
Application Number	16/1873/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	24th October 2016	Officer	Charlotte Burton
Target Date	23rd January 2017		
Ward	West Chesterton		
Site	Whichcote House Springfield Road Cambridge CB4 1HY		
Proposal	Change of use and conversion of Whichcote House from student accommodation to provide 10 no. C3 (dwelling house) units. Addition of a third floor extension to provide a further 1no. 3-bed flat. Associated cycle parking, bin store, car parking and landscaping.		
Applicant	Mr Dominic Anthony c/o Agent		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>The proposal would not cause significant harm to the street scene and the character of the area;</p> <p>The proposal would not have a significant adverse impact on residential amenity or highway safety;</p> <p>The units would provide a high quality living environment for the future occupants.</p>
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The site comprises Whichcote House which is a three storey building fronting Springfield Road and open space at the rear of the site onto Milton Road. There is parking at the front of the site and landscaping along the boundaries.

- 1.2 The property comprises 8 no. flats, individual study rooms, a common room, utility room and laundry facilities. The last occupation was for students or members of King's College, however the property is currently vacant.
- 1.3 There is an extant consent on the site for demolition of the existing building and the erection of a student accommodation block providing 48 no. student rooms for graduates, which was granted consent in November 2015 (15/1302/FUL). The approved scheme was for a block up to three storeys high on the Springfield Road and Milton Road frontages.
- 1.4 The site includes the area to the west of Whichcote House which is currently used as open space associated with the property. There is a current planning application (17/0489/FUL) for the erection of 3 no. terraced dwellings with associated parking, access and landscaping arrangements fronting Milton Road. This application is also due for consideration at planning committee on 30 August.
- 1.5 Springfield Road is a narrow road off Milton Road with traditional terraced properties on either side. The site is located at the northern end where the road terminates at Springfield Terrace, which connects Milton Road to Herbert Street.
- 1.6 The northern boundary of the site runs along Springfield Terrace where this is a pedestrianized lane. Nos. 1-8 Springfield terrace are two storey properties with small front gardens.
- 1.7 To the south are Nos. 37 and 39 Springfield Road which share an access. No. 37 is a traditional two storey end of terrace. No. 39 is a more recent infill development set back from the road which is attached to the rear of No. 37. The properties share a courtyard. No. 37 has extant consent for change of use from residential property (C3 use) to a bed and breakfast (C1 use) (15/2362/FUL), however it is understood that this was never implemented. Planning permission has been granted for extensions and alterations to convert No. 37 into an extension to No. 39 to create a single dwelling (17/0435/FUL).

- 1.8 The site is not within the conservation area. The site is outside the Controlled Parking Zone. There are no other relevant site constraints.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposal is for change of use and conversion of Whichcote House from student accommodation to provide 10 no. C3 (dwelling house) units and the addition of a third floor to provide an additional 1 no. unit, with external alterations, cycle parking, bin store, car parking and landscaping. The units would comprise:
- ☐ 2 x 1-beds
 - ☐ 7 x 2-beds
 - ☐ 2 x 3-beds
- 2.2 The third floor would increase the height of the building from approximately 8m to 10.7m. The additional storey would be set back between 2.4-3.3m from the front and side elevations and 1.4m from the rear elevation. The external materials would be zinc cladding.
- 2.3 The external alterations to the building include the addition of balconies on the first and second floor front and rear elevations, which was included as an amendment to the application. The balconies on the rear include screens to obscure views.
- 2.4 The proposal also includes the resizing of windows and amendments to the fenestration, and the addition of elements of zinc cladding on the first floor front elevation and second floor rear elevation, as well as timber cladding around the main entrance on the ground floor front elevation.
- 2.5 The existing trees and hedge along the Springfield Road boundary would be retained, as would the trees along the northern and southern boundaries. The landscaping would be enhanced with planting beds around the edge of the building. The existing gravel area in front of the building would be hard surfaced.
- 2.6 The open space at the rear would remain as communal garden. Defensible space would be laid out at the rear for the ground floor units using soft landscaping.

- 2.7 6 no. car parking spaces (including one accessible space) would be provided at the front of the site. An accessible ramp would be provided from the front around the side of the building to the rear.
- 2.8 16 no. cycle parking spaces would be provided within the ground floor with access from the front elevation, and a further 10 no. cycle parking spaces would be provided in a cycle store at the rear adjacent to the southern boundary. 2 no. visitor spaces would be provided in front of the building.
- 2.9 The existing bin store to the side of the building on the northern boundary would be retained and extended to provide communal facilities.
- 2.10 During the course of the application, amendments were submitted which included:
- ☐ Revising the description of development to include change of use;
 - ☐ Revising the application site boundary to include the area to the west and the Milton Road frontage;
 - ☐ Internal rearrangements to allow access from the building to the communal space at the rear;
 - ☐ The addition of balconies and roof terraces to the front and rear elevations.
- 2.11 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:
1. Design and Access Statement
 2. Shadow Studies
 3. Visualisations
 4. Drawings

