

Application Number	17/2050/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	7th December 2017	Officer	Mairead O'Sullivan
Target Date	1st February 2018		
Ward	Coleridge		
Site	64 Coleridge Road and Land to the rear of 62 and 60 Coleridge Road		
Proposal	Erection of 2no. houses to the rear of site. First floor side and rear extension to main house. Conversion of house to 1no. 3-bed and 1no. 1-bed flat.		
Applicant	Miss Emily Ceraudo 56 Selwyn Ave, Richmond TW92HD		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The proposal would not harm the character of the area- The proposal is on balance considered to have an acceptable impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers.- The units would provide an adequate standard of amenity for future occupiers
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site is part of a pair of semi-detached properties on the western side of Coleridge Road. The site also comprises land which would formally have served as garden land to no's 62 and 60 Coleridge Road. The area is predominantly in residential use. It has a mixed character. The west side of the road is predominantly characterised by semi-detached two storey dwellings. Many of these have been extended to the

side, rear and into the roof. These are finished in a mixture of brick and render. The eastern side of the road is predominantly two storey terraced properties which are also finished in a mixture of brick and render.

1.2 There are no site constraints.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

2.1 The application seeks full planning permission for extensions to the host dwelling and dividing the property into two apartments; one 3 bedroom duplex and a studio flat in the roof. The application also seeks full planning permission for the construction of two 2 storey dwellings on land to the rear.

2.2 The host dwelling is to be extended to the side and rear and roof. The side extension would consist of a first floor element above an undercroft which provides access to the rear. The side extension has been amended to be reduced in height, so it steps down from the main ridge height, and set back from the front elevation to create a shadow line. The revised proposal retains the existing bay window. The rear extension would consist of a flat roof ground floor element and flat roof first floor element. The ground floor element would replace the existing ground floor extensions and not project beyond the existing footprint of 6.3 metres. The first floor extension would project 3.3 metres and would be set in from the south side elevation by 2.2 metres. The proposed roof extensions consist of a hipped to gable and flat roof dormer in the rear roof space. The house is to be converted into two flats; 1no. 3 bedroom duplex flat (110sqm) and a 1 bed flat (51sqm). The duplex flat is accessed from the undercroft area and is contained on the ground and first floors. Bike storage is shown within the rear garden. Bin storage is shown to be at the front of the property. The studio flat would be contained within the roof space and accessed from a door on the Coleridge Road frontage. The bike store for this unit would be integral and accessed from the undercroft. Bins for this flat are also shown at the frontage.

2.3 The pair of semi-detached properties to the rear of the building would be 1.5 storeys in terms of scale with the rooms on the first floor being contained within the roofspace. The internal layout of these units has been amended to ensure that both bedrooms at 1st floor can have means of escape. These units

would have bin and bike storage in stores to the side of each building. Both units would have rear gardens.

- 2.4 This is the third application on the site. Since the original submission, the scale of the first floor extension has been reduced due to concerns regarding the impact of the extension on the single aspect kitchen of no 62 Coleridge Road. As noted above the side extension has also been reduced in height and set back from the principal elevation as the original proposal was not considered to read as adequately subservient to the host dwelling. Since the original application was submitted, the scale, massing and height of the proposed buildings to the rear has been reduced due to concerns regarding their impact on neighbour amenity and the character of the area.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
17/1465/FUL	Erection of 2 no. houses to the rear of site. First floor side and rear extension to main house. Conversion of house to 1no. 3-bed and 1 no. 2-bed flat.	Withdrawn
17/0645/FUL	Erection of 4no. 3x bed terraced houses to the rear site. Conversion of house to 2 flats following a two storey front and side extension, part two storey part single storey rear extension and roof extension incorporating rear dormer.	Withdrawn

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 Plan 2006	Local	3/1 3/4 3/10 3/11 3/12 3/14 4/13 4/15 5/1 5/2 8/2 8/6 8/10

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 (Annex A)</p> <p>Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard – published by Department of Communities and Local Government March 2015 (material consideration)</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>
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, 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 Objection: The proposed parking arrangement is unclear and there is contradictory information in the Design and Access Statement. The access is only sufficient to provide access to one parking space if each car is to be able to access the site independently. The proposed parking arrangement needs to be clarified. The proposal may increase the demand for on-street car parking which is unlikely to impact on highway safety but may impact on residential amenity.

Environmental Health

- 6.2 No objection: Conditions are recommended in relation to construction hours, collection/delivery hours and piling.

Refuse and Recycling

- 6.3 Unclear as to whether the site will be using a shared bin store. If this is proposed then details of the pull distance to the collection point is required.

Urban Design and Conservation Team

- 6.4 Objection: There is inadequate space for off-street parking. The duplex unit should have its own front door. A set-back should be retained. Materials should match. Cycle and bin storage has been overprovided. The new units could have smaller stores in their gardens. The removal of the integral communal bike and bins stores allows a better entrance space. The new houses would benefit from porches. The roofing materials should continue to the first floor of the extension. Hit and miss lighting should be incorporated into the covered access.

Senior Sustainability Officer (Design and Construction)

- 6.5 No comments received

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Tree Team)

- 6.6 No comments received

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

- 6.7 Objection: The parking area is not adequately large. Cycle and bin storage is poorly considered. The proposals have improved but still do not adequately respond to the constraints of the site. The proposed arrangement has created spaces and uses which do not relate to the needs of the residents well.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Officer)

- 6.8 The proposed development is acceptable subject to a surface water drainage condition. All new or altered external surfaces within the site should be of permeable construction. If ground investigation identifies that infiltration techniques are not appropriate, the surface water runoff rates should be reduced to the equivalent greenfield runoff rates for the new houses and the additional roof area from the extension of the existing dwelling. An overall reduction in surface water runoff from the existing dwelling should be achieved.

Cambridgeshire Constabulary (Architectural Liaison Officer)

- 6.9 The area is at a low to medium vulnerability to the risk of crime. The proposal is to use an entry system of Secured by Design standards which is welcomed.
- 6.10 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:

- 30 Barham Avenue (owner of 66 Coleridge Rd) x3
- 1B Brackyn Road
- 2A Brackyn Road x3
- 56 Coleridge Road
- 62 Coleridge Road x4
- 67 Coleridge Road x3
- 68 Coleridge Road x3
- 71 Coleridge Road
- 73 Coleridge Road
- Camcycle x3
- The Hollies, Derenham x2

- 7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Design, scale and layout:

- Overdevelopment;
- The houses to the rear should be 1/1.5 storeys maximum
- Footprint of houses does not appear significantly reduced since original application
- Out of character; nothing similar in Coleridge
- The design of the houses to the rear is contrasting and unpleasant
- The density is greater than elsewhere on the road
- Additional bins would further obstruct the footpath
- Loss of long garden form which is a characteristic of the area

- Would set a precedent
- The Coleridge Rd precedent has vehicular access and is at the end of a row of houses
- The Catharine Street precedent sited involves a commercial use to the frontage and is also not relevant.
- The precedent cited at 115 Coleridge Road retained a traditional design and had road access to the new dwelling
- The precedent cited at 79 is a single dwelling and therefore no comparable
- The area has character, good quality houses and is a desirable place to live.

Residential amenity

- Loss of light/overshadowing of no.66 and 62
- Loss of light to conservatory, rooflights that serve front room and bedroom of no. 62.
- Occupiers of upper floor will be able to look down into skylights at no.62
- The east facing window will overlook the garden of no.62
- Will be overbearing and cause tunnelling to bedroom of no. 62
- Will result in loss of privacy to adjoining gardens due to increase in movements to the rear
- Odour from bins adjacent to boundary with no.62
- Noise and light pollution from houses to the rear
- Noise disturbance from 1st floor kitchen
- Concerned about timing of work and disturbance from noise and dust during construction while recovering from serious operation

Car, cycle parking, bin storage, and highway safety/traffic

- Inadequate off-street car parking provision; will increase demand for on-street parking
- The roads are already overcapacity
- There is a planned residents parking scheme on Bracklyn Road
- Concerned about disruptions during construction
- No emergency access to the rear
- Cycle stands are too close

- Cycle parking behind bins are inaccessible
- Cycle parking is not a substitute for car parking
- Visitor cycle parking should be provided
- The revised plans result in an under provision of cycle parking; the cycles stored behind the bins are inaccessible.
- The Coleridge Rd precedent has vehicular access and is at the end of a row of houses

Other issues:

- Loss of trees
- Concerned about drainage due to increase in hardstanding
- Concerned about sewer capacity
- Concerned about fire risk
- The land is not a wasteland but a garden which has been poorly maintained.
- Would impact ecological green corridor
- The Catharine Street precedent sited involves a commercial use to the frontage and is also not relevant.

