

Application Number	16/1916/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	1st November 2016	Officer	Charlotte Burton
Target Date	27th December 2016		
Ward	Petersfield		
Site	61 Norfolk Street Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 2LD		
Proposal	Change of use of takeaway (A5 use) and Housing in Multiple Occupation (HMO) to 3no. residential units, including alterations to the front elevation, rear extension and rear roof extensions. Erection of one-and-a-half storey building to provide a further 2no. residential units. Associated landscaping, bin and bike storage		
Applicant	Mr & Mrs N Lai 61, Norfolk Street CAMBRIDGE CB1 2LD		

<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 proposal would have an unacceptable overlooking, enclosing and overshadowing impact on the neighbouring properties, which would have a significant adverse impact on residential amenity. - The proposed increase in the number of units and the site layout would generate significant noise and disturbance, which would have a significant adverse impact on residential amenity. - The proposal would provide future occupiers with poor quality living accommodation and outdoor amenity space, which would fail to provide an unacceptable level of residential
-----------------------	---

	<p>amenity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposal fails to demonstrate adequate provision of bin storage facilities.
RECOMMENDATION	REFUSAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 No. 61 is a two storey mid-terrace property on the southern side of Norfolk Street opposite the junction with Staffordshire Street. Norfolk Street is characterised mainly by terrace housing with a parade of commercial and non-residential uses.
- 1.2 The ground floor is used as a Caribbean takeaway including a shop frontage. The first and second floors are currently used as Housing in Multiple Occupation (HMO). There is a yard at the rear which is partly used for storage. The southern boundary runs along Flower Street which includes a landscaped buffer outside the applicant's control.
- 1.3 To the east of the site are Nos. 63 and 65. No. 63 is a two storey dwelling with a converted attic and a pitched roof dormer in the front roof slope. No.65 has been converted and extended at the rear into four flats. The development was approved in 2007 (07/0787/FUL) and extends from the corner of Norfolk Street along Blossom Street and onto Flower Street.
- 1.4 To the west is No. 59 which is a two storey dwelling with a two storey outrigger on the rear elevation and a rear garden, including a single storey outbuilding. To the south are the properties fronting Blossom Street. The Flower Street play area and open space is to the south.
- 1.5 The site is located within the Mill Road Area of the Central Conservation Area. The property and others within the terrace on the southern side of Norfolk Street are identified in the Townscape Analysis as a 'positive unlisted building'. The site is within a local centre and the controlled parking zone. There are no other relevant site constraints.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposal is for change of use of No. 61 from takeaway (A5 use) and HMO to 3 no. residential units, including alterations and extensions to the existing building. The proposal also includes the erection of a one-and-a-half storey building at the rear to provide a further 2 no. residential units, with associated landscaping, bin and bike storage.
- 2.2 The proposed works to convert No. 61 include blocking up the existing shop frontage with brickwork and windows, and insertion of a gated passageway on the front elevation. The property would be extended at the rear with a three storey stair core with a pitched roof, which would project approximately 2m from the rear elevation. The extensions include the insertion of two pitched roof dormers on the rear roof slope.
- 2.3 The proposed building at the rear of the plot would be one-and-a-half storeys with a pitched roof. The building would fill the width of the plot and would be 8.5m wide and 7m deep. It would be approximately 3.2m high to the eaves and 5.8m high to the ridge. There would be two pitched roof dormers and a roof light on the northern roof slope. The materials would be brick with a slate tiled roof.
- 2.4 There would be no separate access to the property at the rear of the plot from Flower Street. Access to all units would be via the gated passageway from Norfolk Street into a communal area of open space serving all units. Bin storage would be provided in a store located on the side of the passageway and cycle parking would be provided in a cycle store against the eastern boundary of the site.
- 2.5 During the course of the application, revised plans were submitted which increased the width of the side passageway to 1.2m following comments from the Cycling and Walking Officer and the Refuse Team.
- 2.6 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:
 1. Design and Access Statement (including Shadow Study)
 2. Drawings

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
15/1000/FUL	3 new 2 bedroom flats and 3 flats converted in existing building.	Withdrawn

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 Local Plan 2006	3/1 3/4 3/7 3/10 3/11 3/12 3/14 4/11 4/13 5/1 5/2 8/2 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
Supplementary Planning	Sustainable Design and Construction (May

Guidance	2007) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012)
Material Considerations	<u>City Wide Guidance</u> Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010) Roof Extensions Design Guide (2003)
	<u>Area Guidelines</u> Mill Road Area Conservation Area Appraisal (2011)

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 should be taken into account.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

6.1 **Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)**

No objection. Recommended informative to advise future occupants would not be eligible for Residents Parking Permits.

