

Application Number	19/0769/PIP	Agenda Item	
Date Received	4th June 2019	Officer	Mairead O'Sullivan
Target Date	9th July 2019		
Ward	Romsey		
Site	Cambridge and Huntingdon Health Authority 18 Vinery Road		
Proposal Applicant	Residential development of 9 dwellings. Mr O Lines 36 Green End Fen Ditton Cambridge		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The facility is considered to be no longer required and its loss is considered acceptable - The principle of 9 residential units on site is considered to be acceptable.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site lies on the south eastern side of Vinery Road. Vinery Road is a predominantly residential street to the north of the eastern end of Mill Road. The existing building on site has been vacant since 2014 but was last used as primary care support by the NHS. The existing building is part two storey and part single storey with some car parking around and an access point from Vinery Road.
- 1.2 To the south of the site are three semi-detached houses which are set back from the street with garages to the side and either hard standing or small gardens to the front which are bounded

by low walls and fences. A number have hedges and planting to the front. The opposite side of the road is within the Conservation Area. This comprises two storey brick properties with ground floor bay windows. These buildings are only marginally set back from the street with dwarf walls to the front. Further south, the site is bounded by the site of Cambridge Mosque which is currently under construction. Part of the Brookfields site is to the north and east of the site

- 1.3 The site itself is outside of the Conservation Area but the boundary of the Mill Road Conservation Area is the other side of the street so the site will be visible from within the Conservation Area. The site lies within the Mill Road Opportunity Area. There are six TPOs on site. The site is within close proximity to the Mill Road East District Centre.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The application seeks permission in principle for a residential development of 9 dwellings. The application follows a previously approved application for permission in principle for 9 dwellings on the site. The previous application, 19/0051/PIP, was heard at planning committee on 3 April 2019 where members voted to accept the officer recommendation of approval. Following planning committee, the applicant withdrew the application prior to the Local Authority issuing a decision.
- 2.2 Permission in principle is an alternative way of obtaining planning permission for housing-led development which separates the consideration of matters of principle for proposed development from the technical detail of the development. The permission in principle consent route has 2 stages: the first stage (or permission in principle stage) establishes whether a site is suitable in-principle and the second ('technical details consent') stage is when the detailed development proposals are assessed. Permission in principle can be granted through the receipt of a valid application or by entering a site in Part 2 of the brownfield land register.
- 2.3 The scope of permission in principle is limited to location, land use and amount of development. Issues relevant to these 'in principle' matters should be considered at the permission in principle stage. Other matters should be considered at the technical details consent stage. The statutory time limit for

determination of a permission in principle is 5 weeks however as there are objections contrary to the officer recommendation, the application could not be determined under delegated powers and an extension of time has been agreed to allow the application to be heard at planning committee.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
19/0051/PIP	Residential development of 9 dwellings.	Withdrawn

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 Local Plan 2018	1 3 24 28 31 32 33 34 35 36 50 51 52 55 56 57 59 61 71 73 81 82

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

<p>Central Government Guidance</p>	<p>National Planning Policy Framework 2019</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance from 3 March 2014 onwards</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>Previous Supplementary Planning Documents</p> <p>(These documents, prepared to support policies in the 2006 local plan are no longer SPDs, but are still material considerations.)</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><u>City Wide Guidance</u></p> <p>Arboricultural Strategy (2004)</p> <p>Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan (2011)</p> <p>Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (November 2010)</p>

	<p>Cambridge City Council Waste and Recycling Guide: For Developers.</p> <p>Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)</p>
	<p>Mill Road Area Conservation Area Appraisal (2011)</p>

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

6.1 No in principle objection to the development as proposed.

Environmental Health

6.2 No objection in principle to the application site being developed for residential purposes.

Urban Design and Conservation Team

6.3 Insufficient information to comment: There does not appear to have been any more information submitted for this application than for the previous one, therefore the Conservation Team's comments are as before. It is not possible to assess the impact of the proposed development on the adjacent conservation area as there is not enough information submitted. At the very least the Conservation Team would need to know the site layout of the proposed buildings, the heights and how they would address the street. It should be noted that opposite the site is a terrace of fine Victorian houses which are typical of the conservation area and make a positive contribution to it.

