

<b>Application Number</b>	11/0183/FUL	<b>Agenda Item</b>	
<b>Date Received</b>	14th March 2011	<b>Officer</b>	Miss Catherine Linford
<b>Target Date</b>	9th May 2011		
<b>Ward</b>	East Chesterton		
<b>Site</b>	60 And 62 Green End Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB4 1RY		
<b>Proposal</b>	Two storey rear extension to number 62 and conversion of number 62 from dwelling house to one studio apartment and four 1-bed flats and conversion of number 60 from three 2-bed flats and one 1-bed flat to two 2-bed flats, two 1-bed flats and one studio apartment.		
<b>Applicant</b>	Mr John Price 2 Woodlands Close Great Shelford Cambridge CB22 5LP		

---

## **1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT**

- 1.1 60 and 62 Green End Road are a pair of semi-detached houses standing on the north-east side of Green End Road. 60 Green End Road (the northern half of the pair of semis) has been converted into four flats.
- 1.2 The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character. This side of Green End Road is characterised by 1930s style semi-detached and detached two-storey dwellings, which are set back from the main road frontage.
- 1.3 The site does not fall within a Conservation Area and there are no Tree Preservation Orders relating to the site. The site falls outside the Controlled Parking Zone.

## **2.0 THE PROPOSAL**

- 2.1 Full planning permission is sought for the following elements:

## 60 Green End Road

- 2.2 This property has already been converted into three two-bedroom flats and one one-bedroom flat. This application proposes a first floor rear extension (bringing the first floor in line with 62, following the extension of this property), and the conversion of the resultant building into two two-bedroom flats, two one-bedroom flats and one studio flat.
- 2.3 Three car parking spaces will remain at the front of the property with bin storage to the rear, as is currently the case. Both of the two bedroom flats are proposed on the ground floor, with both one bedroom flats and the studio flat proposed on the first floor. The first floor flats would be accessed from the original front door. The front ground floor flat would be accessed from the side, and the rear ground floor flat would be accessed from the rear, requiring the prospective occupier to walk alongside the northwest facing flank of the building to access the rear.

## 62 Green End Road

- 2.4 This property is currently a four-bedroom house. This application proposes a two-storey side and part single storey, part two storey rear extension; and the conversion of the resultant building into four one-bedroom flats and one studio flat.
- 2.5 Four car parking spaces are proposed to the frontage, with bin storage and bicycle storage to the rear. The studio flat and two of the one-bedroom flats are proposed on the ground floor, and the remaining two one-bedroom flats are proposed on the first floor with the front flat extending into the roofspace, which has already been converted into habitable space. All units, with the exception of the rear ground floor flat, are accessed from the traditional front entrance. Access to the rear ground floor flat is from the requiring requiring the prospective occupier to walk alongside the flank of the building to access the rear.
- 2.6 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:

1. Design and Access Statement

### 3.0 SITE HISTORY

#### 60 Green End Road

Reference	Description	Outcome
07/1090/FUL	Redevelopment to form 3no to form 3no two bed flats and 1no one-bed flats	A/C

#### 62 Green End Road

Reference	Description	Outcome
C/95/0017	Extension to house (hipped dormer window to side)	A/C
09/0212/FUL	Two 2-bed flats, two 1-bed flats and one studio flat	REF

8.1 The decision notice for the previously refused application 09/0212/FUL is attached to this report as Appendix 1. This application was refused for five reasons, which (in brief) are that:

1. The extension would have had an unduly dominating and overbearing impact on 64 Green End Road.
2. The extension would have precluded access to the property other than passing across the front and along the side of 60 Green End Road.
3. The extension would have projected to the boundary contributing to the creation of terracing.
4. The proposed access to the ground floor flat would have been in unreasonable proximity to and requires passage alongside existing accommodation in the ground floor of 60 Green End Road.
5. The S106 was not completed.

