

Application Number	17/0792/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	4th May 2017	Officer	Sav Patel
Target Date	29th June 2017		
Ward	Queen Ediths		
Site	23 Baldock Way Cambridge CB1 7UX		
Proposal	Demolition of the existing bungalow and the erection of a detached three bedroom residential unit.		
Applicant	Dr N Cheung		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed development is considered to be of high quality design and would enhance the appearance of the site and local area. - The proposed dwelling has been designed to mitigate the impact on the occupiers of adjacent properties. - The proposed level of outdoor amenity space is acceptable.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 23 Baldock Way is a detached bungalow with an attached single flat roof garage and drive way to the north, situated on the eastern side of Baldock Way. The surrounding area is predominantly residential mainly consisting of two-storey detached, semi-detached and terrace houses. To the north of the site is an allotment site and to the south the site adjoins the rear boundary of no.73 Glebe Road. The application site has been formed from the subdivision of no.73.
- 1.2 The site is not within a Conservation Area or within the setting of any Listed Buildings or Buildings of Local Interest.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposal is for the demolition of the existing bungalow and construction of a two storey 3-bed dwellinghouse with off street car parking and private amenity space. The proposed dwelling would be 5.5 metres in height.
- 2.2 The proposed dwelling has been amended to address concerns relating to the potential overbearing impact on the neighbour at no.71 Glebe Road. The first floor roof element has been pitched so that it is at a similar angle to the roof of the approved dwelling and existing bungalow. Amended plans have been consulted on.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
C/78/0035	Erection of detached bungalow	PERMITTED
14/0129/FUL	Demolition of bungalow and erection of detached house	REFUSED – dismissed at appeal
14/1652/FUL	Demolition of the bungalow and replacing it with a chalet bungalow	REFUSED
15/1589/FUL	Demolition of the existing bungalow and the erection of a pair of two-bedroom residential units.	APPROVED

4.0 PUBLICITY

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

5.0 POLICY

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

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan 2006	3/1 3/4 3/7 3/8 3/11 3/12 5/1 5/14 8/6 8/10

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework March 2012 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014 Circular 11/95
Supplementary Planning Guidance	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007)
	<u>City Wide Guidance</u> Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)

5.4 Status of Proposed Submission – Cambridge Local Plan

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

will have considerably more weight than emerging policies in the revised Local Plan.

For the application considered in this report, there are no policies in the emerging Local Plan that should be taken into account.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

6.1 The proposal should have no significant impact on the public highway subject to the following conditions/informative:

- No unbound materials for driveway;
- No PD rights for gates;
- Drainage measures;
- No overhanging of highway informative

Environmental Health

6.2 The proposed development is acceptable subject to conditions on construction hours and piling and an informative on dust.

Drainage

6.3 No objections subject to a surface water drainage condition. All new or altered external areas within the site boundary should be of permeable construction

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

6.4 The proposed development is acceptable subject to a hard and soft landscaping and boundary treatment conditions.

Urban Design Team

First comments:

6.5 The proposal is acceptable in principle but have significant concerns with the potential overbearing impact of the first floor of the proposal on the existing property at no.71 Glebe Road

and the bulk form of the southern elevation when views from no.73 Glebe Road.

Second comments – on amended plans

- 6.6 The previous concerns about overbearing impact of the first floor massing on the properties at no.71 and no.73 Glebe Road have been alleviated through altering the rear roof-slope to closely match the existing bungalow.
- 6.7 The above responses are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the consultation responses can be inspected on the application file.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

7.1 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations:

- 45 Cavendish Avenue (Support);
- 60 Glebe Road;
- 69 Glebe Road;
- 71 Glebe Road;
- 73 Glebe Road (from Owner of property who lives at Woodlands Farm, Hive Road, Witcham);
- 59 Hills Avenue (Support)

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Design, scale and layout:

- Overdevelopment of the site for an unsuited 3 bed property with lack of garden land;
- The increased height of the buildings and proximity to the boundary of neighbouring properties will exacerbate sense of dominance and enclosure that the existing bungalow already creates;
- The proposed dwellings would provide insufficient external amenity space;

Residential amenity:

- The height of the proposed dwelling and its proximity to the common boundaries, it will have a significant adverse

- overbearing impact on residential amenity and dominate the outlook from the neighbouring properties;
- The proposed dwelling due to its location west of the rear garden of no.71 would cause unacceptable overshadowing over the garden area;
 - The proposed family dwelling has limited external garden space to serve a future occupiers;
 - The proposal would cause overlooking and loss of privacy;

Highway/car parking impact:

- Limited off-site parking provision which is likely to result in increased on-road parking causing significant problems in the area during peak times;
- The site is not close to shops or services;
- Baldock Way is narrow and gets congested at times with parking associated with Addenbrookes and nearby schools;
- The proposal will have a negative impact on local road network and impact road safety;

Other issues:

- Drainage system does not adequately cope with existing demand and causes overflowing;
- Back gardens have regularly become waterlogged and so are concerned that the foundation work for the new dwelling will exacerbate this;
- Sewer pipes regularly blocked and proposal will exacerbate this;
- Misrepresentation of view in the design and access statement

In support:

- The bungalow is of no merit and an eyesore not befitting of the area;
- The proposal is well designed with no intensification of the site as it would replace an existing 3bed property;
- The proposal would provide slightly more amenity space;

Comments received on amended plans:

- The previous application was approved due to the fact there was a clear break in the roof ridge line and there was just in

enough outdoor space which is at odds with the proposed scheme;

- 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. Context of site, design and external spaces
2. Residential amenity
3. Refuse arrangements
4. Highway safety
5. Car and cycle parking
6. Third party representations

Context of site, design and external spaces

- 8.2 The application site fronts onto Baldock Way and is situated on the eastern side of the road. The pattern of development along this stretch of Baldock Way (between Hills Avenue and Glebe Road) is generally characterised by predominantly two storey detached housing set back from the road and behind either hedgerows or timber fences along the front boundaries. However, there are examples of single storey and semi-detached dwellings but the prevailing pattern is of a two storey detached form.
- 8.3 The allotment site; to the north of the application site, gives the eastern side of Baldock Way a more open feel as opposed to the more built up setting on the western side. Baldock Way is characterised by trees planted on grass verges which separate the pavement from the road. The road itself is relatively unrestricted with the exception of a single yellow line that runs along the western side of the road.
- 8.4 The architectural character along this stretch of Baldock Way is varied and so there is no prevailing style from which to respond or take reference from. The existing bungalow has little architectural merit.

- 8.5 The site has extant planning permission (15/1589/FUL dated 15/01/16) for demolition of the existing dwelling and construction of 2no. two storey semi-detached dwellings with basements and roof terraces. The proposal is for a single two storey residential dwelling with off road parking and garden space. The proposed design follows a similar contemporary design concept to the approved scheme.
- 8.6 Concerns were initially raised with the proposed dwelling due to the elevation facing the garden of no.71 Glebe Road. The first floor roof elevation would have resulted in a continuous form approx. 11.8 metres wide. This was considered to have an unacceptable impact. The roof element of the previous scheme was carefully designed to mitigate the overbearing and enclosure impact over the garden area of the adjacent neighbours. As a result, the first floor element was amended. The first floor vertical roof was remodeled so that it was similar to the existing bungalow roof and roof design of the approved development. The proposed dwelling was also pulled off the boundary. These amendments did not compromise the contemporary design of the dwelling.
- 8.7 Therefore, in terms of design and scale the amended scheme is now acceptable and would make a positive contribution to the screen scene. The proposed design is considered to be an improvement on the existing bungalow in terms of architectural style and appearance.
- 8.8 In terms of external amenity space, this was a concern that has been raised in the previous application. However, the proposal would provide more usable outdoor space than the existing bungalow and approved dwellings. The amount of outdoor space is considered to be acceptable for the size of the proposed dwelling – see below table:

Proposed	65.2m ²
Existing bungalow	43.5m ²
Approved scheme (15/1589/FUL)	Total 51.2m ² (split 25.6m ² each unit)

- 8.9 Therefore, whilst there are no policies that prescribe standards for outdoor space for new developments, the proposal would improve the level of outdoor space on the site by making

efficient use of the space/site. The proposal would also provide an on-plot car parking space. In my view, therefore, the proposal would provide sufficient outdoor space for the size of dwelling proposed.

- 8.10 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.11 Concerns have been raised about the potential detrimental impact of the proposed dwelling would have on residential amenity in terms of overbearing and overshadowing and loss of privacy. I set out below my assessment of each.

Overbearing and sense of enclosure

- 8.12 Concerns were raised with the original design of the proposed dwelling. Following amendments to the first floor element, the amended scheme would not appear overbearing from the garden area of no.71 Glebe Road. The impact would be very similar to the existing bungalow and the approved development. The proposed dwelling has been pulled off the boundary and the first floor roof angled so that it pitches away from the rear boundary. The first floor of the proposed dwelling is also set further away from the rear boundary of no.73 Glebe than the approved dwellings. This would also mitigate the impact on the occupiers of no.73. In my view, therefore, the proposal is acceptable and would not have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of the adjacent neighbours.

Overshadowing

- 8.13 The amended scheme would not cause any significant levels of overshadowing over and above the existing bungalow. The proposed dwelling is located north of no.71 and no.73 Glebe Road and as such due to the orientation of the sun the proposed dwelling would not cast any unacceptable levels of shadowing to these properties.

Overlooking

- 8.14 The proposed dwelling does not contain any first floor windows facing the rear gardens of the adjacent properties at no.71 or 73 Glebe Road. All first floor windows, which serve bedrooms, face Baldock Way and therefore the first floor layout of the proposal would not cause any loss of privacy. The proposal does contain ground floor living room windows facing the side boundary of no.71 and rear boundary of no.73 but these are at ground floor level and so would not cause any overlooking issues.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

- 8.15 The proposed dwelling would provide a high quality living accommodation for future occupiers with a decent amount of internal habitable space, sufficient garden space and off road parking. The garden space which is located in a similar location to the existing bungalow would be overlooked by the first floor windows in no.71 and 73 Glebe Road. However, this relationship currently exists with the existing bungalow on this constrained site. By relocating the garden space to the opposite side would have resulted in bringing the dwelling closer to the existing dwellings which would have raised potentially adverse residential amenity issues. Therefore, the impact from overlooking on the future occupiers is not considered to outweigh the benefits of keeping the proposed dwellings away from the boundaries.

Refuse Arrangements

- 8.16 The proposal makes appropriate provision for bin storage within the site in an enclosed space with good access to the highway for collection.
- 8.17 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

Highway Safety

- 8.18 No concerns have been raised by the Local Highway Authority regarding highway safety issues arising from the proposed development.

8.19 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Car and Cycle Parking

Car parking

8.20 The approved development did not provide any off street car parking spaces. However, the proposal provides an on-plot space and car port at the northern end of the site for potentially two cars in the same location as the existing bungalow.

Cycle parking

8.21 The proposal includes suitable provision for the secure storage of two cycles.

8.22 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10.

Third Party Representations

8.23 I set out below my response to the concerns raised in the third party representation in the below table.

Representation	Response
<i>Design, scale and layout:</i>	
Overdevelopment of the site for an unsuited 3 bed property with lack of garden land;	The proposal is not considered to be harmful overdevelopment of the plot. The proposal makes efficient and effective use of the land.
The increased height of the buildings and proximity to the boundary of neighbouring properties will exacerbate sense of dominance and enclosure that the existing bungalow already creates;	The height is comparable to the existing bungalow and approved dwellings. I therefore do not consider the dwelling would appear overbearing or dominant on the adjacent neighbours.
The proposed dwellings would provide insufficient external amenity space;	The proposed dwelling would provide more external amenity space than the existing bungalow and approved dwellings.

<i>Residential amenity:</i>	
The height of the proposed dwelling and its proximity to the common boundaries, it will have a significant adverse overbearing impact on residential amenity and dominate the outlook from the neighbouring properties;	The main bulk of the proposed dwelling would be located further away from the boundaries of the neighbouring properties than the existing bungalow and approved dwellings.
The proposed dwelling due to its location west of the rear garden of no.71 cause unacceptable overshadowing over the garden area;	The proposed dwelling would not cause any significant levels of overshadowing such that it would warrant refusal.
The proposed family dwelling has limited external garden space to serve a future occupiers;	See para 8.15
The proposal would cause overlooking and loss of privacy;	See para 8.14
<i>Highway/car parking impact:</i>	
Limited off-site parking provision which is likely to result in increased on-road parking causing significant problems in the area during peak times;	The proposal provides enough off road parking for 2 spaces the same as the existing dwelling.
Baldock Way is narrow and gets congested at times with parking associated with Addenbrookes and nearby schools;	The proposal makes sufficient provision to cater of its own parking requirements.
The proposal will have a negative impact on local road network and impact road safety;	No highway safety issues have been raised by the County Highway Authority.

Other issues:	
Drainage system does not adequately cope with existing demand and causes overflowing;	<p>The Council's Drainage Officer does not consider the proposal will cause any additional drainage issues over and above that which already exists.</p> <p>The site is also not within a flood zone and therefore any localised flooding /waterlogging issue would appear to be an extant problem that those affected by would need to resolve.</p>
Back gardens have regularly become waterlogged and so are concerned that the foundation work for the new dwelling will exacerbate this;	As above.
Sewer pipes regularly blocked and proposal will exacerbate this;	As above.
Misrepresentation of view in the design and access statement	This is not a material planning consideration. Only the formal plans (elevations/floorplans/site location plan) would be approved.
<i>In support:</i>	
The bungalow is of no merit and an eyesore not befitting of the area;	Noted.
The proposal is well designed with no intensification of the site as it would replace an existing 3 bed property;	Noted.
The proposal would provide slightly more amenity space;	Noted.

