

Application Number	20/01738/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	16th March 2020	Officer	Luke Waddington
Target Date	11th May 2020		
Ward	Coleridge		
Site	Land At Lilac Court Cambridge		
Proposal	Demolition of existing garages and redevelopment to provide eight residential dwellings (Use Class C3) along with car and cycle parking and associated infrastructure and landscaping.		
Applicant	N/A c/o Agent		

SUMMARY	<p>The development does not accord with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Overbearing and enclosing impact upon dwellings on Hinton Avenue, adversely impacting residential amenity2. Insufficient evidence to demonstrate that properties on Hinton Avenue and Lilac Court will not be overlooked or suffer unacceptable loss of light3. Displacement of parking onto nearby streets due to insufficient parking and turning areas on plots, leading to adverse impact on residential amenity4. Enclosed and shaded outdoor amenity spaces result in poor standard of amenity for future occupants5. Harm to trees subject to TPOs which
---------	--

	<p>would not be outweighed by any public benefits</p> <p>6. Insecure cycle storage on a number of plots</p> <p>7. Failure to successfully integrate functional needs of refuse collections</p> <p>8. Insufficient information to demonstrate compliance with carbon reduction standards</p>
RECOMMENDATION	REFUSAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site comprises a rectangular area of land approximately 0.11ha in size. The site hosts a row of self-contained garages which face onto Lilac Court.
- 1.2 To the north, south and west of the site are residential gardens and dwellings fronting Hinton Avenue and Cherry Hinton Road. Across the access road, to the east of the site is Lilac Court, three separate block of flats three storeys in height, aligned parallel with the road. There is a group tree preservation order in place to the immediate west of the site (reference 28/2019/A1) located in rear gardens of dwellings on Hinton Avenue. The site falls outside the controlled parking zone.
- 1.3 The applicant has lodged an appeal against non-determination of this application with the Planning Inspectorate. At the time of writing the appeal has no start date. This report is intended to support the officer recommendation set out above, to allow members to establish the Council's case in respect of the above appeal. The application is referred to Planning Committee as the officer recommendation is one of refusal and third party representations been received supporting the proposed development.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 It is proposed to demolish the existing garages and erect 8 dwellings, consisting of 6no. 2-bed and 2no. 3bed houses, which would be 2 storeys in height with flat roofs. A total of 15

car parking spaces are proposed including 1 on-plot parking space per dwelling, visitor spaces are also proposed. Cycle parking would be provided for each dwelling, plus a replacement cycle store for Lilac Court residents. All proposed units would be provided with private amenity space split across gardens and first floor terraces. The flat roofs would be brown or green roofs.

- 2.2 The proposal has been amended during the assessment period, the amendments included, an entire rear west facade elevation updated Design and Access Statement including information regarding the refuse strategy. Units P1 and P5 were revised to include contain external terraced areas at first floor. Unit P5 was revised to a two-bed property with a study. Cycle parking for Lilac Court residents was amended to provide a new cycle store.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
19/0711/FUL	Demolition of existing garages, and redevelopment to provide 13no. residential dwellings (Use Class C3), including 25% affordable, along with car and cycle parking and associated infrastructure and landscaping.	Withdrawn 20/01/2020

4.0 PUBLICITY

4.1	Advertisement:	No
	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	<p>1 3</p> <p>28 29 31 32 33 34 35 36</p> <p>50 51</p> <p>55 56 57 59 68 70 71</p> <p>80 81 82</p>

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

Central Government Guidance	<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>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012)</p> <p>Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007)</p>
Material	<u>City Wide Guidance</u>

Considerations	<p>Air Quality in Cambridge – Developers Guide (2008)</p> <p>Arboricultural Strategy (2004)</p> <p>Biodiversity Checklist for Land Use Planners in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (March 2001).</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 Draft Air Quality Action Plan 2018-2023</p> <p>Cambridge City Council Waste and Recycling Guide: For Developers.</p> <p>Cambridge City Nature Conservation Strategy (2006)</p> <p>Contaminated Land in Cambridge - Developers Guide (2009)</p> <p>Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)</p> <p>Cambridge On-Street Residential Parking Study (2016)</p>
----------------	---

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Revised comments refer to amended drawings received 18th June 2020

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

- 6.1 Original comments
- * Car parking layout is an improvement on previous application but a swept path analysis is required to show that a domestic car can enter and leave the parking spaces without having to enter the opposite side of the road. The following conditions should be attached to any permission:
 - * Traffic management plan
 - * No vehicle exceeding 3.5 tonnes to be used for deliveries outside the hours of 9.30-15.30 Mon-Fri
 - * Provision of pedestrian crossing points outside each access to the dwellings
 - * Falls and levels to avoid surface water draining onto highway
 - * Construction of driveways and pedestrian paths from bound material
- 6.2 Revised: The swept path analysis clearly shows that in order to access the proposed car parking spaces a vehicle will have to enter the area where the existing residents park, which has the potential to lead to displacement of this parking to the surrounding streets. This is unlikely to have a significant impact in terms of highway safety but may lead to loss of residential amenity to residents of the surrounding streets, which the Planning Authority may wish to consider when determining this application.