7.3 Councillor Herbert has commented on the application. His comments can be summarised as follows:

- Excessively intensive backland development on a small footprint
- Fails to respond to issues raised on previous applications regarding access and by Landscape/Urban Design and neighbours.
- The revised plans do not overcome the objections.
- Minor changes do not change my assessment of the negative overall impacts of this proposal, and breach of policies in the 2006 Plan.

7.4 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations can be inspected on the application file.

8.0 ASSESSMENT

8.1 From the consultation responses and representations received and from my inspection of the site and the surroundings, I consider that the main issues are:

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

Principle of Development

8.2 Policy 5/1 states that applications for housing on windfall sites will be permitted subject to the existing land use and compatibility with adjoining uses. The site is currently in residential use and Coleridge Road is a predominantly residential area characterised by two storey dwellings. As a result, I consider the proposal to comply with policy 5/1.

8.3 Policy 5/2 relates to the conversion of larger properties. This states that the conversion of single residential properties into self-contained dwellings will be permitted except where: a) the property has a floorspace of less than 110m²; b) there would be an unacceptable impact on parking c) the living accommodation provided would be unsatisfactory; d) the proposal would fail to provide for satisfactory refuse bin/bike storage 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 extended property has a floorspace greater than 110sqm and as a result would satisfy criterion a). I have noted the compatibility of the site with residential use in paragraph 8.2. I will assess the proposal against criteria b), c) and d) in the below paragraphs.

8.5 The proposed pair of semi-detached dwellings would be built on land to the rear of 60-64 Coleridge Road. As a result policy 3/10 which relates to the sub-division of plots is relevant. This policy

requires consideration to be given to the impact on amenities of neighbours (part a), amenity space/car parking (b), impact on the character of the area (c), affect on listed buildings/BLI (d), impact on trees (e) and whether the proposal would compromise comprehensive redevelopment (f). In this case parts (d) and (f) are not relevant. I have addressed the other parts of policy 3/10 below.

Context of site, design and external spaces

- 8.6 There are two elements to the proposal; the extensions and alteration to the main dwelling; and introduction of 2no. two storey buildings on land to the rear. I set out below my assessment of each element.

Proposed extensions, alterations and subdivision to the main dwelling:

- 8.7 Coleridge Road has a mixed character and many of the properties on the street have been visibly extended. The proposed side extension has been amended to try and overcome the original concerns with the proposal. The revised proposed side extension is set down from the ridge and set back from the front elevation by approx. 200mm. In my view the revised proposal would appear less dominant and the amendments would mean that the extension would read as subservient later addition to the host dwelling I have recommended a condition requiring it to be finished in materials to match the existing dwelling.
- 8.8 The proposal also incorporates a change from hip to gable and a box dormer to the rear. Both of these elements are considered to be in keeping with other similar extensions in the vicinity. Whilst I am concerned by the potential visual impact of the dormer and roof form from Brackyn Road, in light of there being other similar extensions to properties within the area, I feel it would be difficult to warrant refusal of these elements.
- 8.9 The design and scale of the proposed ground and first floor rear extensions are, in my opinion, acceptable and would read as subservient additions to the main dwelling. The ground floor element would consolidate the existing extensions at ground floor and cover the same footprint. The first floor element would project 3.4m and would be set in from the southern elevation by

2.3m. The first floor element would read as a subservient addition.

8.10 In terms of the layout, the proposed subdivision of the dwelling would consist of two flats; 1 x 3bed flat (110m²) on the ground and first floor and 1 x bed flat (51m²) within the loft space. Access to the 3bed flat would be on the side elevation and access via the undercroft. The undercroft would also provide access to the cycle store for the flat which would be located adjacent to the rear boundary. Access to the 1bed would be via the entrance in the front elevation. The cycle store for this flat would be located within the side elevation and access via the undercroft. The undercroft would also lead to the two proposed dwellings to the rear. The bin storage area for both flats would be located adjacent to the northern boundary at the front of the site. The location of the bin store, adjacent to the boundary with no.62, is not ideal as no.62 has openable windows adjacent to the bin store. The bins should be located either within the footprint of the development or in a location that is easily accessible to both flats. I have therefore recommended a bin storage condition so that details of the type and appearance of the bin enclosure are submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

8.11 The 3 bed flat would have the kitchen and living room on the ground. The kitchen would be dual aspect with a window in the southern elevation and large opening in the west elevation which also provides access into the private garden. The living room, which is separate from the kitchen, is a single aspect room with two windows in the south elevation facing towards no.66. The windows in the southern elevation of the ground floor will be located under the undercroft and 2m from the side elevation of no.66 and could be looked into from occupiers of the proposed dwellings to the rear and duplex flat passing by. I therefore have some concerns with the proposed layout and amount of development trying to be achieved on the site but I do not consider these concerns to be significant enough to warrant refusal. Therefore on balance, the benefits from the proposal in terms of additional housing within the City would in my view outweigh the harm caused by the quality of the living environment.