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
17/0489/FUL	Proposed erection of 3No. terrace dwellings with associated parking, access and landscaping arrangements fronting Milton Road	Pending consideration
15/1302/FUL	Demolition of existing building and construction of a	Approved subject to

	replacement graduate student accommodation building including creation of new/altere	conditions
	pedestrian and vehicular accesses and landscaping including works to trees.	
C/70/0707	Erection of block of eight flats with playroom, pram store and six studies and parking facilities.	Approved subject to conditions
C/63/0135	Use of land for erection of flats.	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	3/1 3/4 3/6 3/7 3/11 3/14
		4/4 4/13
		5/1
		8/2 8/6 8/10
		10/1

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

Central Government Guidance	<p>National Planning Policy Framework March 2012</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014</p> <p>Circular 11/95</p>
Supplementary Planning Guidance	<p>Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007)</p> <p>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012)</p> <p>Planning Obligation Strategy (March 2010)</p>
Material Considerations	<p><u>City Wide Guidance</u></p> <p>Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)</p>

5.4 Status of Proposed Submission – Cambridge Local Plan

Planning applications should be determined in accordance with policies in the adopted Development Plan and advice set out in the NPPF. However, after consideration of adopted plans and the NPPF, policies in emerging plans can also be given some weight when determining applications. For Cambridge, therefore, the emerging revised Local Plan as published for consultation on 19 July 2013 can be taken into account, especially those policies where there are no or limited objections to it. However it is likely, in the vast majority of instances, that the adopted development plan and the NPPF will have considerably more weight than emerging policies in the revised Local Plan.

For the application considered in this report, the following policies in the emerging Local Plan are of relevance and are referred to in the assessment below:

- ☐ Policy 46 – Development of student housing

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

6.1 Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Control)

The proposed development increases the number of residents of the site whilst reducing the amount of off-street parking provision. 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 Local Planning Authority may wish to consider when assessing this application.

6.2 Urban Design and Conservation team

No objection. The proposed third floor forms a subservient extension to the main building when viewed from street level. The additional levels of overshadowing are minor compared to the existing situation and are acceptable in design terms. The amendments to the external appearance are acceptable. The internal access to the communal amenity space is supported. The balconies are supported, although details of materials are required and recommend some internal rearrangement of living spaces.

Recommended conditions:

- ☐ Material samples
- ☐ Non-masonry walling systems
- ☐ Window and door details

Landscape Architect

6.3 Initial comment

Objection. The existing access to the communal garden provides direct access from the central core and common room. The proposed red line application boundary substantially reduces the area of communal garden and fails to establish a

direct and functional relationship with all of the proposed units. Furthermore alternative private amenity spaces are only provided for the ground floor units.

6.4 Comment on revised proposal

No objection. The revised proposals provide a more direct access to the rear communal area which is acceptable. In addition, the revised plan boundary allows for the fullness of the communal area to be available as amenity space for the development. Recommended conditions:

- ☐ Hard and soft landscaping
- ☐ Landscape maintenance and management plan

6.5 **Environmental Health**

No objection. Recommended conditions to control construction hours.

6.6 **Sustainable Drainage Engineer**

No objection. Recommended condition for a surface and foul water scheme.

6.7 **Growth and Economy (Cambridgeshire County Council)**

No objection.

6.8 **Environment Agency**

No objection.

6.8 **Access Officer**

Request a lift and conversion to Code 2 (formerly Lifetime Homes) standard.

6.9 **Designing Out Crime Officer (Cambridgeshire Policy Headquarters)**

No objection.

6.10 Policy Section

Policy 5/1 Housing Provision of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 states that proposals for housing development on windfall sites will be permitted subject to the existing land use and compatibility with adjoining uses. There is no policy coverage of the loss of student accommodation in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

The emerging Local Plan is, as a matter of principle, a material consideration. Policy 46 of the emerging Plan (as proposed to be modified) concerns the development of student accommodation. This policy confirms that the loss of existing student accommodation will be resisted unless adequate replacement accommodation is provided or it is demonstrated that the facility no longer caters for current or future needs.

The proposed development is in conflict with that emerging policy, however, that emerging policy is the subject of objections that have yet to be resolved through the Local Plan examination process. As such, and in accordance with the NPPF, policy 46 of the emerging Local Plan can attract only limited weight. Therefore, there is no in principle objection to this proposal.

6.11 Developer Contributions Monitoring Unit

Community Facilities

The proposed development is within 1 mile of the Akeman Street Community House site.

Given the scale of the proposed development on this site, and in line with the funding formula set out in the Councils Planning Obligations Strategy 2010, a specific S106 contribution of £15,068 (plus indexation) is requested towards the provision of and / or improvement of community facilities and equipment as part of the Akeman Street Community House redevelopment.

So far, the council has not agreed any other specific contributions for this project. The council has proposed, but not formally agreed two further specific contributions for this project.

Indoor Sports

The proposed development is within 400m of the Chesterton Community College sporting facility, which is on the Councils 2016/17 target list of indoor sports facilities for which specific S106 contributions may be sought in order to mitigate the impact of development. This target list was agreed by the City Councils Executive Councillor for Communities in June 2016.