Environmental Health

- 6.3 Revised: No objections, subject to conditions regarding construction hours (x2), construction/demolition noise/vibration & piling, dust, contamination (x6), EV charge points and external lighting details.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Officer)

- 6.4 No objection, subject to recommended conditions regarding surface water drainage, drainage maintenance and finished floor levels.

Refuse and Recycling

- 6.5 Raise concerns about the waste in this development. As its attached to Lilac court flats, and houses their bulk bins by the garages, what will happen to these if the garages are re-developed? As this is a private road, should refuse vehicles be using it? The Council is not liable for damage. There is not enough room to turn at the end, so it involves a reverse, which if less than 12m is acceptable. Residents would need to put their bins at the road side of Cherry Hinton Road, if the road remains private. More information is needed, for vehicle tracking, and waste storage for the existing flats.

Urban Design Team

- 6.6 Original comments

The overall concept of two storey 'mews' units is considered an improvement on the previously withdrawn scheme. Further information is required to adequately assess the relationship between the proposal and surrounding dwellings and gardens in Hinton Avenue and Lilac Court. The applicant has addressed some of the functional design issues previously raised, issues remain with regard to car parking/manoeuvring, refuse collection arrangements and quality of amenity space. Any consent should be subject to conditions requiring details of materials and cycle parking.

Revised comments:

- 6.7 Movement & Access: Highways have noted that the proposed car parking could lead to the potential loss and displacement of existing parking of local residents to the other side of the road. As noted in our previous comments, the Swept Path Analysis (included in the Transport Statement Appendix 5) demonstrates an inadequate reversing distance for an average domestic car. Furthermore, no tracking is shown for Unit P1 which has less reversing space than the other units at around 4.5m. This issue has not been resolved through the resubmission and therefore the inadequate reversing distance remains a concern.
- 6.8 Impact to trees: Arboricultural colleagues have raised concern that the proposed development will result in the removal and limitation of growth to the existing trees on site. As noted in our

previous comments, the submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment (7393-D-AIA, A), shows that there is an overlap between dwellings and the Root Protection Zone (RPZ) and that the proximity of dwellings to the existing trees will require remedial works and/or root pruning to accommodate the proposed buildings. In our view, the retention of the existing trees on the western boundary, are important in terms of how the scheme interfaces with Hinton Avenue. As such, the location of the trees are an important contextual feature that should be used to inform the site coverage of the scheme to allow for their retention and longevity (Policy 55, Cambridge Local Plan 2018). No amendments have been made to the site coverage to work around the tree constraints and therefore our concerns regarding the impact on the existing trees remain.

- 6.9 Private Amenity: The applicant has now revised Unit Type's P1 & P5 to include a 1st floor terrace to address our previous concerns regarding a lack of adequate private amenity space. However, the proximity of the proposed terraces to Lilac Court at around 11m in places, could create potential privacy issues with Lilac Court. Detailing the height and angle of the railing design could help to mitigate this impact, however we recommend that detailed drawings that demonstrate a bespoke solution are requested to determine this.
- 6.10 Scale and massing: We have now had a chance to review the Indicative Rear Elevation (dwg. 433 4-11) and 3D model. The scheme by virtue of the continuous two storey box like form of the upper floor and proximity to the western boundary creates an uncomfortable massing relationship with existing properties of Hinton Avenue. Furthermore, the large expanse of corduroy brick is not effective in reducing the mass. As such, scale and massing issues previously raised remain a significant concern. In our view, a scheme of a reduced footprint that works around the existing trees, in addition to an amended massing approach that creates a less continuous upper level and a more recessive chamfered/sculptured roofline could help to resolve these issues.
- 6.11 In the absence of a BRE daylight and sunlight assessment, the application fails to demonstrate the level of impact upon the amenity of Lilac Court that may result due to the proximity and change in scale over the existing garages that currently occupy the site.

- 6.12 The submitted drawings remain overall unchanged and do not address previous key concerns raised at pre-application stage and in our previous comments. We maintain our significant concerns that the scale and massing of the proposed scheme forms an unacceptable relationship with Hinton Avenue. Furthermore, the application fails to demonstrate the potential amenity impact on Lilac Court in terms of daylight and sunlight. A scheme that works around the trees and resolves the scale, massing and functional design issues raised, is likely to require an amendment to site footprint and therefore the number of units.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Tree Team)

- 6.13 Fails to improve relationship between existing trees and new dwellings and requires removal of trees that contribute to the city's canopy cover. Proximity of some dwellings to retained trees will necessitate remedial works to allow construction and thereafter repeated pruning to maintain reasonable clearances. The younger trees with capacity to significantly increase in size will not reach their potential and their contribution to amenity and climate change mitigation will be limited. Development also fails to take opportunity to accommodate replacement planting. Arboricultural objection is maintained.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

- 6.14 Original comments
Ground level amenity spaces are adequately sized but as shown in the shadow studies for March are shaded nearly all day. It is unclear if the balcony amenity spaces receive adequate light and the location of the upstairs balconies off a study/bedroom is not ideal. The bin storage areas for the A1 and A2 units are not acceptable and require better access. Also query how cycle storage provision for existing Lilac Court flats has been calculated in terms of need. Should the application be approved, recommend hard and soft landscaping and landscape maintenance conditions.

Revised comments:

- 6.15 The bin area for A1 and A2 units have been moved to a boundary within the larger part of the courtyard. Whilst this is borderline acceptable, we would prefer if the bikes and bins traded locations for this unit type in order to create a more

pleasant atmosphere when using the garden. The carport/undercrofts are not closed and present a security risk for parking cycles. We note issues associated with retained on and off site trees have been reviewed by the Arboricultural Officer and consideration should be given to those comments.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Nature Conservation Officer)

6.16 Original comments

Content with findings of bat survey. There is likely to be a high population of hedgehogs in this location and existing vegetation may provide an important foraging route between gardens. Thoughtful mitigation is required. Sedum roofs should be specified as biodiverse green roofs and, in accordance with the bat survey recommendations, details of swift bricks should be provided.

Revised comments:

Submitted documents do not appear to have addressed the initial biodiversity concerns raised with regard hedgehog access, landscaping and biodiverse green roof specification

6.17 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

Cllr Herbert (Coleridge)

7.1 Call in request. This proposal involves serious over-development on a tiny footprint of backland some 12 metres in depth - proposed on a narrow lane which already has 3 storeys of 36 flats, less than 12 metres away - totally inadequate parking provision for the new residents to the detriment of those 36 families - on a site which would cause major detriment and invasion of privacy both to Lilac Court and Hinton Avenue neighbours, and is wholly inappropriate on both design and overlooking - is inadequate on amenity space for the new residents. As with the first application, I also conclude that major uncorrected errors of fact can only be intentionally misleading, given that responses to the first application called

them out and have been totally ignored and repeated again by the developer.

Camcycle

- 7.2 Concerned about availability of secure cycle parking for existing residents. There is inadequate replacement for the existing provision. Existing bike shed is in heavy use and often houses in excess of 30 bikes. Of existing garages to be demolished, 24 out of 31 are rented. We consider it likely that many of these are also used for cycle parking. The applicant is proposing to replace this with insecure parking for eight cycles. For new dwelling types A1 and A2 the proposed cycle parking is in a dedicated area behind the car park space, in a covered car port that is open to the street, this does not comply with the requirements for security in the City Council Guide for design of cycle parking.

Trustees of Cambridge Hedgehogs

- 7.3 Major concerns regarding impact of the proposed development at the site on the local hedgehog population. Development will affect neighbouring gardens. Net biodiversity relies on green roofs which offers nothing for hedgehogs. Gardens to front of proposed dwellings offers little habitat. Removes an area of established hedgerow and scrubland. Development may pose a significant threat to existing biodiversity. Additional cars increase risk of injury. Hedgehogs will no longer be possible to get onto Lilac Court from Hill Avenue (assumed correction to Hinton Avenue). Development must include hedgehog highways.

Cambridge Past, Present, and Future:

- 7.4 Object. Permanent reduction of tree cover, hedges and wildlife. Very limited landscaping proposed. Lack of green space and planting. Loss of cycle parking for Lilac Court residents. Displacement of bin storage for large commercial bins used by Lilac Court. Lack of separation between proposed development and boundaries of adjacent properties. Loss of amenity and privacy. Plans and documents are contradictory.
- 7.5 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations:

Object (67):

4, 5, 10, 13, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30,
31, 37, 43, 49, 51 Hinton Avenue
1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, 21, 23, 24, 25, 27,
30, 31, 32 Lilac Court
43, 76 Cavendish Avenue
19 Neville Road
1, 3, 7, 11, 28 Courtland Avenue
42, 294, 299 Cherry Hinton Road
69 Cowper Road
35 Redfern Close
44 Blinco Grove
54 Hartington Grove
6 Sterne Close
3 Farringford Close
18 Back Road, Linton
6 The Haven, Fulbourn
96 Broomfield Road, Coventry
27 The Bentalls Centre, Colchester (Managing Agent for Lilac
Court)
35 Nursery Hill Shamley Green Guildford
L.H.C.C Action Group
The Vicarage, 12 Harewood Avenue, Bournemouth
Support (3):

3 The Belverdere, Homerton Street
30 Hawthorne Road, Stapleford
Wellington House, East Road

7.6 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Object:

- Obtrusive and unattractive development
Loss of privacy to Lilac Court flats
- Loss of privacy and overbearing impact on Hinton Avenue
- Overshadowing and overbearing impact on Lilac Court flats
- Adverse impact on trees adjacent to site
- Loss of wildlife habitats
- Vehicle visibility issues increase likelihood of accidents
- Loss of raised kerb will put pedestrians and vehicles into conflict

- Loss of parking for Lilac Court
- Cars unable to move in and out of parking spaces unimpeded by existing parking
- Emergency and refuse vehicles unable to turn in reduced turning head
- Reduction in bicycle storage
- Loss of bin storage for Lilac Court
- Unclear where waste bin collection point is located
- Loss of trees
- Overdevelopment and insufficient space on the site for proposed development
- Construction noise
- Pollution from stoves
- Development will result in parking overspill onto adjacent streets
- Lack of space and small gardens will impact future residents amenity
- New dwellings will be dark impacting on occupant amenity
- Insufficient green space
- Residents have not had enough time to comment on proposals
- Structure of older house on Hinton Avenue could be compromised
- Inaccurate plans submitted showing the street to be wider than it is
- Some two bed properties are three bed due to size of study
- Potential for high vehicles to collide with terraces
- Third party access rights over areas to be developed
- No affordable housing proposed

Support:

- The two-storey development has a break in scale and massing.
- The relationship is very similar to a mews type setting often evidenced in a city location
- Sustainable development with environmental improvements
- There are numerous examples of similar development been granted consent for instance Ironworks, Mill Road
- There is a demand for housing of this size and quality
- Design works well within the environment

- Would improve area of poorly constructed neglected garage blocks
- Site is underused and a focus for anti-social behaviour

7.7 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 the main issues are as follows:

1. Principle of development
2. Context of site, design and external spaces
3. Carbon reduction and sustainable design
4. Water management and flood risk
5. Light pollution, noise, vibration, air quality, odour and dust
6. Inclusive access
7. Residential amenity
8. Refuse arrangements
9. Highway safety
10. Car and cycle parking
11. Third party representations

Principle of Development

8.2 Policy 3 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 states that for residential development, the spatial strategy is to focus the majority of new development in and around the urban area of Cambridge, creating strong, sustainable, cohesive and inclusive mixed-use communities, making the most effective use of previously developed land, and enabling the maximum number of people to access services and facilities locally.

8.3 The proposed development seeks to erect 8 dwellings on an area of previously developed land comprising of 4 garage blocks. The principle of development in this urban location is considered acceptable.

Context of site, design and external spaces

8.4 As set out above, the site hosts 4 single storey flat roofed garage blocks, separated by areas of hardstanding and partly

screened on their eastern side by high hedging. Lilac Court flats to the east of the site consist of four separate blocks of flats, three storeys in height with flat roofs and brick construction. To the north, west and south of the site are the residential gardens of dwellings on Cherry Hinton Road, Hinton Avenue and Courtland Avenue, respectively. Dwellings on these roads are generally two storey, semidetached properties with pitched slate roofs. Several mature trees grow close to the shared boundary between the site and these properties.