### 4.0 PUBLICITY

4.1	Advertisement:	No
	Adjoining Owners:	Yes
	Site Notice Displayed:	No
	Public Meeting/Exhibition (meeting of):	No
	DC Forum (meeting of):	No

## **5.0 POLICY**

### **5.1 Central Government Advice**

**5.2 Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development (2005):** Paragraphs 7 and 8 state that national policies and regional and local development plans (regional spatial strategies and local development frameworks) provide the framework for planning for sustainable development and for development to be managed effectively. This plan-led system, and the certainty and predictability it aims to provide, is central to planning and plays the key role in integrating sustainable development objectives. Where the development plan contains relevant policies, applications for planning permission should be determined in line with the plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

**5.3 Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing (2006):** Sets out to deliver housing which is: of high quality and is well designed; that provides a mix of housing, both market and affordable, particularly in terms of tenure and price; supports a wide variety of households in all areas; sufficient in quantity taking into account need and demand and which improves choice; sustainable in terms of location and which offers a good range of community facilities with good access to jobs, services and infrastructure; efficient and effective in the use of land, including the re-use of previously developed land, where appropriate. The statement promotes housing policies that are based on Strategic Housing Market Assessments that should inform the affordable housing % target, including the size and type of affordable housing required, and the likely profile of household types requiring market housing, including families with children, single persons and couples. The guidance states that LPA's may wish to set out a range of densities across the plan area rather than one broad density range. 30 dwellings per hectare is set out as an indicative minimum. Paragraph 50 states that the density of existing development should not dictate that of new housing by stifling change or requiring replication of existing style or form. Applicants are encouraged to demonstrate a positive approach to renewable energy and sustainable development.

**Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing** has been reissued with the following changes: the definition of previously

developed land now excludes private residential gardens to prevent developers putting new houses on the brownfield sites and the specified minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare on new housing developments has been removed. The changes are to reduce overcrowding, retain residential green areas and put planning permission powers back into the hands of local authorities. (June 2010)

5.4 **Circular 11/95 – The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions:** Advises that conditions should be necessary, relevant to planning, relevant to the development permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects.

5.5 **Circular 05/2005 - Planning Obligations:** Advises that planning obligations must be relevant to planning, necessary, directly related to the proposed development, fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind and reasonable in all other respect.

**Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010** – places a statutory requirement on the local authority that where planning permission is dependent upon a planning obligation the obligation must pass the following tests:

(a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;

(b) directly related to the development; and

(c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

5.6 **East of England Plan 2008**

SS1: Achieving Sustainable Development

ENV7: Quality in the Built Environment

5.7 **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003**

Planning Obligation Related Policies

P6/1 Development-related Provision

P9/8 Infrastructure Provision

## 5.8 Cambridge Local Plan 2006

3/1 Sustainable development  
3/4 Responding to context  
3/7 Creating successful places  
3/14 Extending buildings  
5/1 Housing provision  
5/2 Conversion of large properties  
8/6 Cycle parking  
8/10 Off-street car parking

### Planning Obligation Related Policies

3/7 Creating successful places  
3/8 Open space and recreation provision through new development  
3/12 The Design of New Buildings (*waste and recycling*)  
5/14 Provision of community facilities through new development  
10/1 Infrastructure improvements (*transport, public open space, recreational and community facilities, waste recycling, public realm, public art, environmental aspects*)

## 5.9 Supplementary Planning Documents

**Cambridge City Council (May 2007) – Sustainable Design and Construction:** Sets out essential and recommended design considerations of relevance to sustainable design and construction. Applicants for major developments are required to submit a sustainability checklist along with a corresponding sustainability statement that should set out information indicated in the checklist. Essential design considerations relate directly to specific policies in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. Recommended considerations are ones that the council would like to see in major developments. Essential design considerations are urban design, transport, movement and accessibility, sustainable drainage (urban extensions), energy, recycling and waste facilities, biodiversity and pollution. Recommended design considerations are climate change adaptation, water, materials and construction waste and historic environment.

**Cambridge City Council (March 2010) – Planning Obligation Strategy:** provides a framework for securing the provision of new and/or improvements to existing infrastructure generated

by the demands of new development. It also seeks to mitigate the adverse impacts of development and addresses the needs identified to accommodate the projected growth of Cambridge. The SPD addresses issues including transport, open space and recreation, education and life-long learning, community facilities, waste and other potential development-specific requirements.

## **5.10 Material Considerations**

### **Central Government Guidance**

#### **Letter from Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (27 May 2010)**

The coalition government is committed to rapidly abolish Regional Strategies and return decision making powers on housing and planning to local councils. Decisions on housing supply (including the provision of travellers sites) will rest with Local Planning Authorities without the framework of regional numbers and plans.