Given the scale of the proposed development on this site, and in line with the funding formula set out in the Councils Planning Obligations Strategy 2010, a specific S106 contribution of £6,187 (plus indexation) is requested towards the provision of blackout blinds to the main hall to enable the provision of activities to include glow sports and beats fitness at Chesterton Community College, Gilbert Road, Cambridge CB4 3NY.

So far, the council has not agreed any other specific contributions for this project. The council has proposed, but not formally agreed two further specific contributions for this project.

Outdoor Sports

This proposed development is within 700m of Chesterton Recreation Ground, which is on the council's 2016/17 target list of outdoor sports facilities for which specific S106 contributions may be sought.

Given the scale of the proposed development on this site, and in line with the funding formula set out in the council's Planning Obligations Strategy 2010, it is proposed that the council requests £5,474 (plus indexation) for the provision of and / or improvements with regard to the pavilion extension / pitch works at Chesterton Recreation Ground.

So far, the council has proposed only one specific contribution for this project (ref 14/0790/FUL former Cambridge City Football Ground) so there is still scope for this contribution (and up to three others) to be requested. The council has though proposed, but not formally agreed two further specific contributions for this project.

Informal Open Space

This proposed development is within 700m of Chesterton Recreation Ground.

Based on the funding formula set out in the council's Planning Obligations Strategy 2010, it is proposed that the council requests £5,566 (plus indexation) for the provision of and / or improvements to informal open space at Chesterton Recreation Ground.

So far, the council has agreed only one specific contribution for this project, and proposed two further contributions, so there is still scope for this contribution (and one other) to be requested.

Play provision for children and teenagers

This proposed development is within about 800m of Chesterton Recreation Ground play area. Chesterton Recreation Ground play area is on the council's target list of facilities for which specific S106 contributions will be sought. This highlights the scope for improving the play area equipment and facilities in order to mitigate the impact of local development.

Based on the funding formula set out in the council's Planning Obligations Strategy 2010, it is proposed that the council requests £6,320 (plus indexation) for improving the play area equipment and facilities at Chesterton Recreation Ground play area.

So far, the council has not agreed any specific contributions for these projects so there is still scope for this contribution (and up to four others) to be requested. The council has though proposed, but not formally agreed one further specific contribution for this project.

6.12 County Council contributions

Awaiting comments which will be reported as an update to the committee.

- 6.13 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:

- ☐ 12A Springfield Road
- ☐ 14 Springfield Road
- ☐ 24 Springfield Road
- ☐ 28 Springfield Road
- ☐ 29 Springfield Road
- ☐ 30 Springfield Road
- ☐ 31 Springfield Road
- ☐ 32 Springfield Road
- ☐ 33 Springfield Road
- ☐ 35 Springfield Road
- ☐ 38 Springfield Road
- ☐ 40 Springfield Road
- ☐ 42 Springfield Road
- ☐ 8 Springfield Terrace
- ☐ 29 Herbert Street
- ☐ 43 Herbert Street
- ☐ Grange Farm, Wheston Tideswell, Derbyshire

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Character

- ☐ The additional storey would result in a building out of character with the surrounding terraced houses;
- ☐ Sensible and sympathetic to existing dated building;
- ☐ 'Ugly, block-like' architecture;
- ☐ Retention of trees supported, concerned about any potential loss of trees.

Residential amenity

- ☐ Overshadowing, overbearing and overlooking of Springfield Road and Springfield Terrace properties, and loss of daylight and sky;
- ☐ Inadequate parking provision and increased demand for on-street parking;
- ☐ Additional demand for car parking spaces from private residents compared to existing students;
- ☐ Restriction on car ownership required;

- ☐ Proposed third floor windows and enlarged second floor windows excessively large and would result in unacceptable overlooking;
- ☐ Noise and disturbance from future occupants;
- ☐ Waste management arrangements inadequate;
- ☐ Increase in air pollution from additional occupants;
- ☐ Impact of construction traffic and contractor parking.

Highways

- ☐ Inadequate access arrangements;
- ☐ The proposal would add significantly to two-way traffic so Springfield Road should be made one-way;
- ☐ Implications for emergency vehicle access;
- ☐ Recommend closing off the southern entrance to the site leaving only the northern entrance, which would provide one additional off-street car parking space, additional on-street parking space and improved access arrangements.
- ☐ Recommend closure of Springfield Road entrances and creation of new access from Milton Road.

Other

- ☐ Loss of greenery and habitats resulting from potential future development on the western part of the site;
- ☐ Development has commenced on site with the construction of an access from Milton Road and demolition of a large section of wall.
- ☐ Capacity of existing drainage infrastructure and surface water drainage.

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. Highway safety
5. Car and cycle parking

6. Refuse arrangements
7. Third party representations
8. Affordable housing
9. Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

8.2 In assessing this application, the extant consent for student accommodation comprising a three storey block granted in 2015 (15/1302/FUL) is a material consideration that I have given appropriate weight to in my assessment below.