- 8.5 The existing flats on Lilac Court are uniform and unassuming in their design. The flats have a box-like, flat roofed form which is reflected in the design of the proposed dwellings, and in this respect the scheme has responded well to its context and has clearly drawn inspiration from the key characteristics of site surroundings. Officers consider that the contemporary appearance of the proposed dwellings is acceptable in design terms and provides a suitable contrast to the more utilitarian design of the Lilac Court flats.
- 8.6 In design terms, the overall concept of two storey 'mews' scale units is considered to be acceptable and would not visually dominate the three storey flats opposite the site.
- 8.7 The proposed materials shown are considered to be acceptable in design terms and respond well to the surrounding context. Details of these materials can be secured by condition should the application be approved, in the interests of visual amenity.
- 8.8 Areas of buffer planting in front of the proposed units would soften their appearance from the street and the Landscape Officer has recommended conditions to secure hard and soft landscaping and a landscape maintenance and management plan. These would be attached to any consent granted in the interests of visual amenity.
- 8.9 As noted by the Local Highway Authority and other consultees, the Swept Path Analysis (SPA, included in the Transport Statement Appendix 5) provided within the application shows that vehicles using the proposed on-plot car parking spaces would have to enter the area where the existing residents of Lilac Court park, on the eastern side of the road (marked in blue in the SPA). This would lead to conflict with parked cars which may result in displacement of these vehicles to the surrounding

streets which are not within the controlled parking zone. The impacts of this situation on residential amenity will be assessed later in this report. In design terms, the proposed development would fail to incorporate a practical parking arrangement and so would not integrate the functional needs of the development. In this regard the proposed development would not comply with Policies 56 and 57 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

- 8.10 There are several mature trees within rear gardens of Hinton Avenue which grow very close to the shared boundary and which are subject to a group TPO. These trees are to be retained however the proximity of some dwellings to the retained trees (Trees T002,003 and 004) will necessitate remedial works and root pruning to accommodate the proposed buildings, and would require repeated pruning to maintain reasonable clearances between trees and buildings. This would adversely impact the health of these protected trees and the benefits they provide in terms of visual amenity.
- 8.11 Furthermore due to the proximity of the proposed built form, the younger trees adjacent to the site that currently have capacity to significantly increase in size, will not reach their potential and their contribution to amenity and climate change mitigation will also be limited.
- 8.12 The proposed development would also require the removal of hedges and a number of trees within the site, notably those at the southern end of Lilac Court. While these trees are not protected, they contribute to the city's canopy cover and make a modest yet positive contribution to the visual amenity of Lilac Court, and it is noted that the proposed development does not accommodate meaningful replacement planting within the site to mitigate the loss of these hedges and trees on site. As set out above, while details of soft landscaping could be provided via condition, it is considered that this would not be sufficient to overcome the harm to visual amenity that would be caused by damage to and resultant loss of the retained trees within the vicinity of the site.
- 8.13 Officers do not consider that there are any demonstrable public benefits accruing from the proposal which clearly outweigh the current and future amenity value of the trees. As such the proposed development would not comply with Policies 59 and 71 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

Carbon reduction and sustainable design

- 8.14 Policy 57 h. and 70 require development proposals to include an appropriate scale of features and facilities to maintain and increase levels of biodiversity in the built environment. As highlighted by the Nature Conservation Officer, the application provides little information in respect of biodiversity. The Nature Conservation Officer has confirmed that the demolition of the existing garages is unlikely to impact upon bats as the garages do not provide a suitable bat habitat.
- 8.15 Officers consider that, despite the removal of hedging, and trees at the south of the site, the proposed development would be able to maintain levels of biodiversity, through introduction of residential garden planting, hedgehog gaps in existing and proposed boundaries, use of appropriate planting within soft landscaping, swift boxes, and sedum roofs to support a greater diversity of plant and invertebrate species. Details of biodiversity measures set out above would be secured by condition on any consent granted.
- 8.16 Third party comments have been received regarding the presence of chimneys on the proposed elevations and the potential for fireplaces or wood burners within the proposed dwellings. Officers also note the proposed floorplans show what appears to be a wood burner/stove aligned with the external chimney stack.
- 8.17 The Design and Access statement states that the dwellings “move away from natural gas/fossil fuels and towards more passive technologies”, however no further information relating to the chimneys is provided, and no information has been submitted to demonstrate compliance with the required carbon reduction standards set out within the local plan. As such the proposed development fails to comply with Policy 28 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

Water management and flood risk

- 8.18 With regards to drainage and water management, the Council’s Drainage Officer has reviewed the submitted information and has no objections, subject to conditions requiring submission of a detailed surface water drainage scheme, a drainage management plan, and a condition that finished ground floor

levels to be set no lower than 9.150 mAOD, in accordance with the recommendations of the submitted Flood Risk Assessment. These conditions would be imposed on any consent granted, in the interests of adequate drainage and to reduce the risk of flooding, in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 31 and 32.