6.2 Environmental Health

No objection. Standard conditions for construction hours and construction delivery/collection hours are recommended.

6.3 Refuse and Recycling

The number of 660 litre bins and the drag distance to the kerb are acceptable. The passageway is not wide enough for four-wheeled bins which must be 2 metres wide. The bins could be downsized to 240 litre bins, but these would not be collected so residents would need to leave these on the pavement for collection. Is there room? Prefer to have bulk communal bins that crews collect located close to pavement as possible, not through gates and down passageways.

6.4 Urban Design and Conservation team

No objection.

The scheme that has been submitted has taken on board Conservation comments raised at the pre-application stage. The new building to the rear of the site has been reduced in scale, with the ridge height being lower than was previously seen. This now makes it a more appropriate. The set back from Flower Street it will be behind the green border owned by Cambridge City Council which will soften the impact of this new built form.

The stair tower on the rear of no. 61 is now to be in brick rather than timber clad as was proposed in the pre-application submission. This is a more appropriate material. The use of dark grey boarding at roof level, to match with the slates, is supported.

The proposals for the front of no. 61 Norfolk Street are acceptable. Introducing more appropriately detailed windows will improve the front elevation and therefore the character and appearance of the conservation area.

If approved, all materials for this development should be conditioned to ensure that they are appropriate for this site in the conservation area.

6.5 **Cycling and Walking Officer**

The cycle racks and spacing proposed are not acceptable. They should be of the type and spacing required by the Cycle Parking Standards within the Cambridge Local Plan. The width of the passageway to the cycle parking should be a minimum of 1.2m and should be of a hard surfacing.

6.6 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 objecting to the proposal:

- 59 Norfolk Street
- 63 Norfolk Street
- 45 Norfolk Terrace
- 2 Blossom Street
- 15 Blossom Street
- 30 Highsett

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Loss of takeaway use.
- High density lets and student accommodation which does not meet need for local people.
- No affordable housing.
- Overdevelopment of the site.
- Out of keeping with the character of buildings and the Conservation Area.
- Loss of shop frontage would harm the street.
- Landscaped buffer on Flower Street frontage should be enhanced.
- Visually overbearing.
- Overlooking from dormers of new building towards garden of No. 59 Norfolk Street.
- Overlooking towards No. 15 Blossom Street.

- Loss of light to neighbouring properties.
- Noise and disturbance impact on neighbouring properties.
- Increase in fly tipping as a result of high turnover of rental occupiers.
- Increase in anti-social behaviour.
- Increase in crime to neighbouring properties.
- Noise and disruption during construction.
- Increase in vehicle use of Flower Street impacting on highway safety.
- Increased pressure on parking.
- Increase in the number of bins left on the public highway.
- Inadequate cycle parking.
- Stress on local infrastructure.
- Inadequate access for fire safety.
- Capacity and security of water supply and foul sewage drainage.
- Drastically reduce the value of property.

7.3 The Cambridge Cycling Campaign has also objected to the proposal on the grounds of inadequate cycle parking provision.

7.4 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations supporting to the proposal:

- 30 Anns Road
- 36 Gilpin Road
- 5 Chalk Grove
- 7B Great Farthing Close, St Ives
- Apartment 1702, One Hagley Road, Birmingham

7.5 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Beneficial for the area and community.
- The removal of the existing debris and derelict building would also improve the visual appearance of the area.
- In-keeping with the character of the area.
- Attractive for lettings due to proximity with Anglia Ruskin University, city centre and train station.
- Meet demand for wide choice of high quality homes.
- Attractive to foreign investors.

