
- The scale and bulk of the proposal are out of character with the conservation area.
- Four storeys are too tall when seen beside the two storey dwellings of Clarendon Road.
- Design references Kaleidoscope development across the road but not buildings it adjoins in the Conservation Area.
- Proposed footprint breaks the building line of both Fitzwilliam Road and Clarendon Road.
- Change of material at fourth floor does not mask the bulk of the proposal.
- Density per hectare is too high for the Conservation Area.
- It would detract from the tranquil atmosphere of the Conservation Area.
- Materials indicated including metallic roof surfaces, large plate glass windows are not in character with the Conservation Area. They also do not complement or form an acceptable contrast with the surrounding architecture of the Conservation Area.
- Contrary to Brooklands Avenue Conservation Area 2013 which states *development must respect the character, openness of the gardens should be preserved and enhanced*

and views into the rear gardens of the houses are possible and focus on several fine trees.

- Proposed building would dominate buildings of local interest adjoining.
- The addition of over ten balconies is not in keeping with other properties.
- Corner glazed features will stick out from established building line.
- 6 residential units comprising of 4 townhouses and 2 apartments would mean the development would have up to 22 bedrooms. This is overdevelopment of the site.

7.3.2 Overlooking and overshadowing

- The proposal will severely overshadow the rear garden of 3 Fitzwilliam Road and other immediate neighbours.
- Overshadowing will also be felt on a number of properties as losing the gap between the subject building and No. 21 Clarendon Road.
- Many of the first, second and third floors of have rear windows from habitable rooms facing rear facade and garden of 3 Fitzwilliam Road.
- Not enough separation distance is left between the proposal and adjoining properties.

7.3.3 Impact on noise, air and odour

- Concern from immediate neighbours about noise and vibration from proposed underground carpark. Especially as these neighbours have basements.
- The addition of so many new inhabitants to the area will cause noise and disturbance.
- Proposal comes right up to the boundary with No. 21 Clarendon Road with a ramp to an underground carpark. This would create much noise and disturbance.
- Bin store is located too close to the boundary.
- Unclear where bins will be left on day of collection.
- Traffic congestion in this area is already practically high and this development would increase this adding to noise and air pollution.

7.3.4 Trees, parking and miscellaneous

- Removal of trees in rear garden would remove an amenity.

- Trees and TPOs on the site are at risk with such an extensive development proposed.
- Loss of open green space at the front.
- Proposed rear gardens are too small an amenity for future occupiers.
- Concerns there would be not enough parking.
- Proposed carpark would appear poorly designed with six tight spaces and no room for delivery vans or visitor's vehicles.
- Impact on on-street parking.
- Removal of green space will cause potential flood risks to surrounding properties.
- Entrance of car park just passed a corner is dangerous in visibility terms.

7.3.5 Other issues

- Concerns about the basement parking exacerbating local surface water flooding issues.
- There are covenants on the site which the proposal does not respect. Brooklands Avenue Conservation Area Appraisal - May 2002 makes clear references to the 1854 Covenants which govern land use on the site in question.

Representations on amended scheme

- 7.4 The amended scheme is very similar to the original submitted and the majority of the comments of objectors and those in favour of the proposal are still valid.

The letters of representation mainly reiterate the previous comments summarised under headings above. New points of concern include:

- The amended plans do not replace the trees removed in late 2015, which was a condition of the permission granting them being removed in the first place.
- The plans remove all trees from the rear of the site, removing any screening from overlooking.
- Building design does not follow principles used by the current building on site which has no overlooking rear windows.

- While the height of the building ‘tapers’ upwards its height is still grossly disproportionate to the height of No. 21 Clarendon Road.
- Plans do not show where carpark fumes would be vented.
- These amendments are only minor and cosmetic, all previous issues remain.