2no. one and a half storey dwellings:

- 8.12 The pair of semi-detached dwellings to the rear would be 2 storey in terms of scale. These have been reduced in scale and number of proposed houses since the original planning application (ref: 17/0645/FUL) which proposed 4no. x 2 storey 3bed dwellings. This application was withdrawn due to concerns regarding overdevelopment, being out of character with the area and impact on the residential amenity of the occupier at no.66.
- 8.13 The current proposed dwellings would be set approx. 600mm below ground level and be 6.4m to the ridge and 3.8m to the eaves line. The dwellings have been designed with pitched roofs and would in my opinion clearly read as subservient to the host dwelling. The proposed design is contemporary and unfussy. I note that a number of the representations raise concerns regarding the impact of these dwelling on the character of the area. I am satisfied that the dwellings would read as subservient. Whilst a number of the precedents cited are not directly relevant, I am satisfied that the scale and density proposed is acceptable given the large size of the plot.
- 8.14 A representation has raised concerns regarding the loss of trees on site. There are a number of mature trees on site. However these are garden trees and are not protected by Tree Preservation Order (TPO) so there is no restriction on the applicant removing these trees from site. A number of trees are shown to be retained and a hard and soft landscaping condition is recommended requiring details of retained trees and replacement landscaping to be approved prior to commencement.
- 8.15 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/10, 3/11, 3/12 and 4/4.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

Impact of extensions on 66 Coleridge Road

- 8.16 The original application submitted was considered to have an unacceptable enclosure impact on the single aspect kitchen window to the unattached neighbour at 66 Coleridge Road. The subsequent applications have been amended to overcome this

objection by setting the rear extension away from the boundary with this occupier. This allows some space between the extension and the neighbouring kitchen and as a result the impact in terms of enclosure is no longer considered significantly harmful. No. 66 is to the south of the application site so there are no light implications.

Impact of the extensions on 62 Coleridge Road

- 8.17 The existing pitched roofed conservatory is proposed to be removed and replaced with a flat roofed extension with a similar footprint to existing. This would sit roughly in line with the extension at no. 62. The replacement extension would have a flat roof with a height of 2.9m and replaces the pitched roof conservatory which is 2.65m at the ridge. Given the minor increase to the height and as this element is in line with the conservatory to the attached property, I do not consider there would be any significant impact in terms of enclosure or loss of light.
- 8.18 The original first floor rear wall is stepped with the element nearest no. 62 being set back and an element protruding forward 0.6m near the boundary with no. 66. The proposal would extend 3.5m beyond the rear wall adjacent to no. 62. The extension would break the 45 degree horizontal plane when taken from the nearest first floor window of no. 62 which serves as a bedroom. The proposal would result in some enclosure to this window but given that there is no obstruction to the outlook from the other side and as the window is quite large and serves a bedroom rather than a living room or kitchen, which would be more intensively used, I am of the view that the enclosure impact would on balance be acceptable.
- 8.19 The applicant has provided a daylight, sunlight and overshadowing report which assesses the impact of the proposed extensions on light to no. 64 using the criteria set out under BRE guidance. The study looks at the impact of the extension on the nearest first floor window which serves a bedroom, and on two rooflights which serve a living room on the ground floor. The ground floor living room assessed is a single room but has been broken down into two rooms as part of the report; the element of the room which forms part of the original house and the element which forms part of the more recent extension. The extended element is served by the two

rooflights, the other part of the room only receives borrowed light. The report concludes that the proposal would have a minor adverse impact on light to no. 62. The following paragraphs address the assessment in more detail.