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. Principle of development
2. Context of site, design and external spaces / Impact on heritage assets
3. Residential amenity
4. Refuse arrangements
5. Highway safety
6. Car parking
7. Cycle parking
8. Third party representations
9. Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

Principle of Development

8.2 The loss of the takeaway on the ground floor would be acceptable in principle, as there are no planning policies to restrict the loss of this use within local centres. The loss of the HMO is acceptable in principle, as the property would remain in residential use.

8.3 The proposal includes the subdivision of the existing front building into 3 no. units. The relevant planning policy is 5/2, which states that the conversion of single residential properties into self-contained dwellings will be permitted except where:

- a. the residential property has a floorspace of less than 110m²;
- b. the likely impact upon on-street parking would be unacceptable;
- c. the living accommodation provided would be unsatisfactory;
- d. the proposal would fail to provide for satisfactory refuse bin storage or cycle parking; and
- e. the location of the property or the nature of nearby land uses would not offer a satisfactory level of residential amenity.

8.4 The property would have an external floorspace of more than 110m², not including the ground floor, and therefore meets

criteria a. I have assessed the proposal against criteria b – e below. For the reasons given in the following assessment, the proposal fails to meet criteria c and d of policy 5/2.

- 8.5 The proposal also includes the erection of a one-and-a-half storey building at the rear containing 2 no. units. The principle of development on a windfall site is supported in accordance with policy 5/1, as the site is within an existing residential area. Policy 3/10 for the sub-division of plots is also relevant. This supports residential development within the garden area or curtilage of existing properties unless it will:
- a. have a significant adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties through loss of privacy, loss of light, an overbearing sense of enclosure and the generation of unreasonable levels of traffic or noise disturbance;
 - b. provide inadequate amenity space, or vehicular access arrangements and parking spaces for the proposed and existing properties;
 - c. detract from the prevailing character and appearance of the area;
 - d. adversely affect the setting of Listed Buildings, or buildings or gardens of local interest within or close to the site;
 - e. adversely affect trees, wildlife features or architectural features of local importance located within or close to the site; and
 - f. prejudice the comprehensive development of the wider area of which the site forms part.

- 8.6 I have assessed the proposal against these criteria. For the reasons given, in my opinion, the proposal fails to meet criteria c and b of policy 3/10, and as such the principle of sub-division of the plot would not be acceptable.

Context of site, design and external spaces / Impact on heritage assets

- 8.7 The site is located within a mainly residential context of predominantly two storey buildings fronting the highway. The property has an existing shop frontage. To the rear of this mid-terrace property is a yard area with ancillary flat roof structures on the western boundary. No. 65 Norfolk Street which is

located on the corner of Norfolk Street and Blossom Street has been extended and converted into flats.

- 8.8 The conversion of the existing property into residential flats would remove the commercial element on the ground floor, including the shop frontage. The Conservation Team has not objected to the loss of the shop frontage and in my opinion, the replacement with windows and openings would give the front elevation a traditional residential appearance. In my opinion this would be appropriate to the property and the character of the Conservation Area.
- 8.9 The proposed rear extension to the front building would provide a three storey stair core with a pitched roof. I am satisfied that the scale of the extension would be appropriate to the existing building. The Conservation Team has commented that the proposed materials – buff bricks on the ground and first floor and timber boarding on the attic storey – would be appropriate.
- 8.10 The proposal also includes two dormer windows on the rear roof slope. The proportion and design of these is more contemporary but they would sit within the roof and would complement the gable of the stair core extension. They would be appropriate to the existing roof form in accordance with the Roof Extensions Design Guide. The Conservation Team has not objected and in my opinion, the dormers would not harm the Conservation Area.
- 8.11 The proposed building at the rear would infill between the existing single storey outbuilding at the rear of No. 59 and the recent two storey development at the rear of No. 63. In my view, it would not be out of character with the established pattern of development. The footprint, scale and massing of the building would be appropriate to the surrounding context. The building would form part of a cohesive frontage onto Flower Street and the scale would provide a step between the development on either side. The Conservation Team supports the scale and design of the new building.
- 8.12 The southern Flower Street elevation has been designed to be modest and similar in appearance to the adjoining development at the rear of No. 63 to the east in terms of the proportions of the windows and the brickwork headers. In my opinion, the

design and scale would be in-keeping with the character of the Conservation Area.