Light pollution, air quality, noise, vibration, odour and dust

- 8.19 There are no objections from the Council's Environmental Health Department subject to conditions and informatives limiting the hours for demolition, construction and delivery, and control of construction noise, vibration, piling and dust. These conditions would be imposed on any consent granted, in the interests of residential amenity.
- 8.20 The Environmental Health Officer has also requested a condition requiring Electrical Vehicle charging points to be installed in all eight of the allocated parking spaces and two of the five visitor spaces. This condition is considered to be reasonable and in the interests of preserving air quality as set out in Policy 36 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.
- 8.21 The Council's Scientific Officer has reviewed the Contaminated Land Assessment and has stated that the findings and the recommendations of the assessment are appropriate. The Scientific Officer has therefore recommended the full suite of contaminated land conditions be applied. If permission were granted, these would be attached in the interests of residential amenity and the health of site workers and future occupants. In order to protect residential amenity a condition requiring submission of an external lighting scheme would be attached to any consent granted.

Inclusive access

- 8.22 The submitted Design & Access statement received June 2020 confirms that the proposed dwellings would be constructed in compliance with current Approved Document Part M of the Building Regulations, and in this regard the proposed development would comply with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 51.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.23 The proposed development would be located in close proximity to the shared boundary with properties along Hinton Avenue, which have rear gardens that back onto the application site. The box like form of the upper floors would introduce a large, continuous two-storey presence and bulk onto this boundary. The scale and massing of the proposed dwellings alongside the western boundary would appear overbearing from the neighbouring gardens on Hinton Avenue and would result in a sense of enclosure from within the gardens. The expanse of brick on these rear elevations would also fail to break up the visual effect of this massing, and as such the siting of the proposed development in relation to numbers 11 to 29 on the eastern side of Hinton Avenue
- 8.24 The flats at Lilac Court to the east of the site contain high levels of glazing, serving habitable rooms that face directly towards the proposed dwellings. The proposed dwellings are approximately 11-12 metres from the front elevation of Lilac Court flats, and feature projecting bay windows serving bedrooms at first floor level. These windows face directly towards Lilac Court flats, and are shown on the submitted plans to be fitted with angled louvres intended to mitigate overlooking views from these windows. It is also proposed to install these louvres on the proposed first floor rear windows that face the gardens and rear elevations of dwellings on Hinton Avenue.
- 8.25 Officers consider that insufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the louvres would be sufficiently effective in their purpose, and that the level of impact upon the amenity of the existing flats at Lilac Court and neighbouring dwellings on Hinton Avenue would be acceptable.
- 8.26 The proposed units also include first floor terraces. The proximity of the proposed terraces to Lilac Court is around 11m in places. While high railings are shown on the proposed plans Officers are concerned that these would not be sufficient to break up any overlooking views that may be gained from the terraces.

- 8.27 Given the potential for significant overlooking impacts towards Lilac Court and to Hinton Avenue, it is not considered appropriate to request further details of these proposed mitigation measures by condition.
- 8.28 The proposed development would result in an increase in the height of built form at the site, from single storey garage units to two storey dwellings. As set out above, the proposed dwellings are in close proximity to the existing flats, which have windows serving habitable rooms that face the proposed development. Given the increase in scale and relatively close proximity of the dwellings, Officers consider that the proposed development would be likely to result in a loss of daylight and sunlight upon dwellings at Lilac Court. No BRE daylight and sunlight assessment has been submitted to assess this impact; as such the application fails to demonstrate the level of impact upon the amenity of Lilac Court would be acceptable.
- 8.29 As set out earlier in this report, the Swept Path Analysis provided within the application shows that vehicles using the proposed on-plot car parking spaces would have to enter the area where the existing residents of Lilac Court park. This would lead to conflict with parked cars which may result in displacement of these vehicles to the surrounding streets. The application site and streets within the immediate vicinity are not within the controlled parking zone. The nearest street to the west of the site is Hinton Avenue. This street is identified in the Cambridge On-Street Residential Parking Study as being at 90% parking pressure at 05:30 and 78% pressure between 18:00 and 20:00, and therefore suffers from overnight parking stress. Other streets in the close vicinity of the site, such as Lichfield Road and Courtland Avenue have less overnight parking stress; 17% and 25% at 05:30 respectively. As such it is considered that while there may be overspill this would not constitute a significant adverse impact on residential amenity, given the low levels of overnight parking occupancy on the above streets.
- 8.30 In the opinion of officers, the proposal would result in a significant overbearing impact upon dwellings on Hinton Avenue and fails to demonstrate that it would not result in a significant adverse impact upon the residential amenity of its neighbours in terms of loss of light and loss of privacy. Therefore the

proposed development would therefore not comply with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 56.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