- 8.20 The impact of the extension on the first floor bedroom passes all of the light tests; although the impact in terms of annual probable sunlight hours is reduced to the limit of acceptability during winter. The results suggest that the impact of the extension on this room in terms of loss of light would be acceptable.
- 8.21 The two rooflights assessed serve a living room space on the ground floor. Rooflight B is nearest the boundary with no.64 and rooflight C is further north on the flat roof. The living room which the rooflights serve is already enclosed by a conservatory to the rear. The assessment breaks the room down into rooms B and C. Room B is the area under the rooflights, which appears to be part of an extension to the property and has a higher ceiling than room C. Room C is not served by any windows and appears to be part of the original house with a lower ceiling than room B. Rooms B and C are not divided by a door and appear as one room. The room primarily gets its light from the two rooflights but also has a glazed door which leads to the conservatory. This provides limited light due to the orientation of the plot and because the roof of the conservatory is designed to restrict light to prevent it from overheating. At the time of my site visit and in the photographs provided in the light assessment, this glazed door was covered with a net curtain which potentially further restricts light into these rooms. The representation from no. 62 explains that this conservatory was built following the construction of the ground floor extension to no. 64 which blocked light and enclosed the living room of no.62.
- 8.22 The sky component to the rooflights is assessed as part of the light study provided. This indicates the change in level of daylight received to windows as a result of the proposal. The assessment found that the impact on rooflight C to be minimal but rooflight B did not pass the test.
- 8.23 The living room was also assessed in terms of daylight distribution. The level of impact on both parts of the room (rooms B and C) was considered to be acceptable by BRE

guidelines. Average Daylight Factor (ADF) was assessed. As noted above, this breaks down the enclosed living room space into two rooms; room b and room c. Room B, the part of the room under the skylights, passes and receives an ADF of 1.8% above the minimum of 1.5%. Room C, the part of the room without a window and with a lower ceiling, currently fails to get the recommended minimum ADF and the ADF would be reduced further below the minimum standard; the standard being 1.5% with room C reducing from 1.3% to 1.1%. Whilst the reduction to room C is less than ideal, the majority of the room would still receive an acceptable level of light by BRE standards. Essentially, the proposal would make a poor existing situation marginally worse but it is my view that the change would not be significantly harmful to warrant refusal and that, on balance, this impact would be acceptable.

- 8.24 To conclude, the light study finds that the proposal would result in some adverse impacts in terms of loss of light to no. 62. Rooflight B fails to meet the vertical sky component level but rooflight C which serves the same room comfortably passes the test. Light to room C is already poor and the increased worsening of this situation is in my view not sufficiently harmful to warrant refusal. Room C is joined to room B without any door to separate the rooms. Room B passes the test. Room C only receives borrowed light which is currently substandard in terms of the BRE Guidelines and as a result the further worsening of the situation is in my view, on balance, acceptable.

Impact of the new dwellings on residential amenity

- 8.25 The proposed new buildings are set off the boundary with the neighbours to the north (no.66) and south (no.58) by 4.5m and 4.7m respectively. Both buildings would result in some enclosure to these gardens but only the ends of these long gardens would be impacted and as a result the impact is not considered significantly harmful to warrant refusal. The neighbour at no. 66 is to the south of the site and there would be no loss of light to this garden. There would be some minor overshadowing of the garden of no. 58 but only the end of the garden would be impacted and given the set off the boundary and relatively low height, at 3.6m to the eaves and 6.5m to the ridge, this impact would in my view be acceptable. There are two windows on both side elevations facing towards the gardens of no. 66 and no. 58 Coleridge Road. These windows

are shown to be obscure glazed. A condition is recommended requiring the windows to be obscured and on restrictors, to limit the amount these can be opened and ensure there would be no overlooking of these gardens.

- 8.26 The buildings would be relatively close to the boundary with no. 60 and no. 62 Coleridge Road as well as the garden of the proposed 3 bed flat. The height adjacent to these boundaries is lower as the eaves height of the proposal would be 3.6m. Whilst the buildings would result in some additional enclosure to these occupiers, this impact is to the end of the garden and as a result is not considered significantly harmful to warrant refusal. The buildings would result in some minor overshadowing to these gardens but this would only impact the end of the gardens and for a limited time.
- 8.27 Objections have been received from the occupiers of no. 2 Brackyn Road. The proposed buildings to the rear are significantly set away from the boundary with this property; the new houses have gardens of over 8m which provide separation between the new buildings and 2 Brackyn Road. There are no first floor windows on the rear elevation and a condition is recommended requiring the velux windows to be at least 1.7m above the finished floor level to prevent any overlooking.

