

Application Number	17/2030/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	24th November 2017	Officer	Mr David Spring
Target Date	19th January 2018		
Ward	West Chesterton		
Site	Land Adjacent To 52 Victoria Road Cambridge CB4 3DU		
Proposal	Erection of a single building accommodating 3 no. apartments		
Applicant	Mr Andy Brand Nene Lodge Funthams Lane Whittlesey PE7 2PB		

SUMMARY	<p>The development does not accord with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The design of the development would fail to preserve or enhance the character of the Conservation Area. • The proposal would harm trees that make a positive contribution to the character of the Conservation Area. • The proposal fails to comply with the requirements of Policies 50 and 51 of the Local Plan 2018.
RECOMMENDATION	REFUSAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The site is located to the west of No. 52 Victoria Road on the corner of Victoria Road and Green’s Road. Currently it is surfaced in gravel and used for parking. Six mature pear trees and some shrubbery mark the outer boundary of the site. To the north is a recently constructed block of flats (Albert Mews).
- 1.2 The site is located within the Castle and Victoria Road Conservation Area, and also within the Mitcham’s Corner Opportunity Area.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single building accommodating 3 no. one bedroom apartments.
- 2.2 The part of the building facing the junction with Victoria Road and Green Road would be two storeys in height. This two storey element turns the corner and has a two storey bay window facing the corner. To the rear of this two storey element is a single storey pitched roof extension. Two apartments are located in the two storey element, one on the ground floor and one on the first floor. The third proposed apartment is located within the single storey element. A shared amenity space, and bin/cycle storage is proposed to the north side/ rear of the building. The scheme would not include any off-street car parking.
- 2.3 The proposal has been amended since submission. The building was originally proposed to be set back 2.3m from the front elevation of No.52, but is now proposed to be set 5m back from the footpath. The depth of the two storey element has been decreased to allow for this further indentation. This amended scheme proposes to retain 3 trees facing Victoria Road, but to remove the 3 trees on Greens Road.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
16/0847/FUL	Erection of six bedsits	Refused*

This application was refused for the following reasons:

1. The scale, bulk and design of the proposal would result in an overly dominant built form that would appear too prominent and poorly reflect and inadequately relate to surrounding buildings. The result is a scheme that would constitute an overdevelopment of the site, which would neither preserve nor enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposal has not demonstrated that it has responded to its context or drawn upon key characteristics of the surroundings. For these reasons, the proposal conflicts with policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/12 and 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and guidance within paragraph 64 of the NPPF (2012).

2. The proposed loss of all six trees is unacceptable as they are considered to contribute towards the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. For these reasons, the proposal would be contrary to policies 4/3, 4/4 and 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

3. The proposed open space provision for the units would fail to provide an appropriate standard of amenity for the future residents due to the limited amount of space available and the presence of bin and bike stores in this area. As such the proposal fails to provide a high-quality living environment and does not accord with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12.

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 2018 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN		POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Plan 2018	Local	1 3
		22
		35
		50 51 52 55 56 57 59
		61
		71
		81 82

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

<p>Central Government Guidance</p>	<p>National Planning Policy Framework February 2019</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>
<p>Supplementary Planning Guidance</p>	<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>Material Considerations</p>	<p>Castle and Victoria Road Conservation Area Appraisal (2012)</p> <p>Arboricultural Strategy (2004)</p> <p>Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)</p>

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

First comments

- 6.1 No off-street car parking provision is made for the proposed residential accommodation. Some streets in the vicinity provide uncontrolled parking, and as there is no effective means to prevent residents from owning a car and seeking to keep it on the local streets, this demand is likely to appear on-street in

competition with existing residential uses. 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 Planning Authority may wish to consider when assessing this application.

- 6.2 Following implementation of any Permission issued by the Planning Authority in regard to this proposal the residents of the new dwellings will not qualify for Residents' Permits of any kind within the existing Residents' Parking Schemes operating on nearby streets. This should be brought to the attention of the applicant, and an appropriate informative added to any Permission that the Planning Authority is minded to issue with regard to this proposal.
- 6.3 It is unclear whether the new footway will be dedicated as public highway. If this is the intent, please provide a dimensioned drawing showing widths of the proposed footway for comment by the Highway Authority prior to determination of this application.
- 6.4 If, despite the above, the Planning Authority is minded to grant consent, a traffic management plan condition is recommended.

Comments following submission of further footpath details

- 6.5 The footway as shown is not acceptable to the Highway Authority for adoption, as the widths are insufficient to permit two wheelchair users to pass each other while both remain on the footway. The minimum width for this is 1.5m, which the footway achieves only at its starting point.