Principle of development

8.3 The existing use is for student accommodation, which was established through the previous application on the site. The proposal includes the change of use to residential C3 (dwelling house). Thus there is a loss of student accommodation on the site amounting to 8 no. flats and 4 no. studies.

8.4 There are no policies within the adopted Cambridge Local Plan (2006) to resist the loss of student accommodation. The emerging Cambridge Local Plan 2014 replacement draft policy 46 includes provision to resist such loss unless adequate accommodation is re-provided or it is demonstrated that the facility no longer caters for current or future needs.

8.5 The emerging local plan is a material consideration, however the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012) makes it clear that the weight that can be given to policies within emerging plans depends upon the extent to which there are unresolved objections to the draft policy (paragraph 216). Policy 46 has been the subject of objections that have yet to be resolved through the examination process. As such, the Policy Team has advised that there are no policy grounds on which to resist the loss of student accommodation in principle, and I agree with this position.

8.6 There is an extant consent on the site for a graduate student scheme which would represent an increase in the number of student rooms on the site from 30 no. beds to 48 no. beds (15/1302/FUL). This consent could be implemented subject to discharge of pre-commencement conditions, however there is no obligation for the applicant to complete the scheme. Should consent be granted for the current application, the applicant would have the option of which consent to implement. The

potential lapsing of the student accommodation consent is not a material consideration that can be given weight in the assessment of the current application.

- 8.7 Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 5/1 supports residential development on windfall sites, subject to the existing land use and compatibility with adjoining uses. The site is already in residential use and is situated within an established residential area, and therefore I consider that C3 (dwelling house) use and additional units could be supported in principle.
- 8.8 Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/6 requires that development of part of a site will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that due consideration has been given to safeguarding appropriate developments on the remainder of the site. During the course of the application, the applicant submitted a proposal for the western part of the site. I have taken this into consideration in my assessment below.

Context of site, design and external spaces

- 8.9 Whichcote House is an anomaly within the street scene along Springfield Road and is not currently visible from Milton Road due to its position on the eastern part of the site. The existing three storey building on a large site is contrary to the fine grain of the traditional terraced properties along Springfield Road and surrounding streets. The current building is slightly higher than the ridge height of the Springfield Road and Springfield Terrace properties. In my opinion, the building is outdated and makes a poor contribution to the street scene, except for the openness and planting on the frontage.
- 8.10 The proposed additional storey would increase the height, scale and massing of the building, however it would be set back a substantial distance from the outer edge of the floor below. The result would be that the building would taper upwards. Moreover, the third floor would be constructed in zinc cladding which would reinforce this as a subservient element. There would be screens around the roof terraces, however these would be relatively low and would not add to the bulk of the building. The approved scheme (15/1302/FUL) is for a three storey building that is closer to the front of the site. For these reasons, I share the view of the Urban Design team that the scale of the resulting building would be acceptable in design terms and

would not be unduly dominant in the street scene along Springfield Road. The additional storey would not be prominent in views from Milton Road.

- 8.11 The proposed alterations to the window openings and the addition of zinc and timber cladding would enliven the appearance of the building. In my opinion, the proportions, arrangement and materials would be appropriate for the building and would not harm the character of the street. The balconies that were added during the course of the application would relate well to the projections on the existing building and would not significantly increase the bulk of the building. I have recommended the conditions requested by the Urban Design team for materials samples, non-masonry walling details and window details, and subject to this, in my opinion the proposal will enhance the appearance of the building.
- 8.12 The proposal would retain important trees and landscaping along the boundaries, and would enhance the appearance of the site through new hard landscaping at the front and planting beds around the edge of the building to soften its appearance. I have recommended the conditions requested by the Landscape Officer for a detailed hard and soft landscaping scheme and management plan to be submitted for approval. The trees along the boundaries are important to the street scene and I have recommended a condition for tree protection details to be submitted for approval in order to ensure these trees are retained.
- 8.13 The site would function well in terms of providing good internal and external access to the communal space at the rear. The cycle parking would be in a convenient location for users, and the proposal would retain and extend the existing bin store, which is acceptable. No elevations of the cycle and bin stores have been provided, so I have recommended a condition for these details to be submitted for approval.
- 8.14 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/14 and 4/4.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

8.15 The nearest residential neighbours are Nos. 1-8 Springfield Terrace to the north, Nos. 37 and 39 Springfield Road to the south, and Nos. 46 to 44 Milton Road to the south west. The impact on Nos. 32-42 Springfield Road on the opposite side of the street is also considered. To the north-west is Mayfair Court which would not be affected. The existing situation and the extant consent is a material consideration when assessing the impact of the current proposal on these properties.

☐ Nos. 1-8 Springfield Terrace

8.16 These are two storey properties fronting the pedestrianized link from Springfield Road to Milton Road. The front elevations are south-facing towards the application site. The properties have shallow front gardens and long gardens at the rear.