Noise and disturbance

- 8.28 A number of the representations raise concerns regarding noise and disturbance from coming and goings. The two new buildings do not have any vehicular access so people would access the units by foot or bicycle. A boundary treatment condition is required to ensure that there is adequate screening around the adjoining gardens. As noted previously, a number of trees are to be retained, details of which are required by a recommended condition, which would also help provide additional buffering. As a result of the lack of vehicular movements and the potential to provide buffering through the boundary treatment and trees, I am satisfied that there would be no significant noise and disturbance to surrounding occupiers.
- 8.29 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, 3/7 and 3/10.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

- 8.30 The occupiers of the unit would have their own access directly into the flat from an independent entrance to the side of the building. This flat would have a substantial private garden. Bike and bins for this flat are to be provided within stores in the garden; conditions requiring these details to be approved are recommended and discussed under the relevant paragraphs below. The flat is dual aspect and adequately large for the proposed use (110sqm).
- 8.31 The proposed studio flat is contained in the roof space. This would be accessed from a door in the front elevation on Coleridge Road. This unit is small (38sqm) and does not have access to private outdoor amenity space. However, it would be a one bedroom flat that would be occupied by a single individual rather than by a family. The unit is double aspect and the internal space level is considered to provide an adequate standard of living accommodation for future occupiers. Bike and bin storage for this unit could be dealt with by conditions discussed under the relevant headings below.
- 8.32 The two new dwellings are accessed through the undercroft from Coleridge Road. Some lighting is shown for security purposes but details of this are requested by a recommended condition. These houses each provide three bedrooms. The upper floor bedrooms have been rearranged as one of the rooms only had a high level window and this would not be suitable for means of escape. The two upper floor bedrooms are served by obscure glazed windows on restrictors to prevent overlooking. This situation is not ideal as these rooms will have no outlook and will receive limited light. However, given the substantial garden space (smaller garden is 114sqm) and adequate size of the buildings (110sqm), I consider that on balance the units would provide an adequate level of amenity for future occupiers.
- 8.33 For clarity, the internal floorspace for each unit and the National Space Standard for each unit type is provided in the below table:

Unit	Internal floorspace	Nationally described space standards
3 bed duplex flat	117sqm	102sqm
Studio flat	38sqm	39sqm
House to rear	110sqm	102sqm

8.34 In my opinion the proposal, on balance, provides an adequate standard of residential amenity for future occupiers, and I consider that in this respect it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7, 3/10, 3/12, 3/14 and 5/2.

Refuse Arrangements

8.35 The proposal has been revised as originally there was an over provision of bikes and bins. The revised plans resulted in there being a conflict with the stores for the new houses whereby bikes were shown stored behind the bins and were thus not adequately accessible. The bike and bin provision has been further revised to address these concerns.

8.36 The bins for the two units in the existing building are shown in the frontage. In my view the bins for the larger duplex flat should be within a bin store in the garden. I am satisfied that there is adequate space to provide this along with a cycle store and I have recommended that we request details by condition. In my view it would be acceptable to have the bins for the studio unit to the frontage but these should be within a low rise store. Details of the store could also be dealt with by condition.

8.37 The stores for the two proposed new houses have been revised. These seem to show an under provision of bins. However I am satisfied with the proposed approach and consider that revised bin/bike stores which are marginally larger can be provided on site and can be dealt with by the recommended condition.

8.38 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/12 and 5/2.

Highway Safety

- 8.39 The Highway Engineer objected to the proposal as there was inadequate space to provide off-street car parking space without the spaces overhanging the highway. The off street car parking has been removed to overcome this objection and car parking provision is dealt with under the relevant heading below. Many of the representations raise concerns regarding the impact of the proposal on highway safety. A construction traffic management plan is recommended to minimize disruptions during construction. In my view the additional users of the site would not result in such a significant intensification of use of the site to cause highway safety concerns.
- 8.40 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Car and Cycle Parking

- 8.41 As noted above, there was a conflict with the bike and bin storage arrangement as part of the previous proposed plans. This has been revised and now the houses appear to be showing an under provision of bikes and bins. Both houses have large gardens to the side and rear and have elements to the front which would accommodate a store. Details of a store or stores of adequate size to accommodate 3 cycles and 3 bins for each unit are required by a recommended condition.
- 8.42 The cycle store for the duplex flat is in the rear garden. Details of this store could be required by condition. The cycle parking for the studio flat is accessed from the undercroft and is considered to be acceptable.
- 8.43 Off-street car parking has been removed from the proposal as there is not adequate space to accommodate car parking without a car overhanging the footpath. Given the sustainable location of the site, I am satisfied that the lack of car parking is acceptable.
- 8.44 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/10, 5/2, 8/6 and 8/10.