<i>Comments received on amended plans:</i>	
The previous application was approved due the fact there was a clear break in the roof ridge line and there was just in enough outdoor space which is at odds with the proposed scheme;	Each planning application is considered on its own merits. This revised design is of merit and has responded to the site constraints.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The proposed development would replace an existing 3-bed bungalow with a 3-bed two storey detached dwelling. The contemporary design approach taken for the proposed dwelling is acceptable and would enhance the appearance of the site and make a positive contribution to the street scene. The scale of the dwelling has been modelled to ensure it appears similar to the existing bungalow and approved dwellings without compromising the design approach.
- 9.2 The proposed dwelling would not have a significantly detrimental impact on the residential amenity of the adjacent neighbours over and above the impact of the existing bungalow and approved dwellings.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

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

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

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

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

3. 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. 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. 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, 3/12 and 3/14)

5. No unbound material shall be used in the surface finish of the driveway within 6 metres of the highway boundary of the site.

Reason: To avoid displacement of loose material onto the highway in the interests of highway safety

6. Notwithstanding the provision of Class A of Schedule 2, Part 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, (or any order revoking, amending or re-enacting that order) no gates shall be erected across the approved vehicular access unless details have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

7. The access shall be constructed with adequate drainage measures to prevent surface water run-off onto the adjacent public highway.

Reason: To prevent surface water discharging to the highway.

8. In the event of the foundations for the proposed development requiring piling, prior to the development taking place the applicant shall provide the local authority with a report / method statement for approval detailing the type of piling and mitigation measures to be taken to protect local residents from noise and/or vibration. Potential noise and vibration levels at the nearest noise sensitive locations shall be predicted in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228-1&2:2009 Code of Practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Due to the proximity of this site to existing residential premises and other noise sensitive premises, impact pile driving is not recommended.

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

9. Prior to the commencement of development a scheme for surface water drainage works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details shall include an assessment of the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system in accordance with the principles set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and the National Planning Policy Guidance, and the results of the assessment provided to the local planning authority. The system should be designed such that there is no surcharging for a 1 in 30 year event and no internal property flooding for a 1 in 100 year event + an allowance for climate change. The submitted details shall include the following:

- 1) Information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters;

- 2) A management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.

The approved details shall be fully implemented on site prior to the first use/occupation and shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure appropriate surface water drainage. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/16)

10. 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 (eg furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting); proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (eg 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, 3/11 and 3/12)

11. No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatments to be erected. The boundary treatment shall be completed before the use hereby permitted is commenced and retained thereafter unless any variation is agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure an appropriate boundary treatment is implemented. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12)

12. Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), the enlargement, improvement or other alteration of the dwellinghouse(s) shall not be allowed without the granting of specific planning permission.

Reason: To protect the amenity of adjoining properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/10 and 3/12).

13. Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class B of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no new windows or dormer windows (other than those expressly authorised by this permission), shall be constructed without the granting of specific planning permission.

Reason: To protect the amenity of adjoining properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/10 and 3/12).

14. Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class E of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), the provision within the curtilage of the dwellinghouse(s) of any building or enclosure, swimming or other pool shall not be allowed without the granting of specific planning permission.

Reason: To protect the amenity of adjoining properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/10 and 3/12).

INFORMATIVE: No part of any structure may overhang or encroach under or upon the public highway unless licensed by the Highway Authority and no gate / door / ground floor window shall open outwards over the public highway.

INFORMATIVE: Dust condition informative

To satisfy the condition requiring the submission of a program of measures to control airborne dust above, the applicant should have regard to:

-Council's Supplementary Planning Document - "Sustainable Design and Construction 2007":

<http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/docs/sustainable-design-and-construction-spd.pdf>

-Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction

http://iaqm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/guidance/iaqm_guidance_report_draft1.4.pdf

- Air Quality Monitoring in the Vicinity of Demolition and Construction Sites 2012

http://www.iaqm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/guidance/monitoring_construction_sites_2012.pdf

-Control of dust and emissions during construction and demolition - supplementary planning guidance

https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Dust%20and%20Emissions%20SPG%208%20July%202014_0.pdf