- 8.13 The proposal includes a landscaped courtyard, however no details of the landscaping scheme have been submitted. I am satisfied that this could be agreed through a condition. Third parties have raised concern about the impact on the landscaped buffer along Flower Street, however as there would be no access from the site along this boundary, this would not be affected by the proposed development.
- 8.14 The Conservation Team has recommended a condition for material samples to be submitted for all parts of the proposal. Subject to this, I am satisfied that the proposal would not harm the character of the Conservation Area. In my opinion, the proposed alterations and extensions to the front building and the new building at the rear would be acceptable and the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12, 3/14 and 4/11.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.15 The neighbouring residential properties are No. 59 to the west and No. 63 to the east. The impact on these properties is assessed below.

Impact on No. 59 Norfolk Street

- 8.16 No. 59 is a two storey property with a two storey outrigger to the west of the site which forms part of the terrace along the southern side of the street. The property has a small rear garden including a patio close to the house (which is partially covered) and a single storey outbuilding at the rear of the site.
- 8.17 The centre of the nearest dormer window on the northern slope of the one-and-a-half storey building would be approximately 1.8m from the western site boundary. Views towards the patio would be oblique and the patio is partially covered, moreover the dormer window would serve a bedroom, which is less intensively used than living rooms. However, in my opinion, due to the close proximity of the window, there would be an actual and perceived loss of privacy for the occupiers of No. 59,

which would have an unacceptable impact on their residential amenity. There would be oblique views towards first floor windows on the rear elevation and on the side elevation of the outrigger, however these are bathroom windows and are obscure glazed.

- 8.18 The one-and-a-half storey building would have a 5.8m high gable end on the boundary with No. 59. In my opinion, the height and the proximity of this elevation would have an overbearing impact on the garden, which would have a significant adverse impact on residential amenity.
- 8.19 The proposed building would be to the south-east of No. 59 and would increase the area of the garden that is in shadow, however, having reviewed the shadow diagrams submitted by the applicant, in my opinion, this would not have a significant impact compared to the existing situation.
- 8.20 The proposed rear extension to the front building would not have an adverse impact on No. 59, in my opinion, due to the depth of the extension and the set-back approximately 2.4m to the east of the site boundary.

Impact on No. 63 Norfolk Street

- 8.21 No. 63 is a two storey property with a converted attic storey. Following recent development at the rear, this property has retained a small yard. The applicant's drawings label this as a 'service yard', however this is actually used as a courtyard and provides this property's only amenity space. It is enclosed by the two storey development fronting Flower Street and a high brick wall along the boundary with the application site.
- 8.22 The centre of the living/dining room dormer window on the northern roof slope of the one-and-a-half storey building would be approximately 2.4m to the boundary with No. 63. As a result, there would be relatively close-range and direct views from the first floor living/dining room window towards the yard and the ground floor kitchen/living room French doors. The yard is the only private amenity space for this property and is particularly sensitive to overlooking, and therefore in my opinion, there would be a significant loss of privacy. This dormer window would also be approximately 10m from the first floor bedroom window on the rear elevation of No. 63. The

living/dining room would be intensively used and views into bedrooms are particularly sensitive. In my opinion, this would result in a loss of privacy which would have a significant adverse impact on residential amenity.

8.23 No. 68's courtyard is narrow and significantly enclosed by the two storey building along the east and south sides, and the western boundary is a high boundary wall. The south west is the only open aspect from the yard and, as such, development of more than one storey in this location would result in enclosure of the yard on all sides, except directly to the west. The proposed one-and-a-half storey building would have a ridge height of 5.8m with dormer windows on the north facing roof slope adding to the bulk of the building. In my opinion, the scale and proximity of the building would enclose the south western aspect, which would lead to an unacceptable degree of enclosure within the yard. This yard provides the only private amenity space for this family property and as such weight must be given to the quality of this space. In my opinion, this degree of enclosure would have an unacceptable impact on their residential amenity.