#### **Written Ministerial Statement: Planning for Growth (23 March 2011)**

Includes the following statement:

When deciding whether to grant planning permission, local planning authorities should support enterprise and facilitate housing, economic and other forms of sustainable development. Where relevant and consistent with their statutory obligations they should therefore:

- (i) consider fully the importance of national planning policies aimed at fostering economic growth and employment, given the need to ensure a return to robust growth after the recent recession;
- (ii) take into account the need to maintain a flexible and responsive supply of land for key sectors, including housing;
- (iii) consider the range of likely economic, environmental and social benefits of proposals; including long term or indirect benefits such as increased consumer choice, more viable

communities and more robust local economies (which may, where relevant, include matters such as job creation and business productivity);

(iv) be sensitive to the fact that local economies are subject to change and so take a positive approach to development where new economic data suggest that prior assessments of needs are no longer up-to-date;

(v) ensure that they do not impose unnecessary burdens on development.

In determining planning applications, local planning authorities are obliged to have regard to all relevant considerations. They should ensure that they give appropriate weight to the need to support economic recovery, that applications that secure sustainable growth are treated favourably (consistent with policy in PPS4), and that they can give clear reasons for their decisions.

## **City Wide Guidance**

**Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)** – Gives guidance on the nature and layout of cycle parking, and other security measures, to be provided as a consequence of new residential development.

## **6.0 CONSULTATIONS**

### **Cambridgeshire County Council (Engineering)**

- 6.1 Parking provision is proposed at significantly less than one space per dwelling and has the potential to increase demand in the area for on-street parking. The applicant makes reference to access to two additional parking spaces in a layby. This layby is within the public highway and not in the control of the applicant, and therefore this parking provision is not in the applicant's control.

### **Head of Environmental Services**

- 6.2 No objection, but conditions are recommended relating to construction hours, collection and delivery hours, and waste storage.



- 6.3 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:

- ☐ 63 Green End Road

- 7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- ☐ Insufficient car parking spaces
- ☐ Density is greater than the vast majority of housing on Green End Road
- ☐ Some flats are accessed from the rear and therefore the development does not provide an active frontage
- ☐ The applicant compares the development to 58 Green End Road, stating that this fits in well. This is a view, which is not shared by many Green End Road residents.

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

## **8.0 ASSESSMENT**

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

1. Principle of development
2. Affordable Housing
3. Context of site, design and external spaces
4. Residential amenity
5. Refuse arrangements
6. Car and cycle parking
7. Third party representations
8. Planning Obligation Strategy

- 8.2 This report focuses on the previous reasons for refusal of application 09/0212/FUL, as this decision is a material consideration.

## Principle of Development

- 8.3 The provision of additional dwellings on previously developed land, and the provision of higher density housing in sustainable locations is generally supported by Central Government advice contained in Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing, and policy H1 of the East of England Plan (2008). Policy 5/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) allows for residential development on windfall sites, subject to the existing land use and compatibility with adjoining land uses. The existing use of the site is residential and the surrounding area is predominantly residential, and therefore I am of the opinion that this proposal complies with policy 5/1 of the Local Plan.
- 8.4 The Secretary of State's letter to Chief Planning Officers of 15<sup>th</sup> June 2010 states that the objective of the changes made to PPS3 are 'to give local authorities the opportunity to prevent overdevelopment of neighbourhoods and 'garden-grabbing''. In my opinion, this guidance is not relevant to this application as the land on which the extension is to be built is not usable garden land.
- 8.5 Policy 5/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) addresses the conversion of large properties and states that the sub-division of residential properties of more than 110m<sup>2</sup> is considered to be acceptable, as long as the impact on on-street parking is acceptable; the living accommodation provided would be acceptable; satisfactory refuse and cycle storage can be provided and ; and the location of the property or the nature of the nearby land uses would allow a level of residential amenity.
- 8.6 Both 60 and 62 Green End Road have a floorspace of more than 110m<sup>2</sup>, and therefore the proposals comply with part a) of policy 5/2 of the Local Plan, which relates to floorspace. The other sections of this policy will be addressed in further on in this report.
- 8.7 In my opinion, the principle of the development is acceptable and in accordance with policy 5/1 and part a) of policy 5/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