8.17 The existing building has some degree of visual enclosure on the Springfield Terrace properties, particularly those at the western end of the terrace which are closer to the site, due to the orientation of the terrace. The applicant has submitted sections showing relationship with No. 1 which is the closest property. The sections show that the additional storey would only be glimpsed from ground floor windows. The top part would be visible from the first floor windows, however I do not consider that this would be so overbearing as to have a significant adverse impact on residential amenity.

8.18 The applicant has submitted shadow studies which I am satisfied demonstrate that the additional storey would not have a significant overshadowing impact on these properties.

8.19 There would be one window on the side elevation of the additional storey which would face towards the terrace. This window would be set back approximately 3.5m from the outside edge of the floor below and would serve a landing area. Due to the separation distance and elevated position of the window as well as the boundary trees which provide some screening, I am satisfied that this would not result in significant overlooking. The windows on the first floor side elevation would be enlarged. The drawings indicate the lower panel would be obscure

glazed, however I have recommended a condition for details of obscure glazed panels to be submitted for approval, which I am satisfied would secure this. There could be some oblique views from the roof terrace and second floor terraces on the front and rear elevations looking towards the terrace, and I have recommended a condition for details of screens to be submitted for approval.

□ Nos. 32-42 Springfield Road

- 8.20 These are two storey terraced properties fronting onto Springfield Road. The front elevations face towards the application site. The properties are set back from the edge of the pavement behind low boundary walls.
- 8.21 The approved three storey block (15/1302/FUL) would be higher than the existing building and would be closer to the front of the site. The proposed additional storey would be higher than this, however would be set back at least 2.4m from the edge of the floor below. The sections show that the top of the additional storey may be glimpsed from the ground floor and first floor windows of these properties, however it would not be prominent, and would not have an unacceptable overbearing impact. In my opinion, the set-back additional storey would not have a significant impact compared to the approved scheme, and would be mitigated by the retention of the trees along Springfield Road.
- 8.22 There would be terraces on the first floor front elevation and a roof terrace on the third floor. Views towards the front elevation of the Springfield Road properties opposite would be over 15m and would be screened by the existing trees. This would not result in an unacceptable loss of privacy compared to the existing situation. Third parties have raised concerns about loss of privacy from the enlargement of windows on the front elevation, however views are screened by the existing trees and in my opinion this would not result in a significant loss of privacy compared to the existing situation.
- 8.23 Due to the scale of the proposal and the orientation to the west, there would not be unacceptable overshadowing or loss of light to these properties. The applicant's shadow study indicates a small increase in the amount of shadow at 5pm on the summer

solstice (21st June), however in my opinion this would not have a significant adverse impact on residential amenity.

□ Nos. 37 & 39 Springfield Road

- 8.24 No. 37 is a two storey end-of-terrace property fronting Springfield Road. There are two windows on the first floor side elevation serving bedrooms. The property has a part single storey, part two storey rear outrigger, which includes ground and first floor windows on the side elevations serving bedrooms. The extant consent for alterations and extensions (17/0435/FUL) would replace these windows with a larger living room window on the ground floor and bedroom window on the first floor in-line with the side elevation of the main house, therefore closer to the application site. The property has a large rear dormer, which has a large window on the side cheek serving a bedroom.
- 8.25 No. 39 is a two storey dwelling set back from the road with windows on the ground and first floor east elevation facing towards No. 37 and Springfield Road. The property was built hard-up against the boundary with Whichcote House. There are no windows on the north elevation facing towards the application site. Under the extant consent 17/0435/FUL, this property would be incorporated into the same unit as No. 37.
- 8.26 Whichcote House is set back from the road so building does not overlap the two storey element of No. 37. Thus, the proposal would have no impact on the first floor windows on the side elevation. The building is to the north of the courtyard and the outrigger, the side elevation of which is approximately 7m from the boundary. The consented extensions would bring the side elevation of the outrigger closer to the boundary separated by approximately 4m. I have assessed the overbearing impact using sections and in my opinion, the additional storey would only be glimpsed from the courtyard. The top of the extension would have some visual impact on ground and first floor windows as existing and consented, however due to the separation distance and the set-back, the additional storey would be at least 10m from any windows (taking account of the consented extensions) so would not have a significant adverse overbearing impact on these windows. The proposal would not have an overbearing impact on the ground and first floor windows on the front elevation of No. 39.

8.27 The proposal would introduce one window on the side elevation of the additional third storey which would face towards these properties. This window would be set back approximately 3m from the outside edge of the floor below and behind a buffer screen and planting, so I am satisfied that this would not result in significant overlooking towards these properties or No. 35 further to the south. There would be a terrace on the second floor front elevation and I have recommended a condition for the screen to be erected on the side elevation in order to prevent views towards these properties.

8.28 Due to the orientation, there would be no additional overshadowing of these properties.

□ Nos. 46 to 44 Milton Road

8.29 These are two storey properties at the northern end of a terrace along the eastern side of Milton Road. No. 46 forms the end of the terrace and has a long rear garden which runs along the part of the southern boundary of the application site.

8.30 The balcony on the proposed first floor rear elevation would have the potential to afford views into rear gardens of Nos. 46 and 44. These views would be oblique and would be towards the rearmost part of the gardens, which are general considered to be less sensitive to overlooking. However, due to the proximity of the balcony to the site boundary, I consider some mitigation is necessary. The applicant has proposed screens to direct views away from the gardens, and I have recommended a condition for the screens to be installed prior to occupation.

8.31 There would be some oblique views from the rear window on the third floor extension, however this would be set back from the boundary and would be from a bedroom, so I am satisfied this would not result in an unacceptable loss of privacy.

8.32 I am not concerned about enclosure or loss of light to these properties resulting from the proposal.

Relationship with Milton Road units

8.33 The current proposal shows communal open space on the western part of the site, however in accordance with policy 3/6 it is necessary to consider the relationship with future potential

development on the site. The application for 4 no. residential units on the western part of the site shows private amenity spaces that would back onto Whichcote House. The distance from the rear elevation of Whichcote House to the boundary would be approximately 10m. I am satisfied that although there would be direct views from windows and balconies on the rear elevation of Whichcote House, this would not have an unacceptable degree of overlooking. The relationship in terms of enclosure and overshadowing would also be acceptable. In my opinion, this demonstrates that the current proposal would not prejudice development on the western part of the site.

Wider area

- 8.34 Third parties have raised concerns about the impact of additional demand for car parking on residential amenity. The proposal includes the retention of 6 no. car parking spaces which is the same as the existing provision, however is less than one per unit. The proposal includes 9 no. units that are either 2-bed or 3-bed so could be occupied by families, who are more likely to be use cars. This could generate additional demand for on-street car parking within the vicinity compared to the current student use. However, the car parking provision is in accordance with the Council's adopted maximum standards which seek to encourage the use of sustainable transport modes. The site is close to the city centre, to shops and services in Milton Road, and to public transport and cycle routes, so the future occupants would not be car dependent. Moreover, the existing car parking situation on surrounding streets is likely to dissuade car-ownership. For these reasons, in my opinion, the demand for on street parking would not have a significant adverse impact on residential amenity compared to the existing situation.
- 8.35 Third parties have raised concerns about the impact of noise and disturbance during construction. The Environmental Health team has recommended a condition to control construction hours. I accept this advice and have also recommended a condition to control delivery hours to the construction site, due to the constraints of the site.
- 8.36 In my opinion the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and I

consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/14 and 4/13.

Amenity of future occupiers

- 8.37 The future occupants would have convenient access to an area of communal amenity space at the rear of the site. This would provide a generous amount of amenity space. In addition, the units would have access to generous balconies or terraces, except for the one-bed units. In my opinion, this would provide an acceptable level of amenity. The occupants of the one-bed units are less likely to be families who generally have more need for private amenity space. The occupants would have access to the communal amenity space, which is acceptable. I am satisfied that the proposed living space would provide an acceptable level of amenity for the future occupants.

Highway Safety

- 8.38 Third parties have raised concerns about the suitability of the existing access and the impact on Springfield Road as a result of an increase in the number of occupants on the site. The existing accesses from Springfield Road would be retained. These would provide vehicular access to the same number of car parking spaces. Thus the number of car movements to and from the site is likely to be similar to the existing situation. The Highways Authority has advised that the proposal would have an acceptable impact on highway safety, and I accept their advice. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Car and Cycle Parking

Car parking

- 8.39 The existing 6 no. car parking spaces would be retained, including one to be converted to an accessible space. While this would be less than one car parking space per unit, this is in accordance with the adopted maximum car parking standards. I have assessed the car parking provision in terms of highway safety and residential amenity in the relevant sections above. In my opinion, there would be no policy grounds or other material considerations to recommend refusal on these grounds.

Cycle parking

- 8.40 The proposal includes 16 no. cycle parking spaces within the ground floor and a further 10 no. cycle parking spaces in a cycle store at the rear adjacent to the southern boundary. 2 no. visitor spaces would be provided in front of the building. This is in accordance with the adopted cycle parking standards. The cycle parking for residents would be secure and covered. No elevations for the cycle store at the rear have been submitted, so I have recommended a condition for these details to be submitted for approval.
- 8.41 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10.

Refuse arrangements

- 8.42 Third parties have commented that the existing provision is inadequate and results in bins being left near to the front of the site creating an eyesore. The refuse storage and collection arrangements use the existing bins store on the northern boundary of the site, which would be extended. The stores show capacity for approximately 4760l capacity, which is in accordance with guidance. The store would meet the guidance in terms of the distance for residents, however would exceed the drag distance to the highway. The applicant has stated that the bins would be moved to and from the kerb for collection by a management company. This is a common arrangement for developments of this scale. I have some concerns about the width of the path from the bin store alongside the car parking space, however I am satisfied that this can be resolved through the landscaping condition. I have recommended a condition for management details to be submitted for approval.

Affordable housing

- 8.43 The affordable housing requirements have been considered taking the proposed development together with the application for the western part of the site which is with this same ownership. The two schemes together would provide 14 no. units on a site 0.14ha. This would be below the threshold for affordable housing set out in Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 5/5 and thus affordable housing is not required.

Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

8.44 The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010 have introduced the requirement for all local authorities to make an assessment of any planning obligation in relation to three tests. Each planning obligation needs to pass three statutory tests to make sure that it is

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

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

8.45 In line with the CIL Regulations, councils can pool no more than five S106 contributions towards the same project. The new 'pooling' restrictions were introduced from 6 April 2015 and relate to new S106 agreements. This means that all contributions now agreed by the city council must be for specific projects at particular locations, as opposed to generic infrastructure types within the city of Cambridge.

8.46 The planning obligations have been considered taking the proposed development together with the application for the western part of the site which is with this same ownership. Should permission be granted for both schemes, then a joint S106 Agreement would be prepared. Our Legal Officer has advised there is a mechanism for this. In the event that permission is granted for the current scheme but not the proposal on the western part of the site, then only the contributions relation to this application can be sought.

City Council Infrastructure

8.47 The Developer Contribution Monitoring team has recommended that contributions be made to the following projects:

	Projects	Current application 16/1873/FUL	Combined schemes 16/1873/FUL

			& 17/0489/FUL
Community Facilities	Towards the provision of and / or improvement of community facilities and equipment at part of the Akeman Street Community House redevelopment, Cambridge.	£15,068 (plus indexation)	£20,714 (plus indexation)
Indoor Sports	Towards the provision of blackout blinds to the main hall to enable the provision of activities to include glow sports and beats fitness at Chesterton Community College, Gilbert Road, Cambridge CB4 3NY.	£6,187 (plus indexation)	£9,415 (plus indexation)
Outdoor Sports	For the provision of and / or improvements with regard to the pavilion extension / pitch works at Chesterton Recreation Ground.	£5,474 (plus indexation)	£8,330 (plus indexation)
Informal Open Space	For the provision of and / or improvements to informal open space at Chesterton Recreation Ground.	£5,566 (plus indexation)	£8,470 (plus indexation)

Play provision for children and teenagers	For improving the play area equipment and facilities at Chesterton Recreation Ground play area.	£6,320 (plus indexation)	£10,112 (plus indexation)
--	---	--------------------------	---------------------------

County Council Infrastructure

8.48 Contributions sought from the County Council will be reported as an update to the committee.

8.49 I agree with the reasoning set out in the DCMU comments that contributions towards these projects meet the requirements of the CIL regulations. It is my view that the planning obligation is necessary, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably in scale and kind to the development and therefore the Planning Obligation passes the tests set by the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010. Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure this infrastructure provision, I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 10/1 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010.

Third Party Representations

8.50 I have addressed third party concerns as follows:

Representation	Response
Context	
The additional storey would result in a building out of character with the surrounding terraced houses;	The Urban Design team supports the scale and massing in design terms and I accept their advice.
Sensible and sympathetic to existing dated building;	Noted.
‘Ugly, block-like’ architecture;	The scale and proportions relate well to the existing building and would enhance its appearance. The materials and details can be controlled through conditions.
Retention of trees supported,	I have recommended a

concerned about any potential loss of trees.	condition for tree protection measures to be submitted for approval in order to minimise harm to the trees.
Residential amenity	
Overshadowing, overbearing and overlooking of Springfield Road and Springfield Terrace properties, and loss of daylight and sky;	See paragraphs 8.15-8.32.
Inadequate parking provision and increased demand for on-street parking;	See paragraphs 8.34 and 8.39.
Additional demand for car parking spaces from private residents compared to existing students;	See paragraphs 8.34 and 8.39.
Restriction on car ownership required;	This is not required for the reasons set out in paragraphs 8.34 and 8.39.
Proposed third floor windows and enlarged second floor windows excessively large and would result in unacceptable overlooking;	See paragraphs 8.19, 8.22, 8.27, 8.30-8.31.
Noise and disturbance from future occupants;	Whichcote House sits within a large plot and there is ample space between the building and neighbours so that it would not result in unacceptable noise at the boundaries. Due to the limited car parking, I am satisfied that the noise and disturbance from additional trips generated to and from the site would not have a significant harmful impact on residential amenity.
Waste management arrangements inadequate;	I am satisfied with the capacity of the bin provision and that the details of the bin store and access to the kerb

	can be controlled through conditions. The applicant has confirmed that a waste
Increase in air pollution from additional occupants;	The Environmental Health team has not raised a concern in this regard. I do not consider that the impact from the additional occupants would have a significant impact compared to the existing situation.
Impact of construction traffic and contractor parking.	The Highways Authority has not recommended a condition for a construction management plan for highway safety reasons. Due to the scale of the proposed works and the fact that there is access into the site, I do not consider it to be necessary to impose a condition for amenity reasons. I have recommended the condition to control construction and delivery hours, which in my opinion is sufficient.
Highways	
Inadequate access arrangements;	The access arrangements would be the same as existing and the same number of car parking spaces would be retained, so there would be no additional highway safety impact. The Highways Authority has not objected to the proposal.
The proposal would add significantly to two-way traffic so Springfield Road should be made one-way;	As above, the Highways Authority has not recommended that this would be necessary in order to mitigate any impact on highway safety, and I accept this advice.
Implications for emergency	Any additional demand for on-