Other

- 8.45 The adjoining occupier at no. 62 has signed a disclaimer allowing some personal information regarding the status of their health to be published as part of their representation due to their concerns about the impact of any constructions works on their health. The occupier is currently recovering from a medical procedure and needs to be free of disturbance to ensure their recovery is successful. A planning condition has been agreed with the applicant that would prevent any works beginning on site until November 2018. This condition is recommended in place of the standard time condition.
- 8.46 This condition would not be strictly required in planning terms to make the development acceptable; however, in light of the written agreement of the applicant to this approach, Members are invited to consider this as a pragmatic way of accommodating the neighbours particular health circumstances in this instance.

Third Party Representations

- 8.47 I have addressed the majority of the representations within the body of my report. I will address any outstanding matters below:

Representation	Response
<i>Design, scale and layout</i>	
Overdevelopment	The proposed development is considered to be of an appropriate scale for the plot
The houses to the rear should be 1/1.5 storeys maximum	The houses are now 1.5 storey in scale
Footprint of houses does not appear significantly reduced since original application	The footprint of the houses has been reduced since both previous applications. The length has been reduced by over 3m since the previous application. The overall footprint of the building has been reduced from 148sqm to 119sqm
Out of character; nothing similar in Coleridge	See paragraphs 8.6 and 8.15
The design of the houses to the rear is contrasting and unpleasant	The design is considered acceptable. See paragraphs 8.11

	and 8.15
The density is greater than elsewhere on the road	The proposal is considered to adequately respect the amenity of surrounding occupiers and to provide a quality living environment for future occupiers and therefore the increase in density is considered acceptable.
Additional bins would further obstruct the footpath	The additional bins would only be on the footpath for a limited time on collection day. I accept that this will result in some clutter but given that this would be for a limited time I do not consider it to be significantly harmful
Loss of long garden form which is a characteristic of the area	Gardens elsewhere on Coleridge Road have been subdivided and the loss of the long garden is not considered significantly harmful to the character of the area
Would set a precedent	Each application is assessed on its own merits.
The Coleridge Rd precedent has vehicular access and is at the end of a row of houses	I note that a number of the precedents cited are not directly relevant. However some small scale backland development is found in the surrounding area
The Catharine Street precedent sited involves a commercial use to the frontage and is also not relevant.	See above
The precedent cited at 115 Coleridge Road retained a traditional design and had road access to the new dwelling	See above
The precedent cited at 79 is a single dwelling and therefore no comparable	See above
The area has character, good quality houses and is a desirable place to live.	Noted
<i>Residential amenity</i>	
Loss of light/overshadowing of	See paragraphs 8.17-8.24

no.66 and 62	
Loss of light to conservatory, rooflights to living room and bedroom of no. 62	See paragraphs 8.17-8.24
Occupiers of upper floor will be able to look down into living room skylights of no. 62	Any views from the extension into these rooflights would be at an oblique view and as a result there would be no significant impact to the privacy of this room
Will result in loss of privacy to adjoining gardens due to increase in movements to the rear	See paragraphs 8.25 & 8.27 - 8.28
Odour from bins adjacent to boundary with no.62	The bin storage location has been revised and is no longer adjacent to this boundary
Noise and light pollution from houses to the rear	The houses to the rear are set away from all boundaries and in my view the proposal would not result in a significant level of noise or light disturbance given the low number of units proposed
Noise disturbance from 1 st floor kitchen	The use of the kitchen is unlikely to cause significant noise and disturbance through the walls
Concerned about timing of work and disturbance from noise and dust during construction	Although the EHO has not recommended a dust condition, given the concerns, I consider it to be reasonable and have recommended the dust condition and informative. A bespoke time condition is also recommended. See paragraphs ###
<i>Car, cycle parking, bin storage, and highway safety/traffic</i>	
Inadequate off-street car parking provision will increase demand for on-street parking	The site is located in a sustainable location. There is no requirement for off-street car parking
The roads are already overcapacity	I do not consider that the additional two units to the rear and subdivision of the house would have any significant impact on traffic generation

There is a planned residents parking scheme on Brackyn Road	Noted
Concerned about disruptions during construction	A construction traffic management plan has been recommended.
No emergency access to the rear	This is not a planning matter
Cycle stands are too close	I am satisfied that adequate cycle storage details can be provided by condition
Cycle parking behind bins are inaccessible	This has been resolved by the most recent set of plans. Final details of cycle parking and bin storage for all units are recommended to be dealt with by condition.
Cycle parking is not a substitute for car parking	Given the sustainable location of the site I am satisfied that the lack of car parking and proposed cycle parking provision would be acceptable.
Visitor cycle parking should be provided	In my view, there is no requirement for visitor cycle parking given the small number of units proposed.
<i>Other issues</i>	
Loss of trees	See paragraph 8.14
Concerned about drainage due to increase in hardstanding	The sustainable drainage engineer has no objection subject to conditions
Concerned about sewer capacity	There is no evidence to suggest this is a concern
Concerned about fire risk	This is not a planning matter
The land is not a wasteland but a garden which has been poorly maintained.	Noted.
Would impact ecological green corridor	The site has no ecological designation

Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

8.48 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.

- 8.49 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.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The proposed extensions are in keeping with the area and would read as subservient later additions to the buildings. The two new dwellings in the rear are of a scale which would also read as subservient and are not considered harmful to the character of the area. The proposed units would provide an adequate standard of amenity for future occupiers. The light study submitted shows that the proposal would have a minor adverse impact on the amenity of no. 62 but overall the impact on amenity is, on balance, considered to be acceptable.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun after the end of October 2018 and 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 and the personal health of the neighbouring occupier.

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

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

3. The extension hereby permitted shall be constructed in external materials to match the existing building in type, colour and texture.

Reason: To ensure that the extension is in keeping with the existing building. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, and 3/14)

4. No construction of the houses to the rear shall take place until details 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, 3/11 and 3/12)

5. The curtilage (garden) of the proposed properties (flats and houses to the rear) as approved shall be fully laid out and finished in accordance with the approved plans prior to the occupation of the proposed dwellings or in accordance with a timetable otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter remain for the benefit of the occupants of the proposed property.

Reason: To avoid a scenario whereby the property could be built and occupied without its garden land, which is currently part of the host property (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies, 3/4, 3/7, 3/10)

6. 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), no new first floor windows to the houses to the rear (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).

7. The windows identified as having obscured glass on drawing number 1601 310 Rev H shall be obscure glazed to a minimum level of obscurity to conform to Pilkington Glass level 3 or equivalent prior to commencement of occupation of the houses to the rear and shall have restrictors to ensure that the window cannot be opened more than 45 degrees beyond the plane of the adjacent wall and shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 3/12).

8. Prior to the occupation of the units, details of bike and bin stores, including locations and elevations, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The stores shall be installed in accordance with the approved details prior to occupation of the units and maintained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure adequate bike and bin storage for future occupiers (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7 and 3/10)

9. 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)

10. 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)

11. 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)

12. No demolition or construction works shall commence on site until a traffic management plan has been agreed with the Planning Authority.

Reason: in the interests of residential amenity and highway safety in accordance with policies 4/13 and 8/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006)

13. 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 treatment to be erected. The boundary treatment shall be completed before the building(s) is/are occupied 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)

14. 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)

15. Prior to the occupation of the building, details of external lighting to the undercroft as shown in Drawing 201 Rev G shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. External lighting shall be installed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: to protect the amenity of surrounding occupiers (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 4/15)

16. No development shall commence until a programme of measures to minimise the spread of airborne dust from the site during the demolition / construction period has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13

17. No building hereby permitted shall be occupied until details of surface water drainage works have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Surface water drainage will be implemented in accordance with these agreed details.

Reason: To ensure the development will not increase flood risk in the area in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

18. Notwithstanding the approved plans, the rooflights to the two houses to the rear hereby approved shall be a minimum of 1.7m above the finished floor level.

Reason: To prevent overlooking of neighbouring gardens (Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12)

INFORMATIVE: The principle areas of concern that should be addressed by the Traffic Management Plan are:

- Movements and control of muck away lorries (wherever possible all loading and unloading should be undertaken off the adopted public highway)
- Contractor parking, for both phases (wherever possible all such parking should be within the curtilage of the site and not on street).
- Movements and control of all deliveries (wherever possible all loading and unloading should be undertaken off the adopted public highway)
- Control of dust, mud and debris, please note it is an offence under the Highways Act 1980 to deposit mud or debris onto the adopted 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

INFORMATIVE: Before the details of the surface water drainage are submitted, an assessment shall be carried out 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 associated 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 + 40% an allowance for climate change. The submitted details shall:

i. provide 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; and

ii. provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development.

iii. The surface water drainage scheme shall be managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the agreed details and management and maintenance plan.