## Context of site, design and external spaces

- 8.8 The previous application for the extension and conversion of 62 Green End Road (09/0212/FUL) was refused for a number of reasons. One of the reasons related to design and the impact on the street scene, which is set out in full below:

*The proposed building is unacceptable because of its overall width, which projects to the common boundary of the adjacent property number 64 Green End Road, thereby creating an encroachment and erosion of space between numbers 62 and 64 Green End Road, contributing to the creation of a terracing of these semi detached dwellings. The proposal fails to respond to its context and has not used the characteristics of the locality to help inform its siting, massing and design; instead it would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area and have a negative impact on its setting.*

- 8.9 In the previous, refused application the extension projected out to the boundary, mimicking a previous addition to 60, and re-establishing the symmetry between the pair of semi-detached properties by adding a double height bay window. In isolation, this would have been beneficial to the appearance of the building as it would have balanced it, but the concern was that extending to the boundary would erode the space between the this pair of semis and the next house (64) creating a terracing effect and resulting in a negative impact on the street scene
- 8.10 In this application, at its closest point, the proposed side/rear extension to 62 Green End Road will sit approximately 800mm from the boundary with 64 Green End Road, retaining the gap between 62 and 64. The previously proposed extension mimicked a previous addition to 60, which would have created a more balanced appearance to the building. In my opinion, reducing the width of the extension and retaining a gap between 62 and 64 would improve the appearance of the pair of semis along with the street. This addition would still balance the appearance of the building (as a double height bay window would still be introduced although narrower), without creating a terracing effect. The design of the extension is, in my view, in keeping with the design of the building and is sympathetic.

- 8.11 In my opinion, the alterations made to the proposed extension to 62 satisfactorily address this reason for refusal.
- 8.12 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*

- 8.13 In my opinion, the residents that this proposal may affect are the occupiers of 64 and the existing occupiers of 60. The previous application was also refused for the following reason, which related to the impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring residents:

*The proposed development is unacceptable because the combined impact of the two-storey side extension projecting right out to the common boundary with number 64, and the rear addition extending 8m out beyond the rear of the existing dwelling at less than 3 m from the common boundary with 64, would have an unduly dominating and overbearing relationship with number 64. These additions would cause the occupiers of number 64 to suffer an undue sense of enclosure, to the detriment of the amenity that they might otherwise reasonably expect to enjoy. In addition, the rear extension will also result in a loss of light to and outlook from the upper floor flat of the adjoining number 60, and be oppressive and unneighbourly to the occupiers of that accommodation. In having these negative impacts on numbers 60 and 64 Green End Road, the proposal fails to respond to its context and does not achieve good integration between buildings.*

- 8.14 The existing building is 2.6m from the boundary with 64, projecting back approximately 1.5m further than 64. To the rear of the building there is a single storey element, which is 4m deep, and this section steps in from the boundary by 4.5m.
- 8.15 At the side, the proposed extension would no longer be built up to the boundary with 64 being 800mm from the boundary when directly adjacent to the house at 64. The extension would then step in from the boundary bringing it 2.7m from the boundary for a length of 2.5m. The extension would still extend a significant way past the rear wall of 64 (8.5m), but the reduction in width,

bringing the building away from the building would significantly reduce the impact on the neighbour. In my opinion, the proposal therefore satisfactorily addresses this section of this reason for refusal.

- 8.16 The previous proposal was for an extension to 62 only, and would have resulted in the first floor window of 60 being at the end of a 'tunnel', walled in at either side. This would have been detrimental to the occupiers of this flat and was considered to be unacceptable. The applicant is now proposing to also extend the first floor of 60 out, in line with the extended 62, i.e. filling in this 'tunnel'. This would mean that the extension to 62 would have now have no impact on the occupiers of this flat, resulting in the proposal also satisfactorily addressing the second section of this reason for refusal.