vehicle access;	street parking resulting from the proposed development would be unlikely to have a significant additional impact that would affect access along Springfield Road compared to the existing situation.
Recommend closing off the southern entrance to the site leaving only the northern entrance, which would provide one additional off-street car parking space, additional on-street parking space and improved access arrangements.	I must assess the plans as submitted which do not include the closing off of one of the entrances. The Highways Authority has not recommended that this would be necessary in order to mitigate any impact on highway safety, and I accept this advice.
Recommend closure of Springfield Road entrances and creation of new access from Milton Road.	I must assess the plans as submitted which do not include the closing off of the Springfield Road accesses. The Highways Authority has not recommended that this would be necessary in order to mitigate any impact on highway safety, and I accept this advice.
Other	
Loss of greenery and habitats resulting from potential future development on the western part of the site;	The current application does not include development on the western part, although a separate application has been submitted. This is a matter relevant to that application.
Development has commenced on site with the construction of an access from Milton Road and demolition of a large section of wall.	This does not affect my assessment of the application.
Capacity of existing drainage infrastructure and surface water drainage	The Sustainable Drainage Engineer has recommended a condition for a surface and foul water drainage scheme to be submitted for approval.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The change of use to residential is acceptable in principle. I acknowledge that the additional storey would have some visual impact on the street scene and visual enclosure on neighbouring properties, however I consider that the set-back mitigates this impact to an acceptable level. The car parking provision is in accordance with adopted standards and would not cause significant harm the amenity of the neighbourhood. In my opinion, the proposal would enhance the appearance of the building and the site, and would be acceptable in terms of its relationship with neighbours.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to completion of the s106 Agreement and 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. No construction work or demolition work shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours and 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

4. There should be no collections from or deliveries to the site during the demolition and construction stages outside the hours of 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours to 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties.
(Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

5. Prior to commencement of development a scheme for the disposals of surface water and foul water shall be provided to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of water management (NPPF).

6. No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter, development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate.(Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 3/14).

7. Prior to the commencement of the development, full details of all non-masonry walling systems, cladding panels or other external screens including structural members, infill panels, edge, junction and coping details, colours, surface finishes/textures and relationships to glazing and roofing are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This may consist of large-scale drawings and/or samples. Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To ensure that the materials selected are of a high quality and appropriate to the context of the building
(Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 3/14).

8. Full details of all windows and doors, as identified on the approved drawings, including materials, colours, surface finishes/textures are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This may consist of large-scale drawings and/or samples. Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed details unless the Local Planning Authority agrees to any variation in writing.

Reason: To ensure that the window and doors are appropriate to the context of the building (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 3/14).

9. Prior to first occupation for the use hereby permitted and notwithstanding the approved plans, obscure glazed panels within window openings to be identified shall be installed in accordance with details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The obscure glazing shall be to a minimum level of obscurity to conform to Pilkington Glass level 3 or equivalent prior to commencement of use (of the extension) and shall have restrictors to ensure that the window cannot be opened more than 45 degrees beyond the plane of the adjacent wall. The glazing shall be installed in accordance with the approved details and thereafter retained.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13).

10. Prior to first occupation for the use hereby permitted and notwithstanding the approved plans, screens to the balconies and roof terraces shall be provided in accordance with details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include the positioning, height and materials for the proposed screens. The screens shall be installed in accordance with the approved details and thereafter retained.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13).

11. No development shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include proposed finished levels or contours; means of enclosure; car parking layouts, other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials; minor artefacts and structures (e.g. furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting); proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines indicating lines, manholes, supports); retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant. Soft Landscape works shall include planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate and an implementation programme.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that suitable hard and soft landscape is provided as part of the development (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 3/11).

12. A landscape maintenance and management plan, including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing prior to occupation of the development or any phase of the development whichever is the sooner, for its permitted use. The landscape plan shall be carried out as approved. Any trees or plants that, within a period of five years after planting, are removed, die or become in the opinion of the local planning authority, seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced as soon as is reasonably practicable with others of species, size and number as originally approved, unless the local planning authority gives its written consent to any variation.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that suitable hard and soft landscape is provided as part of the development (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 3/11).

13. Prior to first occupation for the use hereby permitted, cycle and bin store facilities shall be provided in accordance with details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the facilities shall be retained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 4/13 and 8/6).

14. Prior to first occupation, details of waste and refuse management arrangements shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include details of the management arrangements for the collection and return of bins to and from the highway. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13).

15. Details of the specification and position of fencing, or any other measures to be taken for the protection of any trees from damage during the course of development, shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for its written approval, and implemented in accordance with that approval before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought onto the site for the purpose of development (including demolition). The agreed means of protection shall be retained on site until all equipment, and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area protected in accordance with this condition, and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered nor shall any excavation be made without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the visual amenity of the area and to ensure the retention of the trees on the site (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 4/4).