8.24 The shadow diagrams submitted by the applicant show that No. 63's yard is already somewhat overshadowed by surrounding development. The proposed outbuilding would be to the south west of No. 63, however in my opinion, this would not have a significant impact compared to the existing situation. Nonetheless, the shadow diagrams do not show the impact on loss of light to the windows on the rear elevations and a daylight/sunlight assessment is required. As such, the proposal has failed to demonstrate that it would have an acceptable impact on light levels of No. 63.

8.25 Due to the depth of the three storey extension on the rear elevation of the existing building and its central position on the elevation, I am not concerned that this element would have a significant impact on the residential amenity of No. 63. There would be some oblique views from the proposed dormer windows on the south facing roof slope towards the yard, however in my opinion, this would be no worse than existing views from the first floor windows and as such would be acceptable.

- 8.26 No. 65 has also been extended at the rear with a building that turns the corner around Blossom Street and Flower Street. These two upper floor units (Nos. 16 and 17 Blossom Street) have no amenity space and no windows on the rear elevations facing the application site, and as such, the proposal would not impact on the amenity of the occupiers of this property.
- 8.27 The occupants of No. 15 Blossom Street have raised concerns about overlooking their property. The proposed one-and-a-half storey building would not have any first floor windows facing towards this property other than roof lights, and therefore I am not concerned about any overlooking. There may be some views from the dormer windows and stair core on the front building, however these would be over 20m away.
- 8.28 The number of units proposed on the site is likely to result in around 20+ future occupants. This increase in the intensity of use would generate significantly more comings and goings as well as noise and disturbance from use of the communal courtyard compared to existing. Since the only access – including for bikes and bins - would be via the passageway to the west of No. 63, the noise and disturbance would have a significant impact on this property. The location of the cycle parking against the southern boundary and the positioning of the bin store in close proximity would also generate noise and disturbance from people using these facilities on a regular basis. In my opinion, this would have an unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.
- 8.29 The impact of noise and disturbance during construction on the residential amenity of nearby properties could be addressed through conditions to restrict construction and delivery hours.
- 8.30 For these reasons, in my opinion the proposal fails to adequately respect the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and I consider that it is not compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/10 and 3/12.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

- 8.31 In my opinion, the proposal fails to provide an acceptable level of amenity for the future occupants. There would be overlooking from the communal amenity space into the

bedrooms of the ground floor units as there is no private or defensible space in front of these windows. There would be overlooking from Flower Street into the ground floor bedroom and, while the landscaped buffer would provide some degree of defensible space, as the maintenance of this buffer is outside the applicant's control, in my opinion this would not be acceptable. There would be direct views from the ground floor living/dining room of Unit 4 towards the bedroom of Unit 1; and direct views from the first floor bedroom and living/dining room windows of Unit 5 to the bedroom and kitchen windows of Unit 2. These views would be approximately 9.8m from window-to-window and, in my opinion, would lead to overlooking which would provide an unacceptable level of privacy and residential amenity for the future occupants. There would also be overlooking from the windows on the staircore towards the building the rear, however I am satisfied this could be resolved through a condition requiring these windows to be obscure glazed.

8.32 The proposal would provide 4 no. two-bedroomed units which would expect to have some amenity space provision and 1 no. one-bedroomed unit, which is more likely to be occupied by only two people. The proposed amenity space would be approximately 65sqm. In my opinion, this would not be large enough to provide an acceptable level of amenity for the proposed 5 no. units. Due to the orientation of the proposed one-and-a-half storey building on the southern part of the site, there would be a high degree of overshadowing which would provide a poor quality communal amenity space. In my opinion, the amount and quality of the outdoor amenity space would provide an unacceptable level of amenity for the future occupants.

8.33 For these reasons, in my opinion the proposal fails to provide a high-quality living environment and an appropriate standard of residential amenity for future occupiers, and I consider that in this respect it is not compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/10, 3/12 and 3/14.