- 8.17 The previous application was also refused for the following reason:

*The proposed access to the rear ground floor flat is in unreasonable proximity to and requires passage alongside existing accommodation in the ground floor of 60 Green End Road. The relationship is such that it will unreasonably erode the amenity of occupiers of existing residential units on the ground floor of 60. For this reason the proposal is considered to be in conflict with Cambridge Local Plan policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/14.*

- 8.18 In the previous scheme, in order to access the rear ground floor flat in 62, the occupier would have had to walk directly adjacently to the windows on the ground floor of 60, which included a bedroom window. In this proposal, the rear ground floor flat in 62, would still be accessed from the rear, but via the passageway between 62 and 64. This means that the occupier of this flat would no longer have to walk directly adjacent to the windows of other flats. In my opinion, this alteration, satisfactorily addresses this reason for refusal.
- 8.19 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 and 3/7.

*Amenity for future occupiers of the site*

8.20 The previous application was also refused for the following reason:

*The proposed construction of the two-storey side extension hard up to the south-eastern boundary of the site precludes access to the rear of the property other than by passing across the front and along the side of 60 Green End Road. The siting of the bicycle store to the rear of 60 and the refuse provision for the proposed units to the front/side of 60 and 56, would result in future residents of the proposed accommodation having to travel inappropriate distances to these essential operational elements of the proposed development. They would furthermore generate frequent comings and goings unassociated with those nearby properties, in close proximity to the ground floor windows of the flats in the adjoining property, 60 Green End Road, to the detriment of the amenity of the occupiers. For these reasons the proposal constitutes poor design that has not made adequate provision for the prospective occupiers and would have negative impacts on residents of 60 and, therefore, fails to respond to its context and does not achieve good interrelation or integration between buildings and the external spaces. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/14 and 5/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006, and policy ENV7 of the East of England Plan 2008.*

8.21 In the previous application, it was proposed that two large bicycle stores would be erected to the rear of 60 Green End Road (accessed from the passageway between 56 and 60 or from the rear of the buildings) to serve the occupiers of 56, 60 and 62 Green End Road. The existing bicycle store situated to the front of 56 would have been converted to a bin store for all three buildings. This arrangement was considered to be unacceptable as it would have resulted in a convoluted route to essential facilities for the occupiers of all three buildings. The location of bicycle and bin storage has been reconsidered. Bin storage is proposed at the rear of 60, (which is currently the bin storage area for 56 and 60) with further bin storage to the side of 62. In my opinion this will mean that there is sufficient bin storage in a convenient location for all residents. However, in order to ensure this I recommend a condition requiring details (condition 4). A bicycle store is proposed to the side/rear of 62, and there is an existing bicycle store to the rear of 60. In my opinion this represents sufficient provision of bicycle storage in

an accessible location for all, but to ensure this is the case I recommend a condition requiring details (condition 5). In my opinion, this reworking results in this reason for refusal being satisfactorily addressed.

- 8.22 In my opinion the proposal provides a high-quality living environment and an appropriate 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 and 3/12 (or 3/14).

#### Refuse Arrangements

- 8.23 In my opinion, there is sufficient waste storage shown on the submitted plans, although it is unclear how the storage space will be allocated to residents, and the types of bins that will be used. Therefore, Environmental Health have recommended that details of the waste storage are required by condition (condition 4).
- 8.24 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

#### Car and Cycle Parking

- 8.25 In total, there are seven off-street car parking spaces available on the site. This is below the maximum standards stated in Appendix C of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006), but due to the site's location on public transport routes. I do not consider it necessary or reasonable to refuse this application on these grounds.
- 8.26 A cycle store is proposed to the rear of 62 Green End Road and 60 Green Road already has existing cycle parking provision. Therefore, I am satisfied that an appropriate level of cycle parking can be provided on site. However, to ensure that an acceptable form of cycle parking is provided I recommend that the details of this are required by condition (condition 5).
- 8.27 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10.

### Third Party Representations

- 8.28 The issues raised in the representation received have been addressed under the headings above.

### Planning Obligations

- 8.29 The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 have introduced the requirement for all local authorities to make an assessment of any planning obligation in relation to three tests. If the planning obligation does not pass the tests then it is unlawful. The tests are that the planning obligation must be:

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

In bringing forward my recommendations in relation to the Planning Obligation for this development I have considered these requirements. The Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) provides a framework for expenditure of financial contributions collected through planning obligations. The Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document 2008 provides guidance in terms of the provision of affordable housing and the Public Art Supplementary Planning Document 2010 addresses requirements in relation to public art (amend/delete as applicable). The applicants have indicated their willingness to enter into a S106 planning obligation in accordance with the requirements of the Strategy and relevant Supplementary Planning Documents. The proposed development triggers the requirement for the following community infrastructure:

### *Open Space*

- 8.30 The Planning Obligation Strategy requires that all new residential developments contribute to the provision or improvement of public open space, either through provision on site as part of the development or through a financial contribution for use across the city. The proposed development requires a contribution to be made towards open space, comprising outdoor sports facilities, indoor sports facilities,



informal open space and provision for children and teenagers. The total contribution sought has been calculated as follows.

- 8.31 The application proposes the conversion of 5 residential units containing 11 bedrooms in total to form 10 units in total containing a total of 12 bedrooms. In conversions, the contributions for open space are based on the number of additional bedrooms created, each additional bedroom being assumed to contain one person. Contributions for provision for children and teenagers are only required if they are in units with more than one bedroom. The totals required for the new units resulting from the proposed conversion are calculated as follows:

<b>Outdoor sports facilities</b>					
Existing total bedrooms	New total bedrooms	Net additional bedrooms	Assumed net additional persons	£ per person	<b>Total £</b>
11	12	1	1.5	238	<b>357</b>

<b>Indoor sports facilities</b>					
Existing total bedrooms	New total bedrooms	Net additional bedrooms	Assumed net additional persons	£ per person	<b>Total £</b>
11	12	1	1.5	269	<b>403.50</b>

<b>Informal open space</b>					
Existing total bedrooms	New total bedrooms	Net additional bedrooms	Assumed net additional persons	£ per person	<b>Total £</b>
11	12	1	1.5	242	<b>363</b>

<b>Provision for children and teenagers</b>					
Existing total bedrooms	New total bedrooms	Net additional bedrooms not in 1-	Assumed net additional persons	£ per person	<b>Total £</b>

		bed units	not in 1-bed units		
11	12	0	0	316	<b>0</b>

- 8.32 Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure the requirements of the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010, I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003) policies P6/1 and P9/8, Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 5/14 and 10/1 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010.

### *Community Development*

- 8.33 The Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) requires that all new residential developments contribute to community development facilities, programmes and projects. This contribution is £1256 for each unit of one or two bedrooms and £1882 for each larger unit. The total contribution sought has been calculated as follows:

<b>Community facilities</b>			
Type of unit	£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
1 bed	1256	5	6280
2-bed	1256		
3-bed	1882		
4-bed	1882		
<b>Total</b>			<b>6280</b>

- 8.34 Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure the requirements of the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010, I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003) policies P6/1 and P9/8, Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 5/14 and 10/1 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010.

### *Waste*

- 8.35 The Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) requires that all new residential developments contribute to the provision of household waste and recycling receptacles on a per dwelling basis. As the type of waste and recycling containers provided

by the City Council for houses are different from those for flats, this contribution is £75 for each house and £150 for each flat. The total contribution sought has been calculated as follows:

<b>Waste and recycling containers</b>			
Type of unit	£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
House	75		
Flat	150	5	750
<b>Total</b>			<b>750</b>

- 8.36 Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure the requirements of the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010, I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003) policies P6/1 and P9/8, Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 5/14 and 10/1 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010.

### *Education*

- 8.37 Upon adoption of the Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) the Council resolved that the Education section in the 2004 Planning Obligations Strategy continues to apply until it is replaced by a revised section that will form part of the Planning Obligations Strategy 2010. It forms an annex to the Planning Obligations Strategy (2010) and is a formal part of that document. Commuted payments are required towards education facilities where four or more additional residential units are created and where it has been established that there is insufficient capacity to meet demands for educational facilities.
- 8.38 In this case, five additional residential units are created and the County Council have confirmed that there is insufficient capacity to meet demand for lifelong learning. Contributions are not required for pre-school education, primary education and secondary education for one-bedroom units. Contributions are therefore required on the following basis.

<b>Life-long learning</b>					
Type of unit	Persons per unit		£per unit	Number of such units	Total £

1 bed	1.5	5	160	5	800
2+- beds	2		160		
<b>Total</b>					<b>800</b>

8.39 Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure the requirements of the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010, I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003) policies P6/1 and P9/8, Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 5/14 and 10/1 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010.