Letters of representation regarding the amended scheme were also received from Brooklands Avenue Area Residents’ Association whom could not support the scheme and City Councillor of Trumpington Zoe O’Connell whom objected to the proposal. Councillor O’Connell echoes points made by the residents including:

- The proposal pays no respect to the heritage assets of the conservation area and nearby buildings of local interest.
- Plans and photos largely avoid the view down Clarendon Road.
- The third floor of the proposal does not attempt to blend in with the sloped roofs of the surrounding properties.
- Mimics the more modern developments across the road and not in keeping with conservation area.

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. Response to Context
3. Residential Amenity of Neighbouring Properties
4. Impact on Landscape
5. Noise, Air and Odour Pollution

8.2 Principle of Development

The Conservation Team has no objection to the principle of demolishing the late C20th brick three storeys building currently on the site. However, this is subject to a replacement scheme

remaining in keeping with the character of the conservation area and policy 4/11. The principle of developing residential on this site is also acceptable as the current building is vacant and unlikely to be re-used for its current use. The addition of housing to this site is also in accordance with policy 5/1 as this could be a windfall development contributing to housing provision in a central area. Four 4 bedroom townhouses are proposed and two 2 bedroom apartments. The principle of this housing mix is acceptable, it is considered larger units for families in this central location is also favourable and accords with policy 5/10.

However there are some major concerns regarding the scale, bulk and design of this proposal's impact on the Conservation Area, the amenity of adjoining neighbours and trees on site.

8.3 In my opinion, while the principle of residential redevelopment is acceptable, the current proposal is not. The reasons why it is not acceptable are set out below.

8.4 **Response to Context**

8.4.1 Height and Bulk

While effort has been made with amendments to make this scheme respond better to the surrounding built environment, not enough has been done to scale back the bulk and improve the design. As previously stated, the subject site is located in Brooklands Avenue Conservation Area. The Appraisal defines Nos. 3-9 Fitzwilliam Road (which are immediately to the west of the site) as Buildings of Local Interest. This terrace is three storeys tall with a hipped roof. The proposal is four storeys tall to flat roof. This fourth storey while slightly indented and scaled back by amendments, does little to respect the hipped roof form, instead the bulk of this storey even with its different material treatment dominates these Buildings of Local Interest.

The Conservation Officer states '*whilst the glazed top floor has been recessed somewhat beyond the front and side elevation walls, the difference between it and the masonry is considered insufficient, and in combination with the overall height of the structure, will appear overbearing and rather abrupt.*'

While the height of the proposal and Fitzwilliam Terrace are comparable, the height difference and proximity of footprint between the proposal and its other immediate neighbours on Clarendon Road is unacceptable. Clarendon Road contains properties mainly of two-storeys, detached or semi-detached that offer a sense of green landscaped spaciousness between them. It is considered that the relationship of two versus four stories (even with a stagger down in height) would have an unacceptable impact on the streetscene given the limited distance of 3.5 metres that would be between the proposal and no. 21, the staggered and assertive height of the storeys and the depth of the side return. It is noted that the glimpse view of the mature rear gardens of the Conservation Area between the current building and No. 21 Clarendon Street would be significantly diminished, with this gap narrowed from circa 10 metres to 3.5 metres. While the loss of this glimpse view is not considered a reason for refusal of itself, the impact of the overbearing nature of the Clarendon Road side on the property of No. 3 Fitzwilliam Road by the narrowing of this gap is a concern, as is the resulting cramped nature of the space that would be left between the new building and no. 21 compared to the existing more spacious layout of building footprints on this side of Clarendon Road. This will create an altogether uncomfortable and cramped juxtaposition of built form, which would do little to preserve the character or appearance of this residential side of the road within the Conservation Area.

The Conservation Officer states *'at the Clarendon Road end of the site, the relationship between the property at no.21 and the proposed block is uncompromising. The scale remains excessive and would therefore not preserve the character of the place. It is appreciated that several attempts have been made to mediate between no.21 and the new development, but the current scheme does not meet expectations.'*

I agree with this assessment for the reasons as set out above.