Environmental Health

- 6.6 The proposal is acceptable subject to conditions controlling construction hours, construction collections and deliveries, piling, dust and noise insulation.

Conservation Team

Comments on original proposal

- 6.7 Additional information required showing the proposal in its Conservation Area context. The existing townscape suggests that a modest, terraced form of housing could be suitable here but the main design feature should be to 'turn-the-corner' satisfactorily from the gable end of No. 52 Victoria Road into Greens Road. It will also be important to use appropriate materials, and design details to maintain the consistency of the house types throughout the Conservation Area. Whilst the scheme is generally now acceptable in conservation and townscape terms, it is not clear why it is set back, leaving more of the gable end of No. 52 exposed than proposed in pre-application discussions. It was understood that the layout would largely conceal that 'unfinished' feature from view from looking west down Victoria Road, but it is now some 2.3m back from the front façade line of the existing building. The stepping down of the northernmost flat to a single storey element did not feature in the earlier designs; however, in conservation terms, provided that the detailing and materials take account of this change from two storeys to one, this should be acceptable.

Any approval should be subject to conditions requiring further details of the materials, joinery, detailing, outbuildings, boundary treatments and hard landscaping.

Comments on first amendment (with 4.2m set-back from footpath)

- 6.8 By moving the building further north, it fails to obscure the gable end of No.52 Victoria Road as well as it might. The Conservation Team question whether these trees are special enough to be retained as the townscape will not benefit from this revision.

Comments on second amendment (with 5m set back from footpath)

- 6.9 No comments received to date. Any further comments will be reported on the Amendment sheet.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Tree Team)

First comments

- 6.10 Do not agree with the assessment in the submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment and consider that all the trees make a valuable contribution to the verdant character of Victoria Road, as they are all easily viewed from the east along Victoria Road. It is however the loss of G1 that will be most detrimental to public amenity. In its current form, the proposal should be refused.

Comments on first amendment (with 4.2m set-back from footpath)

- 6.11 While the plan shows the retention of one of the trees in the front group it is not realistic. The tree would have to be pruned to allow construction, and then continued management would be required to maintain a reasonable clearance. In addition, given the existing levels, a no-dig path is not realistic either. Any scheme on this site should allow the retention of all three trees in G1 without the need for crown reduction works.

Comments on second amendment (with 5m set back from footpath)

- 6.12 Maintain objection to the impact of the development upon the three trees on Victoria Road.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Officer)

- 6.13 No objection subject to a standard surface water drainage condition.
- 6.14 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 that object to the proposal:

- 10 Greens Road
- 12 Greens Road
- 14 Greens Road
- 20 Greens Road
- 28 Greens Road x2
- 30 Greens Road
- 32 Greens Road
- 33 Greens Road
- 47 Greens Road
- Flat 5, Albert Mews

7.2 Their representations can be summarised as follows:

Character

- The front façade of the new building is intimidating in so far as it visually creates a narrow entrance which is entirely unacceptable from a conservation point of view.
- While the façade of the building facing Victoria Road is satisfactory in a mock Victorian way, the parts of the building facing Green's Road are ill-conceived and clumsy, especially the transition from 1 to 2 storeys.
- The frontage facing Victoria Road is set back too far, leaving an unattractive view of the side of No. 52 Victoria Road.
- The rear of the building (bins/bike store) is badly designed and untidy.
- The proposed 1.8m high brick wall and railings adjoining the proposed amenity space will look out of keeping and overbearing when viewed from Greens Road. It should be half the height proposed or another low solution should be sought.
- The type of accommodation in the development is very small, short term accommodation of which there is already much in the area and risks changing the nature of the area.

Parking

- Currently there are proposals to cut the parking provision down to 4/5 spaces only for the whole of Greens Road, and yet three more flats are proposed with no parking.
- Parking is already a huge problem on Green's Road and in the area generally. With no onsite parking, this development will potentially add to an already difficult problem and reduce the amenity of local residents.

Loss of trees

- There are six mature trees on the site that would all have to be removed. These trees provide an amenity to local residents and wildlife and are a beautiful part of Greens Road. The proposal to plant 3 smaller trees at the back of the site is inadequate.
- The removal of the trees would be a significant loss to the Conservation Area. There are now very few trees along Victoria Road and Mitcham's Corner, and those remaining punctuate the urban scene, and are highly valued by residents.
- A previous application for a development on this site was rejected due to the removal of 6 established trees from the site. This development also requires the removal of the same trees, and should be rejected for the same reason as before.