Refuse Arrangements

8.34 The proposal includes a bin store on the western side of the passageway within the footprint of the existing building. The Refuse Team has commented that communal 660 litre bins are

preferred for the proposed number of units. They are satisfied that the capacity of the bins is acceptable and the drag distance from the bin store to the public highway would be less than the 10m maximum distance, however the 1.2m wide passageway is not wide enough to allow the proposed 660 litre bins.

8.35 The Refuse Team has advised that the passageway would be wide enough for 240 litre bins for each unit to have their individual bins, however the applicant has not provided details of an alternative bin store that would have the required capacity. I am not convinced that the required capacity could be achieved without further compromising the quality of the amenity space. This would have an impact on the residential amenity of future occupiers.

8.36 Moreover, the Refuse Team has advised that the 660 litre bins would be preferable. I have concerns that the number of bins that would be required for the proposed 5 no. units would obstruct the pavement on collection day. Each unit would need 3 no. bins to separate refuse, recycling and compostables. On some collection days, this would mean that 10 no. bins would be left out for collection. The pavement in this location is narrow and there are parking bays out the front. In my opinion, this would have a significant impact on the safety of what is a busy pavement which provides access to the local centre and primary school.

8.37 For these reasons, I am not satisfied that this could be resolved through conditions. The proposal has failed to demonstrate adequate bin storage and refuse arrangements and in my opinion, is not compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/10, 3/12 and 3/14 and the Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012).

Highway Safety

8.38 There would be no vehicle access onto the public highway. The proposal does not include any car parking, however the Highways Authority has advised that this would not have an impact on highway safety. I accept this advice and in my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Car Parking

8.39 The proposal does not include any car parking and the site is within the controlled parking zone. Third parties have raised concerns about the impact of additional demand for on-street car parking. The Highways Authority has commented that the future occupants would not be eligible for Residents Parking Permits and has recommended an informative to advise accordingly. The occupants of the proposed units would therefore not increase pressure on on-street car parking. In my opinion, the site is in a highly sustainable location close to the city centre and the Grafton Centre, as well as local services along Norfolk Street, so the future occupants are not likely to be car-dependent. The adopted car parking standard set maximum limits and, in my opinion, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/10.

Cycle Parking

8.40 The proposal includes 10 no. cycle parking spaces within a store on the eastern boundary of the courtyard. During the course of the application, the width of the passageway was increased to 1.2m to respond to concerns from the Cycling and Walking Officer. The width of the gate would be at least 1m wide. I am satisfied that details of the cycle store could be secured through conditions. For these reasons, subject to this condition, in my opinion the proposal complies with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/6 and the Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010).

Third Party Representations

8.41 I set out below my response to the third party representations received.

Objections:

Matter	Comment	Response
Principle of development	Loss of takeaway use.	See para 8.2.
	High density lets and student accommodation which does not meet need for local people.	There is an evidenced need for one and two bedroom units within the city.

	No affordable housing.	The proposal does not meet the thresholds to trigger affordable housing contributions under Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 5/5.
Response to context	Overdevelopment of the site.	See paras 8.7-8.14.
	Out of keeping with the character of buildings and the Conservation Area.	
	Loss of shop frontage would harm the street.	
	Landscaped buffer on Flower Street frontage should be enhanced.	
Residential amenity	Visually overbearing.	See paras 8.15-8.30.
	Overlooking from dormers of new building towards garden of No. 59 Norfolk Street.	
	Overlooking towards No. 15 Blossom Street.	
	Loss of light to neighbouring properties.	
	Noise and disturbance impact on neighbouring properties.	
	Increase in fly tipping as a result of high turnover of rental occupiers.	
	Increase in anti-social behaviour.	
	Increase in crime to neighbouring properties.	
	Noise and disruption during construction.	See para 8.29.