### *Monitoring*

8.40 The Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) requires that all new residential developments contribute to the costs of monitoring the implementation of planning obligations. The costs are calculated according to the heads of terms in the agreement. The contribution sought will be calculated as £150 per financial head of term, £300 per non-financial head of term. Contributions are therefore required on that basis.

### *Planning Obligations Conclusion*

8.41 It is my view that the planning obligation is necessary, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably in scale and kind to the development and therefore the Planning Obligation passes the tests set by the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.

## **9.0 CONCLUSION**

In my opinion this proposal satisfactorily addresses the reasons for refusal given for the previous application, and therefore this application is acceptable subject to conditions.

## **10.0 RECOMMENDATION**

### **FOR RECOMMENDATIONS OF APPROVAL**

**1. APPROVE subject to the satisfactory completion of the s106 agreement by 30 June 2011 and 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. Except with the prior written agreement of the local planning authority in writing no construction work or demolition shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours to 1800 hours 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)

3. Except with the prior agreement of the local planning authority in writing, there should be no collection or deliveries to the site during the demolition and construction stages outside the hours of 0700 hrs and 1900 hrs on Monday - Saturday and there should be no collections or deliveries on Sundays or Bank and public holidays.

Reason: Due to the proximity of residential properties to this premises and that extensive refurbishment will be required, the above conditions are recommended to protect the amenity of these residential properties throughout the redevelopment in accordance with policies 4/13 and 6/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006)

4. No development shall commence until such time as full details of the on-site storage facilities for waste including waste for recycling have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter the development shall be in accordance with the approved details. The approved facilities shall be retained thereafter unless alternative arrangements are agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To protect the amenities of nearby residents/occupiers and in the interests of visual amenity. (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV7 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 4/13)

5. No development shall commence until details of facilities for the covered, secured parking of bicycles for use in connection with the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The approved facilities shall be provided in accordance with the approved details before use of the development commences.

Reason: To ensure appropriate provision for the secure storage of bicycles. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/6)

6. 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. (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV7 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 3/14)

7. **Unless prior agreement has been obtained from the Head of Development Services, and the Chair and Spokesperson of this Committee to extend the period for completion of the Planning Obligation required in connection with this development, if the Obligation has not been completed by 30 June 2011 it is recommended that the application be refused for the following reason(s).**

The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for public open space, community development facilities, education and life-long learning facilities, in accordance with the following policies, standards and proposals 3/7, 3/8, 3/12, 5/14, 10/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006; and policies P6/1 and P9/8 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003; and as detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy 2004.

### **Reasons for Approval**

1. This development has been approved subject to conditions and the prior completion of a section 106 planning obligation (/a unilateral undertaking), because subject to those requirements it is considered to conform to the Development Plan as a whole, particularly the following policies:

East of England plan 2008: SS1, ENV7

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003: P6/1, P9/8

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/1, 3/4, 3/7, 3/8, 3/14, 5/1, 5/2, 5/14, 8/6, 8/10, 10/1

2. The decision has been made having had regard to all other material planning considerations, none of which was considered to have been of such significance as to justify doing other than grant planning permission.

These reasons for approval can be a summary of the reasons for grant of planning permission only. For further details on the decision please see the officer report online at [www.cambridge.gov.uk/planningpublicaccess](http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/planningpublicaccess) or visit our Customer Service Centre, Mandela House, 4 Regent Street, Cambridge, CB2 1BY between 8am to 6pm Monday to Friday.

## **LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985**

Under Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972, the following are “background papers” for each report on a planning application:

1. The planning application and plans;
2. Any explanatory or accompanying letter or document from the applicant;
3. Comments of Council departments on the application;
4. Comments or representations by third parties on the application as referred to in the report plus any additional comments received before the meeting at which the application is considered; unless (in each case) the document discloses  
『exempt or confidential information』
5. Any Structure Plan, Local Plan or Council Policy Document referred to in individual reports.

These papers may be inspected by contacting John Summers (Ext.7103) in the Planning Department.



11/0183/FUL  
60 And 62 Green End Road Cambridge