Construction

- Access along Greens Road is limited and narrow. Construction traffic and materials delivery and storage would put an unreasonable strain on traffic using this road.
- Builders have consistently blocked Greens Road with vehicles when working on other schemes, and no highway enforcement has taken place to prevent this. This has resulted in access to properties along Greens Road being obstructed and severe disruption to local residents.
- Local residents would be negatively impacted by noise and dust during the construction period.

Miscellaneous

- If this development for affordable housing it may be more tolerable.

- The proposed shared amenity space will be used for random storage and become an eye sore.

7.3 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations that support the proposal:

- 102 Huntingdon Road
- 220 Milton Road
- 52 Thornton Way, Girton

7.4 Their representations can be summarised as follows:

- The proximity of the site to the City Centre is ideal for people whom wish to walk/cycle into work.
- This type of housing would be ideal for younger people, key workers and first time buyers.
- The traditional design is in keeping with the properties along Victoria Road.
- The communal area is welcomed and the scheme is not considered an overdevelopment of the site.

7.5 County Councillor Richards objects to the proposal for the following reasons:

- There is limited parking in the area currently and the proposed new three units will put even further pressure on parking in the area.
- This proposal would be very difficult to construct and cause major disruption to residents as Green Road is a very narrow road which has little parking. A standard construction plan condition is far from sufficient.
- It is understood that further objections are being raised by local residents regarding the loss of trees.

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

8.0 ASSESSMENT

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

1. Principle of development
2. Context of site, design and external spaces, including impact on the Conservation Area
3. Trees
4. Residential amenity
5. Inclusive access
6. Refuse arrangements
7. Highway safety
8. Car and cycle parking

Principle of Development

8.2 Policy 3 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) generally supports the provision of new housing within the city.

8.3 Policy 52 of the 2018 Local Plan relates to development on garden land and the subdivision of plots. This states that such proposals will only be permitted where a) the form/height/layout respects the surrounding character, b) there is sufficient space retained for the existing dwelling and any worthy trees are retained, c) adequate amenity and privacy to neighbours is protected, d) adequate amenity space, vehicular access and car parking for proposed and existing properties is provided and, e) the proposal does not compromise development of the wider area. Criterion e) is not relevant. The remaining criteria are assessed below in the body of the report.

Context of site, design and external spaces, including impact on the Conservation Area

8.4 Currently this site is one of the few openings free of development in this part of the Conservation Area. The Castle and Victoria Road Area Appraisal states:

'Green's Road has a tatty appearance when viewed from Victoria Road. A gravel car park on the east with a view to derelict pantiled workshop buildings is not inviting nor is the building occupied by Art Space, but around the corner are

pleasant terraces such as Salmon Terrace (1896) on the west.'

Since this was written in 2012 much development has taken place in this area. The Art space has since been redecorated and a new development of dwellings directly north of this site has been built. There is still a glimpsed view of Salmon Terrace through this site from Victoria Road that will be lost with this proposal.

- 8.5 The previous refused scheme (planning reference 16/0847/FUL) was much more substantial in bulk as it involved two 2-storey blocks. The building facing Victoria Road was traditional and subservient in form but its detailing was not considered of a high enough quality to complement its adjoining neighbour at No. 52 (which is identified in the Conservation Area Appraisal as a building of importance to the character of the area).
- 8.6 This scheme has gone some way towards addressing concerns regarding the bulk and massing of the previous scheme. The Conservation Team recommended approval of the originally proposed scheme, which was set back 2.3m from the footpath/Victoria Road frontage, although expressed reservations regarding the awkward relationship with No.52 and the extent of the gable of the adjacent building that would be exposed. In an attempt to address concerns raised by the Trees Officer, the scheme has been amended to set the building back even further (by a total of 5m), thereby resulting in an even more awkward relationship with No. 52, and also truncating and weakening the design of the bay window element that 'turns the corner'. As a result, I consider the scheme creates an awkward relationship between these two buildings on this prominent corner, which would not preserve or enhance the conservation area.
- 8.7 I consider the single-storey element to the rear would have an acceptable impact on the street scene of Greens Road subject, as advised by the Conservation Officer, to the use of appropriate materials. A 1.8 metre high brick wall with railings is proposed along this boundary, details of which could be secured by condition if the application were approved.

- 8.8 In my opinion the proposal is not compliant with Cambridge Local Plan: 2018 Policies 52, 56, 57, 59 and 61.