- 8.31 The gross internal floor space measurements for units in this application are shown in the table below:

Unit Type	Number of bedrooms	Number of bed spaces (persons)	Number of storeys	Policy Size requirement (m ²)	Proposed size of unit	Difference in size
A1	3	5	2	93	96	+3
A2	3	5	2	93	96	+3
B	3	5	2	93	95	+2
C	2	4	2	79	76.4	+0.4

- 8.32 As set out in the table above, all proposed units would comply with the space standards in respect of internal floor space. While some units show a study at first floor level, these are all over 7.5m² and under 11.5m² and as such are counted as 1 person bedrooms for the purposes of the above table. The proposed dwellings are all considered to provide sufficient space for outdoor amenity areas, through a combination of rear garden space and first floor terraces.
- 8.33 However, Officers are of the view that these garden spaces, particularly those serving plots 2, 3, 4 and 6 are not of good quality and would not constitute a desirable or usable space. As shown on the submitted Shadow Studies, these spaces are in shade for much of the day and surround by boundaries and therefore are unlikely to be attractive for use by future residents.
- 8.34 The proposed balcony spaces receive a little more light, but Officers cannot fully ascertain if any of the space receive 50% of sunshine for 2hours on 21st March as recommended by the BRE. The balconies are in full or majority shade for all the dates and times shown on the submitted Shadow Studies other than the morning and early afternoon of 20th June and 9am on March 20th and September 23rd.
- 8.35 Overall, the standard of outdoor amenity space in terms of sunlight and outlook is considered to be poor and would not provide a good standard of amenity for future occupants of the development.

- 8.36 In the opinion of officers, the proposal fails to provide an appropriate standard of outdoor amenity space for future occupiers, and would not comply with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 50.

Refuse Arrangements

- 8.37 The proposed strategy for refuse collection is unclear. Page 14 of the amended Design and Access Statement (DAS) states that domestic waste bins for the proposed development will be brought to the roadside on collection days, and that the refuse vehicle is to enter the site for collection. Page 15 of the DAS states bin storage is proposed located close to the highway (3.5m) and that waste collection vehicles are not required to enter the site.
- 8.38 It may be the case that a refuse vehicle currently enters Lilac Court for collections, however Officers note that the current circumstances would be altered by the proposed development, due to the reduction in size of the turning head at the southern end of the site. Officers have taken measurements from the submitted drawing number 1-12A (Existing and Proposed Site Plans), which show that the western spur of the turning head currently measures approximately 4.6 metres wide and would be reduced to 3.6 metres. The mouth of the turning head would also be reduced from approximately 15 metres to 10 metres. The terrace for unit 7 also appears to overhang the turning head. As no tracking is provided for refuse vehicles it is not clear whether this reduced area would be sufficient to allow turning for a refuse vehicle entering the site for on-street collection. No bin collection point that is within the control of the applicant has been identified within the application.
- 8.39 The residents of Lilac Court flats currently store their communal bins informally on the hardstanding areas by the existing garages. This would no longer be possible within the proposed development, however the application does not provide alternative bin storage provision for the current residents of Lilac Court.
- 8.40 This appears to be an informal arrangement, however the proposed development would likely result in displaced communal refuse bins for Lilac Court being stored in closer

proximity to either the existing flats or the proposed dwellings, having a potential adverse impact on residential amenity.

- 8.41 As such the proposed development would not successfully integrate functional needs such as refuse and recycling, contrary to Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 57.

Highway Safety

- 8.42 Comments from third parties regarding vehicle visibility issues and highway safety concerns are noted, however the Local Highways Authority has raised no objection to the proposed development on the grounds of highway safety. In this regard the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 81.

Car and Cycle Parking

- 8.43 Each of the proposed 8 dwellings is provided with a single on-plot parking space in the form of a car port, and the proposed site plan indicates that there are 2 unallocated and 5 visitor spaces within the wider site. As such the proposed development would meet the requirements for amounts of parking set out within Policy 82 Appendix L.
- 8.44 However, as set out in the Residential Amenity section of this report, the parking and turning arrangements for the proposed dwellings conflict with the existing parking on Lilac Court adjacent to the site, and would compromise the functionality of the on-plot parking spaces.
- 8.45 Furthermore, no tracking is shown for Unit P1 which has less reversing space than the other units at around 4.5m, and it is not demonstrated that this would provide a functional and accessible parking space.
- 8.46 Policy 82 Appendix L states that cycle parking should accord with the standards in the Council's Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010). This document states that for residential development, where access to cycle parking is in a secure area, restricted to residents only, open stands that are covered are acceptable. Units 2, 3, 4, 6 and 8 provide cycle parking at the rear of an open carport. As such this cycle

parking is not considered to be secure and would not comply with the standards set out in Policy 82 Appendix L.