8.4.2 Design

The design of the proposal is considered unsympathetic to the architectural environment of Brooklands Avenue Conservation Area. In the view of the Conservation officer *'the architectural language monolithic elevations clad in glass and gault brick is becoming locally distinctive in the city, but is not an architectural*

panacea - and should not necessarily be employed, particularly in sensitive settings.'

The terrace adjoining the subject site on Fitzwilliam Road are Buildings of Local Interest. It is considered the proposed balance between horizontal and vertical rhythm is understandable, as it loosely reflects the form of the Victorian properties adjacent, but in its execution it is awkward, and the horizontal banding does not tie in with the Victorian bands adjacent. The result is jarring, to the general detriment of the streetscene.

The fourth glazed flat roof storey is also considered to not complement the gently sloped roofs of adjoining properties.

The Conservation officer states *'so, whilst it is clear that the proposed development is taking its cues from across the road, it would be more appropriate to draw inspiration from the scale, articulation and rhythm of the properties between which it is to sit.'*

The Brooklands Avenue Conservation Area Appraisal (2013) states *'the City Council will continue to protect the Conservation Area from inappropriate development, and where new development is allowed, will ensure that it is of the highest possible quality.'* Given that the scheme has a number of issues concerning its scale and massing, particularly on its return down Clarendon Road and that coupled with this, the Conservation Officer raises numerous issues with the detailed design, I can only conclude that the proposal is an overdevelopment of the site and of poor design, which would harm the Conservation Area.

- 8.4.3 For the reasons set out above, the proposal does not accord with s.72 of the Listed Buildings Act, the principles of the NPPF or the Local Plan, policies 3/4, 3/12 (responding to context) or 4/11 and 4/12 (which reflects the requirements in the Act to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area).

8.5 Residential Amenity of Neighbouring Properties

8.5.1 Enclosure and overlooking

The rear facing first and second storey glazing of the existing building is nearly entirely hidden as is angled upwards with no direct views over the rear gardens of both No. 3 Fitzwilliam Road and No. 21 Clarendon Road. The proposal would have a total of 15 windows to habitable rooms from first floor and above now facing these immediate neighbouring rear gardens. 12 of these would be to bedrooms, 1 to a kitchen and 2 to offices. The nearest of these windows bedroom 3 and 2 of unit T3 would be located 11 metres from the boundary with No. 3 Fitzwilliam Road. While some overlooking from a new development could be expected when compared to the existing situation, the addition of 12 windows servicing habitable rooms is considered excessive and would detrimentally impact on the immediate neighbour's enjoyment of their rear garden. Having been on a site visit to the rear garden of No. 3 Fitzwilliam Road, there is currently a sense of privacy which would be lost with this proposal, because of the layout of the adjacent terraced properties and their immediate rooms.

The built form of the proposal compared to the existing situation would also lead to a sense of enclosure to the rear gardens of No. 3 Fitzwilliam Road and 21 Clarendon Road to which I also consider would lead to significant harm to residential amenity. This would result in a very dominant built form.

The 10 roof terraces/balconies are proposed to the front façade are located 20 plus metres away from the kaleidoscope apartments across the road. This distance coupled with the two TPO trees is determined sufficient to dispel any detrimental impacts.

8.5.2 Overshadowing

No shadow study information has been provided with this application. As the depth of the proposal would not surpass the rear of both adjoining properties and there would be a gap of 2.4 metres between the proposal and No. 21 Clarendon Road and 2.5 metres between the proposal and No. 3 Fitzwilliam Road no overshadowing of any windows on the rear façade of these neighbours is envisaged.

However, windows lighting the stairwell in the side elevation of No. 3 Fitzwilliam Road would lose a significant amount of daylight. Also an obscurely glazed bathroom window and a glazed side door in the side elevation of No. 21 Clarendon Street would be affected. As all of these windows are to non-habitable rooms/spaces, this loss of daylight is considered, whilst regrettable, not to amount to a reason for refusal.

Light into the rear garden of No. 3 Fitzwilliam Road in the early part of the day, would be likely to be reduced as the gap of currently circa 10 metres between No. 21 Clarendon Road would be reduced to 3.5 metres with this proposal. This loss of light will further lead to the sense of enclosure to these rear gardens. However, the garden of No. 3 is relatively long and I do not consider any harm would be that severe to warrant a reason for refusal.

- 8.5.3 In my view, the proposal inadequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and is not considered compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/12.

8.6 Amenity of future occupiers

It is considered as each town house will have a narrow rear private garden of circa 8.5 metres x 3 metres a balcony big enough for a table and 4 chairs (at first floor level) and a private terrace each at third floor level that there is a amount of amenity space for future occupiers of these units would be adequate.

The two apartments will both also have generous balconies and all units will have use of the communal front garden.

8.7 Landscape

- 8.7.1 Consent was granted to remove two unprotected trees, a European Larch and a Silver Birch under reference 15/540/TTCA in December 2015 via a tree works application. The trees were removed due to decay leading to issues of structural integrity. From my recent site visit these trees have now been removed and this has led to an increased sense of openness from the rear garden of no. 3 looking towards the site, where previously in part the trees would have softened or

filtered this outlook. Condition 3 of the consent to remove the trees requires two suitable replacements of a size and species to be agreed with the Council and replanted in a similar location. Whilst the tree works application and its requirements form part of a separate process independent from the application for planning permission, in the consideration of an application for planning permission, my view is that the LPA must be comfortable that a scheme for tree planting can be delivered in the rear garden area via a suitably worded condition. Replanting may be currently possible, but I am doubtful, given the Tree Officer's comments, in the absence of any further information and the fact that a large underground basement would be constructed very close to the rear edge and corner of the site, that a landscaping scheme, sufficient to filter the visual impact of the proposal and overlooking from windows, is realistically achievable or that even if it was, that it would result in tree planting of a similar size when replanted as those that have recently be removed. I am less concerned about the role of these trees in terms of the wider conservation area than I am regarding their role in partially mitigating the impact of the proposed development, but the recent removal of them and the perceived difficulties in adequate replacements, adds to my concerns regarding the impact of the proposal on the residential amenity of no.3 Fitzwilliam Road in particular.

8.7.2 In addition, the Tree Officer also has concerns that the scale of the basement car park would impact on the root protection area of the two TPO'd Sycamore Trees located at the front of the site.

The Brooklands Conservation Area 2013 states of Trees, Landscapes and Open Spaces where the subject site is located:

The eastern part of the Conservation Area, around Clarendon Road, Fitzwilliam Road and Shaftesbury Road, is still notable for the many trees which lie within private gardens, both front and back.

8.7.3 Again in the absence any further comment from the Tree Officer or further supporting information from the applicants to demonstrate that the trees would be adequately protected, I consider that the proposal could have a significant and detrimental impact to the health and vitality of the frontage trees

and as a consequence to the site's contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The scheme therefore fails to meet Local Plan policies 4/3, 4/4 and 4/11. If the applicants were to submit further information to deal with the frontage tree issue, it may well be that the reason for refusal could be overcome but I am not presently in a position to offer support to the scheme's impact on the frontage trees based upon the advice that I have received.

8.8 Movement and Access

The Highways Department is happy with amendments made to this application and the Transport Statement by SLR Global Environment Solution dated Oct 2015 has satisfied their initial concerns. It is considered as the proposal is located in such a sustainable location close to many amenities and Cambridge City Centre six car parking spaces is sufficient for this development of six residential unit. This accords with the councils maximum parking standards. The use of this underground parking is also determined preferential for the aesthetics of the conservation area.

The amendment of relocating the cycle storage from the front communal garden of the proposal to the underground car park is less desirable. Whilst in one respect this amendment frees up the rear of the communal area, it is a poor arrangement to have cycles using a ramp and may result in conflicts. Also this basement is gated and a cyclist is less likely to wait for this service. If the committee is minded to approve details of cycle parking could be conditioned. Were assured the issues do not amount to a reason for refusal.

8.8.1 The proposal therefore currently fails to meet Local Plan policy 8/6.

8.9 Noise, Air and Odour Pollution

Many residents had concerns that an influx of new residents would create additional impacts in the area of noise, air and odour pollution. Residents are especially concerned in regards to the underground car park element of this proposal. The construction of this car park will have to meet Building Control Standards. I have no evidence to suggest the basement would be incapable of being constructed.

Environmental Health have not voiced any concerns regarding the location of the bin store and potential odour impacts on adjoin residents. However, no formal location collection point has been identified so we have used the assumption that it will be collected off the main driveway access. It appears this collection point could be located well over 40 metres away for some bins. This contravenes the Recap Waste Management SPD. But, if the committee were minded to approve, details could be obtained via condition. These issues, to my mind, do not amount to a reason for refusal.

9.0 Response to third party representations

Issue	Response
Family housing	See 8.2
Location is highly sustainable	See 8.2
Design out of keeping with CA	See 8.4.1 and 8.4.2
Scale out of keeping with CA	See 8.4.1 and 8.4.2
Overdevelopment	See 8.4.1 and 8.4.2 and 8.10
Overlooking of immediate neighbours	See 8.5.1
Not enough separation distance between proposal and immediate neighbours	See 8.7
Overshadowing of immediate neighbours	See 8.7
Concerns regarding noise and air pollution regarding carpark	See 8.14 and 8.12
Removal of tree and threats to TPOs	See 8.10
Accessibility of carpark	See 8.12
Flooding of carpark	Building control issue
1854 Covenants	Not a planning issue

10.0 CONCLUSION

The scale, bulk and design of the proposal do not adequately respect the Brooklands Avenue Conservation Area and is an overdevelopment of the site. Detrimental impacts to immediate neighbours would be incurred in the shape of overlooking and enclosure. The layout of the proposal is poorly planned as there

has been no consideration of where trees will be replanted and how the roots of the TPOs will be impacted. The location of cycle storage and bin storage is also less than satisfactory, although these elements could be conditioned.

11.0 RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE for the following reasons:

1. The scale, bulk and design of the proposal would result in an overly dominant built form that would appear too prominent, cramped (significantly diminishing the existing space) and too deep in footprint in views from Clarendon Road and which would poorly reflect and inadequately relate to the adjacent Buildings of Local Interest along Fitzwilliam Road with regard to the detailed design but also the form and shape of the roofing elements. The result is a scheme which would constitute an overdevelopment of the site, which would neither preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposal has not demonstrated that it has responded to its context or drawn upon key characteristics of the surroundings. For these reasons, the proposal conflicts with policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/12, 4/11 and 4/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and guidance within paragraph 64 of the NPPF (2012).
2. The use of the rooms, position and substantial amount of glazing used on the upper floors (first to third) on the rear facade of the proposal and the increased massing and dominance of built form from that existing would all contribute to the unacceptable loss of privacy and sense of enclosure to the occupiers of No. 3 Fitzwilliam Road and No. 21 Clarendon Road which are in close proximity to the site. In addition and in the absence of information to demonstrate otherwise, the lack of adequate space for landscaping, particularly tree planting, along the boundaries with these properties due to the proposed basement structure underneath, would mean that views of the proposed building could not be adequately or partially mitigated. For these reasons, the proposal would be contrary to policies 3/4 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

3. There is insufficient evidence to suggest that the proposed development would not endanger the health of two trees with TPO status on the front of the site. These trees positively contribute towards the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. For these reasons, the proposal would be contrary to policies 4/3, 4/4 and 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).