Trees

- 8.9 There are six mature trees on the site, three fronting Victoria Road and three along Green's Road. Whilst they do not have Tree Preservation Orders, they are protected by virtue of their location within the Conservation Area. The trees are planted along the boundary of the site in a prominent position on the junction of one of the main arteries of the Conservation Area, Victoria Road. It is considered that these mature trees contribute greatly to the setting of this neighbourhood and help soften the urban landscape.
- 8.10 The previously refused application on this site (for six flats) proposed to remove all six trees and was partly refused on this basis (reason no.2). The current application proposes to remove the three trees along Green's Road but to retain the three trees on Victoria Road, with the building being set back 5m from the Victoria Road frontage in an effort to secure the retention of these trees.
- 8.11 The Tree Officer has conceded that the trees along Green's Road are of lesser significance and has not therefore raised any specific objection to their removal. Whilst the scheme shows the retention of the other trees in the front group, this is not realistic as they would need to be pruned to allow construction, and continued management to maintain a reasonable clearance to the development. In addition, the levels would make no-dig construction unfeasible.
- 8.12 The scheme would not afford these trees sufficient clearance to realistically secure their retention and, in doing so, would compound the negative impact the development would have upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposal is not therefore compliant with Policies 61 and 71 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.
- 8.13 The applicant's agent has advised that the landowner agreed in the 1980's to the Council planting trees on his land, and that it was made clear at the time the trees were not intended to prevent development, and that landscaping conditions could be used to secure replacement planting. The landowner considers

this to be a binding agreement and is taking legal advice on this. Whilst I appreciate that, at the time, the trees were not considered to constitute a constraint to development, the area has in the meantime been designated as a Conservation Area (thereby affording the trees protected status) and the trees have grown to an extent where they are considered to be important to the character of this part of the Conservation Area.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.14 No. 52 Victoria Road is used as a commercial business at ground floor with a flat above and its rear yard is used for parking for this business. While the rear portion of the proposed building is indented 1 metre off the boundary it extends 2 metres past the first floor rear elevation and 5 metres past the ground floor rear elevation of No. 52. A Daylight and Sunlight Assessment was undertaken to assess the impact on this property, especially the two rear first floor windows. I consider the scope of this assessment is acceptable. It indicates in both the Vertical Skyline Component (VSC) test and the No Sky Line (NSL) test that the impact would still allow a level of light that surpasses recommended BRE levels into these habitable rooms. I therefore consider the impact to the amenities of this property in terms of daylight is acceptable.
- 8.15 I also consider outlook from the rear bedroom window of No. 52 nearest to the boundary of the site will not be unduly impacted. This is because the bulk of the first floor is minor in scale as it only extends past this window by 2 metres and is indented 1 metre off the shared boundary.
- 8.16 The proposed building at ground floor level will extend beyond the rear elevation of No. 52 Victoria Road by 5 metres. This single storey element is indented off the shared boundary between 1 and 1.2 metres and has an eaves height of 2.9 metres. No. 52's rear garden is currently entirely finished in gravel and used for parking. I therefore consider this impact to be acceptable.
- 8.17 There would be 21 metres between the first floor of the proposal and the side elevation of the Albert Mews development to the north, and 13.4 metres at ground floor. I consider this sufficient

to ensure the development would not result in a material loss of light to or overlooking of these properties.

8.18 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 2018, Policies 52, 55, 56 and 57.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

8.19 The proposed dwellings are all one-bedroom, one-person properties with shower rooms. The gross internal floor space measurements for the units are shown in the table below:

Unit	Number of bedrooms	Number of bed spaces (persons)	Number of storeys	Policy Size requirement (m ²)	Proposed size of unit	Difference in size
1	1	1	1	37	32.2	-4.8
2	1	1	1	37	37.6	+0.6
3	1	1	1	37	32.2	-4.8

8.20 Two of the proposed flats (nos. 1 and 3) fail to meet the space standards required by Policy 50 of the Local Plan. In addition, whilst an area of communal amenity space is shown on the north side of the building (which would be accessed via Green’s Road), none of the units have direct access to an area of private external amenity space (in the form of balconies/patios etc), also required by Policy 50. The combination of the overly small size of the units and lack of private outdoor space means that future occupiers would not enjoy a satisfactory level of amenity.

8.21 In my opinion the proposal would not provide an adequate quality living environment or an appropriate standard of residential amenity for future occupiers, and I consider that it fails to comply with Cambridge Local Plan: 2018 Policies 50 and 52.

Inclusive Access

8.22 Policy 51 of the Local Plan 2018 requires all new housing development to be of a size, configuration and internal layout to enable Building Regulations requirement M4 (2) ‘accessible and

adaptable dwellings' to be met. The proposal includes an upper floor flat without lift (ie – step-free) access and therefore fails to meet the requirements of Policy 51. The applicant's agent has advised that providing a lift would render the scheme unviable but, in the absence of any detailed viability information to demonstrate this, insufficient information has been put forward to set aside the requirements of this policy in this instance.

Refuse Arrangements

8.23 An enclosed bin store is proposed to be provided within the communal garden area on the north side of the building. This is considered sufficient for the amount of residential units proposed, and could be secured by condition in the event the application were approved.

8.24 In my opinion the proposal is compliant in this regard with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policies 52 and 57.

Highway Safety

8.25 The Highway Authority has not raised any highway safety concerns to the proposal although, following the receipt of further footpath details, has commented that the footpath would not be sufficiently wide to enable it to be adopted by the County Council. This would not render the application unacceptable on highways grounds but would mean that the owner would need to make arrangements for the private management and maintenance of this area.

8.26 Local residents in Green's Road have raised significant concerns on the grounds of congestion and disturbance likely to arise during the construction period, based on experience with other nearby development projects. This would be likely to result in congestion, obstruction of Green's Road and consequent disruption to residents in Green's Road. The Highways Authority has recommended a traffic management plan condition be added to any consent, and I concur with their views that this would be sufficient to address concerns regarding the impact of construction vehicles on the highway network.

8.27 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 52 and 82

Cycle and Car Parking

Cycle parking

- 8.28 The proposed cycle store provision within the amenity area to the rear of the building is considered sufficient for the amount of residential units proposed. If this application were to be approved, this could be secured through a planning condition.

Car parking

- 8.29 The Highway Authority has raised concern regarding the potential for the application to increase on-street parking given that the application proposes no off-street parking provision. A number of local residents have also raised concern that the development would have an adverse impact on the limited on street parking situation on Greens Road.
- 8.30 The Cambridge On-Street Residential Parking Study (2017) shows that Greens Road experiences significant on-street residential parking pressure, with demand at all times of day exceeding the available capacity. The proposed development would therefore compound this pressure. However, an extension to the Controlled Parking Zone to cover this area has been agreed by the County Council and my understanding is that this is due to be implemented later this year. Suitable on-street parking controls would therefore exist in the future. In addition, this is a location where access to and ownership of a car would not be a necessity given that the site lies within easy walking and cycling distance of the City Centre and is also very well served by public transport. Given these factors together with the small number of units and occupiers, I do not consider the effect of the proposal upon on-street parking pressure in the area could be argued to be so significant as to warrant a refusal of the application on this basis.
- 8.31 In my opinion the proposal would not unduly compromise highway safety and is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 82.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 It is considered that the combination of the impact on trees to the front of the site and the proposed building's relationship with

No. 52 Victoria Road give this proposal an unacceptable appearance which is incongruous to the street scene and out of character with the Conservation Area. In addition, the proposal fails to comply with Policies 50 and 51 of the Local Plan.

- 9.2 The applicant's agent has commented that the proposal would be consistent with the aims of the NPPF, in terms of bringing forward additional housing on a brownfield site, and that there should be a more balanced consideration of these benefits against the harm considered to be caused by the removal of the trees. Whilst I concur that the scheme would bring forward these benefits, I consider that, as commented upon by the Tree Officer, this could be secured in a manner that could also retain the most important group of trees on Victoria Road, thereby ensuring that the Conservation Area would not be unduly compromised by the development.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE for the following reasons:

1. The three trees on the corner of Victoria Road and Green's Road make a valuable contribution to the character of the Conservation Area. Whilst the application proposes to retain these trees, this is not considered to be realistic as the trees would need to be pruned to enable construction to take place, and then continually managed to maintain a reasonable clearance to the dwellings. As a consequence, the development would threaten the future health of the retained trees, which would result in harm to the visual amenity of the area and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. For these reasons, the proposal would be contrary to Policies 52, 61 and 71 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).
2. The proposed development would be set back 5 metres from the Victoria Road frontage of the site and, as a result, the building would have an awkward relationship with the adjacent building at No. 52 Victoria Street, and result in a scheme that poorly reflects and inadequately relates to surrounding buildings. The resultant scheme would therefore neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, contrary to Policies 52, 55, 57 and 61 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

3. Two of the proposed flats would fail to meet the internal space standards required by Policy 50 of the 2018 Local Plan, whilst none of the flats would have access to an area of private external amenity space. The proposal therefore fails to provide a satisfactory standard of amenity for future occupiers, contrary to Policies 50 and 52 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

4. The proposal fails to comply with Policy 51 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018, which requires all housing development to be of a size, configuration and internal layout to enable Building Regulations requirement M4 (2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings' to be met.