- 8.47 There is a cycle store within the existing garage area for use of the residents of Lilac Court flats. This would be demolished and replaced to accommodate the proposed development. The amended site plans 1-11A and 1-12A show a replacement cycle store that appears larger than that originally proposed, but the capacity of this store, and the amount of cycle parking currently provided for existing residents, have not been demonstrated. As such officers cannot be satisfied that the proposed development provides adequate cycle storage for the existing users of the site.
- 8.48 Taking the above into account, the proposal would not provide adequate secure cycle parking for the proposed development and does not demonstrate that the proposed development would provide adequate cycle parking facilities for existing users of the site, contrary to Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 82.

Third Party Representations

- 8.49 Officers note third party representations stating that residents have not had enough time to comment on proposals. Officers can confirm that there are no outstanding public consultations in relation to the application.
- 8.50 Comments regarding the potential impact of the development upon the structure of older houses on Hinton Avenue are not material planning considerations.
- 8.51 No affordable housing is proposed as part of the development as it does not meet the required threshold of 11 units set out in the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 Having regard to applicable national and local planning policies, and having taken all relevant material considerations into account, it is considered that planning permission should be refused in this instance.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE for the following reasons:

1. Due to its continuous two storey form and the bulk, scale and massing of the proposed development in relation to the rear gardens of numbers 11 to 29 Hinton Avenue the proposed development would result in an unacceptable sense of enclosure and overbearing impact upon those properties, causing a significant adverse impact upon residential amenity, contrary to Policies 55, 56 and 57 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.
2. Insufficient information has been submitted to establish that the proposed dwellings would not result in a significant overlooking impact from first floor windows upon Lilac Court Flats and rear gardens on Hinton Avenue, or that the proposed dwellings would not, by their scale and proximity to Lilac Court Flats, result in an unacceptable loss of daylight or sunlight to those dwellings. The application fails to demonstrate adequate preservation of residential amenity and is contrary to Policies 55, 56 and 57 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.
3. The on-plot parking for the proposed dwellings would not provide sufficient space for vehicles to enter and leave the spaces without coming into conflict with vehicles parked on the eastern side of the Lilac Court access road. This would result in displacement of parking onto nearby streets outside of the Controlled Parking Zone. The proposed development would therefore fail to successfully incorporate functional and practical car parking arrangements contrary to policies 56, 57 and 82 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.
4. The rear gardens of the proposed dwellings are surrounded and enclosed by built form and boundary treatment and are in shade for much of the day, throughout the year. The proposed balcony areas are also shaded for much of the day, throughout the year. These areas are therefore unlikely to be attractive for use for future residents and overall would result in a poor standard of amenity for future occupants of the proposed development, contrary to the external residential space standards in Policy 50 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

5. By virtue of its proximity to trees that are subject to a Tree Preservation Order, the proposed development would require significant works to these trees and would limit their further growth, adversely impacting their positive contribution to visual amenity and biodiversity. The development would therefore fail to preserve, protect and enhance existing trees and hedges that have amenity value as perceived from the public realm and would not provide sufficient space for trees and other vegetation to mature. There are no demonstrable public benefits accruing from the proposal which clearly outweigh this harm and so the proposed development is contrary to Policies 59 and 71 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.
6. The proposed development would not provide secure cycle storage for plots 2, 3, 4, 6 and 8, that would be in accordance with the standards set out in Policy 82, Appendix L of the Local Plan 2018 and Council's Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010). Furthermore, insufficient information has been provided within the application to ascertain that the proposed replacement cycle store for the existing users of the site would be sufficient to address the cycle parking needs of residents at Lilac Court. As such the proposed development fails to comply with Policy 82 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.
7. It is not demonstrated within the application that there is sufficient space for a refuse vehicle to enter and leave the site safely to collect refuse bins, or that the practical necessities of refuse removal could be accomplished in an alternative way. Neither does the proposed development provide an alternative bin storage area for existing residents of Lilac Court. As such the proposed development would not successfully integrate functional needs such as refuse and recycling, contrary to Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 57.
8. Insufficient information has been submitted with the application to demonstrate that the proposed development can achieve adequate carbon reduction in accordance with the criteria set out in Policy 28 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.