Highways	Increase in vehicle use of Flower Street impacting on highway safety.	See para 8.38.
	Increased pressure on parking.	See paras 8.38-8.39
Bins and bikes	Increase in the number of bins left on the public highway.	See paras 8.32-8.34. The preferred arrangement is for communal bins to be collected from within the site by the refuse team.
	Inadequate cycle parking.	See para 8.40
Other	Stress on local infrastructure.	Contributions towards the provision of infrastructure should not be sought for this development for the reasons set out in Section 9 below.
	Inadequate access for fire safety.	These are not a relevant planning matters that I can take into account.
	Capacity and security of water supply and foul sewage drainage.	
	Drastically reduce the value of property.	

Support:

Comment	Response
Beneficial for the area and community.	This is subjective. For the reasons set out in this report, in my opinion the proposal would not deliver net benefit to the wider area.
The removal of the existing debris and derelict building would also improve the visual appearance of the area.	I consider the proposal would enhance the appearance of the site.
In-keeping with the character	I consider the proposal is in-

of the area.	keeping with the character of the area for the reasons set out in paras 8.7-8.14.
Attractive for lettings due to proximity with Anglia Ruskin University, city centre and train station.	The proposal would provide units to contribute towards meeting evidenced demand within the city, however, in my opinion this benefit of this does not outweigh the significant harm that would be created by the proposed development.
Meet demand for wide choice of high quality homes.	
Attractive to foreign investors.	This is not a relevant planning matter.

9.0 Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

9.1 National Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph 031 ID: 23b-031-20160519 sets out specific circumstances where contributions for affordable housing and tariff style planning obligations (section 106 planning obligations) should not be sought from small scale and self-build development. This follows the order of the Court of Appeal dated 13 May 2016, which gives legal effect to the policy set out in the [Written Ministerial Statement of 28 November 2014](#) and should be taken into account.

9.2 The guidance states that contributions should not be sought from developments of 10-units or fewer, and which have a maximum combined gross floorspace of no more than 1000sqm. The proposal represents a small scale development and as such no tariff style planning obligation is considered necessary.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE for the following reasons:

1. The proposal, by virtue of the scale, orientation and proximity to site boundaries, fails to have an acceptable impact on the residential amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties. The proposed one-and-a-half storey building would have a significant enclosing impact on the outdoor amenity space of No. 63 Norfolk Street and the proposal has failed to demonstrate that it would not result in a significant loss of light to this property. The western gable end of the proposed one-and-a-half storey building would have an unacceptable overbearing impact on the outdoor amenity space of No. 59 Norfolk Street. The dormer windows on the proposed one-and-a-half storey building would overlook the amenity spaces of Nos. 59 and 63 Norfolk Street and the rear windows of the latter property, which would lead to an unacceptable loss of privacy. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Cambridge Local Plan policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/10 and 3/12, and paragraph 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

2. The proposal, by virtue of the number of proposed units and site layout, fails to have an acceptable impact in terms of noise and disturbance on the residential amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties. The number of potential future occupiers would significantly increase the intensity of use on the site. Use of the communal amenity space would result in noise which would have a significant impact on the residential amenity of Nos. 59 and 63 Norfolk Street. The number of comings and goings along the single access and the positioning of the cycle parking and bin storage would generate significant noise and disturbance which would impact on the residential amenity of the occupants of No. 63 Norfolk Street. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Cambridge Local Plan policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/10 and 3/12, and paragraph 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

3. The proposal fails to provide an acceptable level of amenity for the future occupants. The separation distance between the windows of habitable rooms on the proposed one-and-a-half storey building and the converted building would provide an unacceptable degree of overlooking. The overlooking from the communal amenity space into the ground floor habitable rooms would provide an unacceptable level of privacy for the future occupants. The amount and quality of the amenity space, which would be significantly overshadowed, would provide an unacceptable level of amenity. As such, the proposal fails to comply with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/10, 3/12 and 3/14, and paragraph 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

4. The proposed refuse and recycling arrangements are unacceptable and the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposal would meet the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012). The width of the passageway would not meet the standards required thereby preventing collection which would result in an unacceptable level of amenity for future occupants. As such, the proposal would be contrary to policies 3/10, 3/12 and 3/14 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006), and paragraph 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).