6.4 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:

- 43 Vinery Road
- 45 Vinery Road

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Frustrated that another application has been submitted with no details of site layout, appearance, heights,
- Concerns expressed previously still stand – concerned about potential density and whether adequate car parking will be provided.

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

Principle of Development

8.1 The application is wholly the same as the previous Permission in Principle application on the site which was heard at planning committee in April 2019. The assessment remains the same. I have included the assessment as set out on the previous committee report in full below.

8.2 The applicant has provided details of the last use of the building. The building was used as primary care support (administrative support) for the NHS. The last use of the building would be considered a D1 use as it had a health purpose but the building was never used by a direct patient facing service. Primary Care Support had been provided by a company called Serco but the NHS then retendered the service and it is now offered by Capita. The NHS have also provided a letter which confirms that the building has been surplus to requirements and vacant since 2014.

8.3 As the last use of the site was a D1 use, the last use of the site would be considered a community use and policy 73 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) is relevant. This states that the

loss of a facility that was last in community use will only be permitted where the facility can be replaced within the new development or relocated to its existing scale, range, quality and accessibility for users or the facility is no longer needed. Appendix K of the Local Plan details how to demonstrate a facility is no longer required.

8.4 Appendix K states that proposal where facilities are being replaced elsewhere should demonstrate the following:

- a. equal or improved site accessibility to users by all means of transport including foot and cycle; and
- b. sufficient spare capacity or agreement to accommodate displaced users at other equivalent community/leisure facilities with similar accessibility for users. For existing leisure facilities, in the absence of a robust district-wide needs assessment/capacity assessment, applicants will be expected to carry out such an assessment at their own cost; and
- c. through local consultation, the level of interest in and viability of the continued use of the premises as a community/leisure facility

8.5 The site never offered a patient facing service so criteria a. is not relevant. The service is still offered to the NHS by a different operator so no users have been displaced. K.5 goes on to state that any marketing of the site would need to be for a similar facility to that being lost. The last use of the site was administrative support to a health service and is unlikely to be taken up by a user other than the NHS. As a result the loss of the use is considered acceptable.

8.6 Policy 3 of the Cambridge Local Plan supports the provision of new residential development in and around the urban area of Cambridge. Policy 52 relates to the subdivision of existing plots and is also relevant as the proposal seeks to establish the principle of 9 residential units on site. Policy 52 states that the subdivision of a plot will be permitted where the form height and layout is in keeping with the surrounding character, sufficient gardens space and trees of worth are retained, the amenity and privacy of the existing and new properties is protected, adequate provision of amenity space, vehicular access and car parking to existing and proposed properties and there is no detrimental effect on potential comprehensive development of the wider area. The redevelopment of the site as 9 residential

units would not impact on the potential for comprehensive development of the wider area. The other criteria would be assessed when further detail is submitted as part of the technical detail application.

8.7 I note the Conservation Officers holding objection due to lack of information. The lack of information provided as part of the application has also been raised in the neighbour representations. The proposal is for permission in principle and as a result the only requirements for validation are a completed application plan, site location plan and application fee. The permission is only for the principle of the number of residential units proposed. All other details including layout, height, scale, appearance, car parking and type of units proposed will be provided, consulted on and assessed as part of a subsequent technical details application.

8.8 Both the Environmental Health Officer and Highway Engineer have no objection to the principle of development. More detailed comments will be provided as part of the technical details application.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 The D1 facility is considered to no longer be required and its loss is considered acceptable. The principle of 9 residential units on site is considered acceptable. It is not possible for conditions to be attached to a grant of permission in principle and its terms may only include the site location, the type of development and amount of development

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE