



25/00174/FUL– 80 - 82 Lovell Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB4 2QP

Application details

Report to: Planning Committee

Lead Officer: Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development

Ward/parish: Kings Hedges

Proposal: Erection of self-build dwelling, alterations to existing access and alterations to 80 and 82 Lovell Road

Applicant: Daniel and Sarah Austin

Presenting officer: Amy Stocks

Reason presented to committee: Officer referral on the grounds of third party representations and policy conflicts

Member site visit date: N/A

Key issues:

1. Contrary to the character and pattern of development of the area
2. Safety concerns for existing occupants of no. 80-82
3. Cycle storage

Recommendation: Refuse

Report contents

Document section	Document heading
1	Executive summary
2	Site description and context
3	The proposal
4	Relevant site history
5	Policy
6	Consultations
7	Third party representations
8	Assessment
9	Principle of development
10	Design, layout, scale and landscaping
11	Trees
12	Heritage assets
13	Carbon reduction and sustainable design
14	Biodiversity
15	Water management and flood risk
16	Highway safety and transport Impacts
17	Cycle and car parking provision
18	Amenity
19	Planning obligations (s106)
20	Other matters
21	Planning balance
22	Recommendation

Table 1 Contents of report

1. Executive summary

- 1.1 The application seeks permission for the erection of a self-build dwelling, alterations to existing access and alterations to 80 and 82 Lovell Road.
- 1.2 Although the visual design of the dwelling is considered in keeping with the character of the area, the introduction of backland development is not characterful of Lovell Road and would therefore be contrary to the pattern

of development of the street. It should be noted the wider area has history of applications of this nature being refused.

- 1.3 The proposal raises future amenity concerns which ultimately make the application unacceptable. The application fails to demonstrate there would be no harm to neighbouring occupants from the use of the proposed access road in between properties 80-82. It shall be noted the front doors of these properties will face directly onto the proposed access road.
- 1.4 The proposal is contrary to Policies 52, 55, 56, 57 and 80 of the Cambridge City Local Plan 2018 and Paragraphs 117, 135 and 139 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).
- 1.5 Officers recommend that the Planning Committee refuse the application.

Consultee	Object / No objection / No comment	Paragraph Reference
County Highways Development Management	No Objection	6.1 – 6.2
Ecology Officer	No Objection	6.3 – 6.4
Environmental Health	No Objection	6.5 – 6.6
Streets and Open Spaces	No Objection	6.7
Sustainability Officer	No Objection	6.8 – 6.9
Third Party Representations (56)	Objection and Support	7.1 – 7.4
Member Representations (0)	-	-
Local Interest Groups and Organisations / Petition (0)	-	-

Table 2 Consultee summary

2. Site description and context

- 2.1 The site is located to the rear 80-82 Lovell Road. To the north and east of the site is a grassed area currently being used by the neighbouring KIA

garage, the guided busway and Cambridge Science park. To the south and west of the site are neighbouring properties and gardens of Lovell Road.

- 2.2 The site borders allocated site M1, which has been allocated for 95 dwellings 50 density per hectare and or 0.53 ha employment, however the application site falls outside this jurisdiction. Additionally, as allocated site M1 has not been developed for its allocated use, officers cannot give the land allocation weight in the assessment of this application.

3. The proposal

- 3.1 The application seeks permission for the erection of a self-build dwelling, alterations to existing access and alterations to 80 and 82 Lovell Road
- 3.2 The application has been amended to address highways matters and further consultations have been carried out as appropriate.

4. Relevant site history

Reference	Description	Outcome
C/73/0835	Residential development	Refused
C/77/0647	Erection of greenhouse, Cambridge.	Permitted
C/73/0373	The erection of 6 residential units	Refused
C/77/0326	Erection of glasshouse, Cambridge.	Refused

Table 2 Relevant site history

5. Policy

5.1 National policy

National Planning Policy Framework 2024
National Planning Practice Guidance
National Design Guide 2021
Environment Act 2021
Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017
Equalities Act 2010
Local Transport Note 1/20 (LTN 1/20) Cycle Infrastructure Design
Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standard (2015)
ODPM Circular 06/2005 – Protected Species
Circular 11/95 (Conditions, Annex A)

5.2 Cambridge Local Plan (2018)

Policy 3: Spatial strategy for the location of residential development
Policy 28: Sustainable design and construction, and water use
Policy 29: Renewable and low carbon energy generation
Policy 31: Integrated water management and the water cycle
Policy 32: Flood risk

Policy 33: Contaminated land
Policy 35: Protection of human health and quality of life from noise and vibration
Policy 50: Residential space standards
Policy 51: Accessible homes
Policy 52: Protecting garden land and the subdivision of existing dwelling plots
Policy 55: Responding to context
Policy 56: Creating successful places
Policy 57: Designing new buildings
Policy 58: Altering and extending existing buildings
Policy 59: Designing landscape and the public realm
Policy 69: Protection of sites of biodiversity and geodiversity importance
Policy 70: Protection of priority species and habitats
Policy 71: Trees
Policy 80: Supporting sustainable access to development
Policy 81: Mitigating the transport impact of development
Policy 82: Parking management

5.3 Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)

Biodiversity SPD – Adopted February 2022
Sustainable Design and Construction SPD – Adopted January 2020
Cambridgeshire Flood and Water SPD – Adopted November 2016
Landscape in New Developments SPD – Adopted March 2010
Trees and Development Sites SPD – Adopted January 2009

5.4 Other guidance

Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan (2011)
Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2010)
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste
Cambridgeshire Design Guide For Streets and Public Realm (2007)
Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)

6. Consultations

Publicity

Neighbour letters – Yes

Site Notice – Yes

Press Notice – No

County Highways Development Management - No Objection

- 6.1 *Comment dated 13th February 2025:* Objection for the following reasons-
- Access width is not appropriate for that of a single dwelling.
 - Vehicular access should be constructed using dropped kerbs rather than radii ones.
 - Parking spaces for no.82 Lovell Road has been relocated to accommodate the wide access. Consequently, suitable visibility splays between no.82 and 84 cannot be achieved.
 - Application may be suitable once concerns have been addressed subject to conditions.
- 6.2 *Comment dated 1st July 2025:* No objection subject to the imposition of the following conditions-
- 2m x 2m visibility splays.
 - Levels of proposed driveways.
 - Material of the first 5m of the proposed driveways.
 - Informative relating to works within the local highway.

Ecology Officer- No Objection

- 6.3 *Comment dated 10th June 2025:* No objection subject to the imposition of the following conditions-
- Ecological enhancement.
- 6.4 *Comment dated 23rd June 2025:* No objection subject to the imposition of the following conditions-
- Ecological enhancement.

Environmental Health- No Objection

- 6.5 *Comment dated 7th February 2025:* No objection subject to the imposition of the following conditions-
- Phase 2 investigation.
 - Implementation of remediation.
 - Submission of phase 4 verification/validation report.
 - Unexpected contamination.
 - Materials management plan.
 - Construction hours.
 - Piling management.
 - Dust management.

- 6.6 *Comment dated 16th June 2025:* No further comments to add from previous comments.

Streets and Open Spaces- No objection

- 6.7 No objection subject to the following comments-
- Any services required outside of the footprint of the building will increase the impact on these trees and therefore needs to be considered/mitigated.

Sustainability Officer- No Objection

- 6.8 *Comment dated 10th February 2025:* No objection subject to the imposition of the following conditions-
- Carbon reduction and water efficiency.
 - Water efficiency.
 - Informative relating to water usage restrictions (110 litres per person per day).
- 6.9 *Comment dated 1st July 2025:* No further comments to add from previous comments.
- 6.10 The Drainage department and Greater Cambridge Partnership have been consulted on the application; however, no comments were received.

7. Third party representations

- 7.1 56 representations have been received.
- 7.2 Those in objection have raised the following issues:
- Traffic and parking concerns
 - Increased traffic
 - Increased congestion
 - Loss of existing parking spaces
 - Concerns on the narrowness of Lovell Road and how this development will impact this.
 - Concerns of emergency access compromised
 - Impact on learner drivers and delivery drivers
 - Safety risks from new roads and turning points.
 - Erosion of character of the area and street layout
 - Modern design is not in keeping with the street scene

- Scale and character of the dwelling is not in keeping with the character of the area.
- Concerns the site will be used as an HMO
- Loss of garden space
- The introduction of backland development will set precedent for future developments.
- The proposed access road is a safety risk to pedestrians.
- Emergency vehicles and lorries struggle to turn in the road already.
- Increased traffic hazards due to the existing narrow road, the junction of the new road will exacerbate this.
- Concerns relating to noise, air pollution and dust impact during the construction period and the blockages of Lovell Road from construction vehicles.
- Concerns on the long-term disruption to daily life.
- Concerns for the loss of biodiversity from the wider site being stripped. Tree felling and scrub clearance was undertaken before surveys.
- Impact on local wildlife
- Concerns relating to the destruction of a badger sett
- Concerns of overlooking from the proposed dwelling into rear gardens and neighbouring properties.
- Policy conflicts
- The occupants of the proposed dwelling will be impacted by the guided busway
- Suspicion of support comments as there is no connection to Lovell Road
- The whole of Lovell road was not notified
- Concerns the introduction of dwellings to the rear will promote developers to buy dwellings along Lovell road to do the same and ultimately outbidding families who want family homes.
- There needs to be wider consideration of the neighbouring allocated site.

7.3 Those in support have given the following reasons:

- The proposal will contribute to Cambridges housing needs
- The proposed dwelling is an opportunity to achieve sustainable, energy- efficient homes.
- The proposal would allow for a better use of underused land.

7.4 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations are available on the Council's website.

8. Assessment

- 8.1 From the consultation responses and representations received and from an inspection of the site and the surroundings, the key issues are:
- Principle of development
 - Housing provision
 - Design, layout, scale and landscaping
 - Trees
 - Carbon reduction and sustainable design
 - Biodiversity
 - Water management and flood risk
 - Highway safety and transport impacts
 - Car and cycle parking
 - Amenity
 - Planning obligations
 - Other matters
 - Planning balance
 - Recommendation

9. Principle of Development

- 9.1 Policy 3 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 states that the overall development strategy is to focus the majority of new residential development in and around the urban area of Cambridge, creating strong, sustainable, cohesive and inclusive mixed-use communities. The policy is supportive in principle of new housing development that will contribute towards an identified housing need.
- 9.2 The application form lists the land as residential curtilages and disused scrubland. As confirmed by the applicant, the land contains land, which is residential curtilages, therefore policy 52 of the local plan is engaged.
- 9.3 Proposals for development on sites that form part of a garden or group of gardens or that subdivide an existing residential plot will only be permitted under policy 52 where:
- a. *the form, height and layout of the proposed development is appropriate to the surrounding pattern of development and the character of the area;*
 - b. *sufficient garden space and space around existing dwellings is retained, especially where these spaces and any trees are worthy of retention due to their contribution to the character of the area and their importance for biodiversity;*
 - c. *the amenity and privacy of neighbouring, existing, and new properties*

is protected.

- d. provision is made for adequate amenity space, vehicular access arrangements and parking spaces for the proposed and existing properties; and*
- e. there is no detrimental effect on the potential comprehensive development of the wider area.*

- 9.4 The proposal is contrary to point a of policy 52. While officers consider the scale and massing of the dwelling to be acceptable, considering the distances between the proposed dwelling and existing neighbouring dwellings, the location of the dwelling is contrary to the established pattern of development. Although neighbouring properties have one-storey buildings in their gardens, the proposed dwelling does not follow the same scale, pattern of building type or same intended use (neighbouring buildings appear to be summer houses or external recreational rooms rather than residential homes). Therefore, the proposed development is not in keeping with the surrounding pattern of development or landscape.
- 9.5 The proposal would not adversely impact neighbouring trees and would allow for the retention of sufficient garden space for nos. 80-82 Lovell Road. It shall be noted it was reported to officers that the site had been cleared of scrub and trees and there was the potential of the disturbance of a badger sett. While the applicant has confirmed there were no badger setts on site, officers advised the concerned party that as it is illegal to disturb badgers under the Protection of Badgers Act 1992, any activity doing as such should be reported to the police as it is a criminal offence. This is not the responsibility of the council to investigate.
- 9.6 Point c refers to the amenity and privacy of the neighbouring properties. Given the scale of the dwelling and the separation distance between the proposed dwelling and the existing dwellings, officers do not consider the neighbouring privacy will be adversely impacted. However, the access to the existing dwellings will be impacted and therefore the amenity will be impacted.
- 9.7 Officers consider the proposal fails to accord with point d. The access to the rear property will be between nos.80-82 Lovell Road. The front doors of nos.80-82 are located on the side of these properties and as such occupants of these properties will access and exit their properties via the new access road which only serves vehicles. It shall be noted the access road does not benefit from footpaths. As occupants of nos.80-82 will need to use the proposed access road to access their homes and share this access with vehicles, officers do not consider the proposal is in accordance with the hierarchy in terms of manoeuvring a site (pedestrians being the highest priority) and as such would not maintain safe adequate access to

the existing dwelling. Officers do not consider point c has been accorded with.

- 9.8 Point d refers to provision being made for adequate amenity space, vehicular access and parking arrangements for proposed and existing properties. While no.82 benefits from a wider dropped kerb on Lovell Road, no.80 does not and the imposition of an access will remove space for the manoeuvring of vehicles at this location. While officers acknowledge a parking space to the front of no.80 is being moved over and retained, the accessibility to this space will be hindered by the development. Consequently, the proposal would adversely impact the usability of parking to the existing dwelling and point d has not been complied with.
- 9.9 Officers do not consider the proposal would have a detrimental effect on the potential comprehensive development of the wider area.
- 9.10 The proposal would not be in keeping with the pattern of development of the area and would not allow for ease of access to the existing dwellings (nos.80-82). As such the proposal is contrary to policy 52 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).
- 9.11 When informed of the decision the agent representing the applicant raised instances where policy 52 had been implemented. The agent considers the application of policy 52 has been inconsistent. Please see the below table:

<i>Planning Reference</i>	<i>Site address</i>	<i>Description</i>
25/00588/FUL	14 Kings Hedges Road CB4 2PA	Single storey rear extension and internal alterations to existing dwelling and erection of a new detached dwelling to the rear along with associated works
22/05070/FUL	Land To Rear Of 208 And 210 Queen Ediths Way CB1 8NL	Erection of 8 new homes, car parking, landscaping, bin and bike stores and associated works
24/00973/FUL	Land To Rear Of 33-39 Paget Road CB2 9JF	Construction of 4 No. dwellings (comprising 4 x 3-bed units) including demolition of existing garages, widening of existing access from Paget Road and associated landscaping.

- 9.12 The above table are the examples as provided by the agent where policy 52, in their opinion, has been imposed differently. Before exploring these cases, officers would like to note that each case is assessed on its own merits and therefore are not directly comparable within areas of differing contexts.
- 9.13 14 Kings Hedges Road is located 0.4 miles south of the site. Despite being close, 14 Kings Hedges is a different road with its own context. For reference the application was a resubmission of a previous application (23/01744/FUL). Policy 52 was applied in the assessment of this application. The applicant of this application addressed officers' previous concerns regarding scale and massing and its impact on neighbouring properties. Additionally, there was evidence of neighbouring sites which had permission for backland development prior to the determination of this application. 80-82 Lovell Road does not benefit from the same context of 14 Kings Hedges (i.e. surrounding pattern of development), therefore the application of policy 52 at Lovell Road will not result in the same outcomes as that at 14 Kings Hedges Road.
- 9.14 Land To Rear Of 208 And 210 Queen Ediths Way is located 8.8 miles south of 80-82 Lovell Road. The character of the existing dwellings is different to those found on Lovell Road, the access into the site was existing and did not require the removal of land from neighbouring properties to create access and was deemed to have limited impact on residential amenity. In the case of Lovell Road, the proposal would require the removal of land and floor space from existing dwellings to facilitate the access. This creation of an access at Lovell Road poses residential health and safety concerns, which were not posed by the application at Ediths Way, therefore the outcomes of the imposition of policy 52 will be different.
- 9.15 Land To Rear Of 33-39 Paget Road is 10 miles south of 80-82 Lovell Road. Much like the Queen Ediths site, the access to the proposal site of Paget Road was existing as it served a carpark. The proposed dwellings broadly followed the dwellings to the rear of Paget Road on Scotsdowne Road. With an existing access and the context of the area to the rear of Padget Road, the development of the car parking area was considered reasonable. Unlike Lovell Road where a new access is required which poses residential health and safety concerns, which were not posed by the application at Ediths Way, therefore the outcomes of the imposition of policy 52 will be different.
- 9.16 Overall, the contexts of these sites, their individual constraints and opportunities were different from those of 80-82 Lovell Road and as such the application of policy 52 will not allow for the same outcomes to be achieved.

10. Self-Build

- 10.1 The application proposes the erection of a single self-build dwelling. Paragraph 63 of the 'National Planning Policy Framework' (2024) highlights the need for different groups in the community to be assessed and reflected in planning policies, including "people wishing to commission or build their own homes".
- 10.2 Paragraph 73 (b) of the NPPF 2024 states that local planning authorities should seek opportunities, through policies and decisions, to support small sites to come forward for community-led development for housing and self-build and custom-build housing.
- 10.3 The provision of a self-build dwelling is a material consideration to be considered in the determination of the application and weight needs to be given to the delivery of self-build dwellings, should the Council have a shortfall in delivery. The figures of the self-build register with the district are shown below.

Assessment Period	Number of people added to register (within base period)	Permissions Granted (3 years following base period)
Base Period 1: 01/04/16 to 30/10/16	69	69
Base Period 2: 31/10/16 to 30/10/17	89	89
Base Period 3: 31/10/17 to 30/10/18	135	14
Base Period 4: 31/10/18 to 30/10/19	204	64
Base Period 5: 31/10/19 to 30/10/20	157	48

Base Period 6: 31/10/20 to 30/10/21	189	103
Base Period 7: 31/10/21 to 30/10/22	130	-
Base Period 8: 31/10/22 to 30/10/23	82	-
Base Period 9: 31/10/23 to 30/10/24	32	

10.4 The demand for self-build dwellings is measured by the number of new applicants entered on the self-build register in each base period; and that number must be matched by new suitable permissions granted within 3 years of the end of each relevant base period.

10.5 The demand for self-build dwellings is measured by the number of new applicants entered on the self-build register in each base period; and that number must be matched by new suitable permissions granted within 3 years of the end of each relevant base period. The above table shows that the number of applicants on the register from 2016 up to the end of base period 6 on 30 October 2021 was 843. To comply with the Act, suitable permissions should have been granted for 843 self-build dwellings by 30 October 2024.

10.6 The figures show that 387 self-build dwellings were granted permission. This would result in a shortage of 456 plots. As there is a shortfall, there is an identified need for self builds. As the proposal seeks the inclusion of a self-build the development would contribute towards an identified unmet need to self/custom build properties, although the provision of a single dwelling would have a small contribution. In the event of approval, this would be secured by way of a Section 106 Agreement.

10.7 As there is a clear need for self builds within the district, officers would give the provision of this tenure moderate weight, subject to the suitability of other policies within the local plan and National guidance.

11. Design, layout, scale and landscaping

11.1 Policies 55, 56, 57 and 59 seek to ensure that development responds appropriately to its context, is of a high quality, reflects or successfully

contrasts with existing building forms and materials and includes appropriate landscaping and boundary treatment.

- 11.2 The proposed 1.5 storey self-build dwelling will be approximately 6.5m in height. The dwelling will be circa 9.6m in depth (at the deepest) and 11m in width. The dwelling will benefit from materials such as seamed metal roofing, Cambridge brick and grey casement windows/doors. Materials of this nature can be observed on some properties at the beginning of Lovell Road. Despite the proposed material palette not being in keeping with the immediate properties around the site, officers consider the small-scale nature of the dwelling (physically) and that the dwelling will be shielded from the street scene would allow for this palette to be considered acceptable in this location. The proposal would benefit from various soft landscaping normally associated with a development of this type of development, further details of the types of landscaping to be imposed can be secured via condition.
- 11.3 Officers consider the appearance of the dwellings to be responsive to the design of the neighbouring development and would therefore not be out of character with the wider area. However, the pattern of development of the wider site is still an issue. For the reasons stated in paragraphs 9.4 of this report, the proposed development of a dwelling to the rear is considered to be harmful in terms of the character and appearance of the area by virtue of being backland development in this context
- 11.4 The proposal will see the construction of a new access to serve the dwelling. The access will be located between nos.80 and 82 Lovell Road. The access will be circa 3.1m in width and will be accessed via Lovell Road. Visibility splays have been provided from this access which the local highway authority (LHA) consider to be acceptable. The construction of the access results in the removal of the characterful oriel windows of nos 80-82, to allow for taller vehicles (i.e delivery lorries) to use the proposed access track. This removal of the oriel windows will reduce the size of the upstairs bathroom, resulting in the removal of a bath in favour of a shower.
- 11.5 The access road is considered to have direct impacts on the occupants of 80-82 Lovell Road. The access track will be located directly outside the front doors of no.80-82 Lovell Road. Although officers acknowledge vehicles will unlikely be travelling at speed down this access, there remains the possibility occupants will face with travelling vehicles when exiting their homes. This conflict is also present when occupants of nos.80 and 82 will access their bin stores and cycle storage in their rear gardens, in the absence of a designated footway, the proposal fails to prioritise pedestrian safety.
- 11.6 Overall, the proposed development is a high-quality in relation to the design of the dwellings, but the impacts the access road would have on future occupants, the application fails to accord with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 55, 56, 57, 59 and 80, and Paragraphs 117, 135 and 139 of the NPPF (2024).

12. Trees

- 12.1 Policies 59 and 71 seeks to preserve, protect and enhance existing trees and hedges that have amenity value and contribute to the quality and character of the area and provide sufficient space for trees and other vegetation to mature. Paragraph 136 of the NPPF seeks for existing trees to be retained wherever possible.
- 12.2 The Council's Tree Officer has advised that any services required outside of the footprint of the building would increase the impact on the surrounding trees and any such activity will need to be mitigated. Officers consider any potential mitigation required could be secured via condition.
- 12.3 Subject to conditions as appropriate, the proposal would accord with policies 59 and 71 of the Local Plan (2018).

13. Carbon reduction and sustainable design

- 13.1 The Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (2020) sets out a framework for proposals to demonstrate they have been designed to minimise their carbon footprint, energy and water consumption and to ensure they are capable of responding to climate change.
- 13.2 Policy 28 states development should take the available opportunities to integrate the principles of sustainable design and construction into the design of proposals, including issues such as climate change adaptation, carbon reduction and water management. The same policy requires new residential developments to achieve as a minimum water efficiency to 110 litres pp per day and a 44% on site reduction of regulated carbon emissions and for non-residential buildings to achieve full credits for Wat 01 of the BREEAM standard for water efficiency and the minimum requirement associated with BREEAM excellent for carbon emissions.
- 13.3 Policy 29 supports proposals which involve the provision of renewable and / or low carbon generation provided adverse impacts on the environment have been minimised as far as possible.
- 13.4 The application is supported by a design and access statement, which states the proposal will benefit from an air source heat pump and would implement measures to ensure no more than 110 litres of water per person per day would be used. Water butts are also used for external water use. The sustainability department have confirmed the proposal would be in accordance with the relevant local plan policies subject to the imposition of conditions relating to carbon reduction, water efficiency and an informative for water usage.
- 13.5 The department have noted the southwest elevation is highly glazed and as such, recommend the integration of external shading to help mitigate the risk of excess internal solar gains in the summer and shoulder months. Given the orientation the elevation would benefit from both vertical and

horizontal shading, which could be provided via appropriate setting back of the windows in the projecting dormers, noting that the projecting dormers already provide shade to the ground floor. From the drawings, it does appear that a setback has been provided, which is welcomed. It is recommended the use of an external solar blind on the southwest facing roof light, which can be retracted when not required.

- 13.6 The applicants have suitably addressed the issue of sustainability and renewable energy and the proposal is in accordance is compliant with Local Plan policies 28 and 29 and the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2020.

14. Biodiversity

- 14.1 The Environment Act 2021 and the Councils' Biodiversity SPD (2022) requires development proposals to deliver a net gain in biodiversity following a mitigation hierarchy which is focused on avoiding ecological harm over minimising, rectifying, reducing and then off-setting. This approach is embedded within the strategic objectives of the Local Plan and policy 70. Policy 70 states that proposals that harm or disturb populations and habitats should secure achievable mitigation and / or compensatory measures resulting in either no net loss or a net gain of priority habitat and local populations of priority species.
- 14.2 The proposal is for a self-build dwelling. According to the government's exemption list, self-builds do not have to provide the mandatory 10% net gain. However, the proposal would have to provide an ecological enhancement in line with the Councils Biodiversity SPD 2022. Officers consider this could be achieved by condition. As stated in paragraph 9.5, it was reported to officers that the site had been cleared of scrub and trees and there was the potential of the disturbance of a badger sett. While the applicant has confirmed there were no badger setts on site, officers advised the concerned party that as it is illegal to disturb badgers under the Protection of Badgers Act 1992, any activity doing as such should be reported to the police as it is a criminal offence. This is not the responsibility of the council to investigate.
- 14.3 The application has been subject to formal consultation with the Council's Ecology Officer, who raises no objection to the proposal and recommends a condition relating to ecological enhancement.
- 14.4 Taking the above into account, the proposal is compliant with 57, 69 and 70 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

15. Water management and flood risk

- 15.1 Policies 31 and 32 of the Local Plan require developments to have appropriate sustainable foul and surface water drainage systems and minimise flood risk. Paras. 159 – 169 of the NPPF are relevant.
- 15.2 The site is in Flood Zone 1 and is therefore considered at low risk of flooding. While limited information has been provided in terms of water management, officers consider these details could be secured via condition.
- 15.3 Subject to conditions the proposal is in accordance with Local Plan policies 31 and 32 and NPPF advice.

16. Highway safety and transport impacts

- 16.1 Policy 80 supports developments where access via walking, cycling and public transport are prioritised and is accessible for all. Policy 81 states that developments will only be permitted where they do not have an unacceptable transport impact.
- 16.2 Para. 116 of the NPPF advises that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.
- 16.3 The application is supported by a Transport Appraisal. The appraisal advocates the new private drive between 80-82 Lovell Road will serve one dwelling, will comply with design standards and will allow for the emergency vehicle access. The new access can achieve necessary pedestrian visibility splays and thus would have a negligible impact on road safety concerns.
- 16.4 The application has been subject to formal consultation with Cambridgeshire County Council's Local Highways Authority, raise no objection to the proposal subject to conditions as set out under paragraph 6.1.
- 16.5 Subject to conditions as applicable, the proposal accords with the objectives of policy 81 of the Local Plan and is compliant with NPPF advice.
- 16.6 However, officers have concerns with the interaction between the new access road and the existing dwellings. Paragraph 117c of the NPPF states that applications for development should *'create places that are safe, secure and attractive – which minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles'*. As stated previously, the front doors of no.80-82 Lovell Road are accessed from the sides of the dwellings. If implemented the front doors will face directly onto the proposed access road. While officers acknowledge it is unlikely cars will be speeding on this

access road, there will be a conflict of use introduced within this location of the site. Occupants of nos.80-82 will be required to exit their homes with caution to ensure the access will not be in use by a car and will continue to be cautious while walking away from their property due to the lack of footpaths being used. Additionally, the lack of footpaths within the development to these front doors indicates a clear prioritisation of car uses over pedestrian and cycle movements, directly contrary to paragraph 117 (a).

- 16.7 As such officers consider the development fails to prioritise safe pedestrian movements within the site and would be contrary to policy 80 of the Cambridge City Local Plan (2018) and paragraph 117 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).

17. Car and cycle provision

17.1 Cycle Parking

- 17.2 The Cambridge Local Plan (2018) supports development which encourages and prioritises sustainable transport, such as walking, cycling and public transport. Policy 82 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) requires new developments to comply with the cycle parking standards as set out within appendix L which for residential development states that one cycle space should be provided per bedroom for dwellings of up to 3 bedrooms. These spaces should be in a purpose-built area at the front of each dwelling and be at least as convenient as car parking provision. To support the encouragement of sustainable transport, the provision for cargo and electric bikes should be provided on a proportionate basis.

- 17.3 The site will see the provision of cycle storage to the front of the dwelling. The cycle storage will be 2m in depth and 2m in width. In accordance with the cycle parking guide for new residential developments this cycle store would be capable of two cycles rather than the three required for the dwelling. To store three cycles, a store of 2m x 2.2m is required. As this has not been provided, adequate cycle storage on site cannot be secured. However, officers consider these details could be secured via condition.

- 17.4 Subject to conditions, the proposal would provide and integrate adequate cycle storage and is therefore complies with policies 57 and Appendix L of the City Local Plan (2018).

17.5 Car parking

- 17.6 Policy 82 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) requires new developments to comply with, and not exceed, the maximum car parking standards as set

out within appendix L. Outside of the Controlled Parking Zone the maximum standard is no more than 1.5 spaces per dwelling for up to 2 bedrooms and no less than a mean of 0.5 spaces per dwelling up to a maximum of 2 spaces per dwelling for 3 or more bedrooms. Inside the Controlled Parking Zone the maximum standard is no more than one space per dwelling for any dwelling size. Car-free and car-capped development is supported provided the site is within an easily walkable and cyclable distance to a District Centre or the City Centre, has high public transport accessibility and the car-free status can be realistically enforced by planning obligations and/or on-street controls. The Council strongly supports contributions to and provision for car clubs at new developments to help reduce the need for private car parking.

- 17.7 The site is located outside of a controlled parking zone. The dwelling will benefit from two car parking spaces. Officers consider the parking provision for the new dwelling to be acceptable and would allow for parking to be secured outside of the dwelling reducing the reliance on on-street parking.
- 17.8 The Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD outlines the standards for EV charging at one slow charge point for each dwelling with allocated parking, one slow charge point for every two dwellings with communal parking (at least half of all non-allocated parking spaces) and passive provision for all the remaining car parking spaces to provide capability for increasing provision in the future.
- 17.9 Subject to conditions, the car parking is considered to accord with policy 82 of the Local Plan and the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD. The proposed car and cycle parking is compliant with Policy 81 of the Local Plan.

18. Amenity

- 18.1 Policies 35 and 50 seek to preserve the amenity of neighbouring and / or future occupiers in terms of noise and disturbance, overshadowing, overlooking or overbearing and through providing high quality internal and external spaces.

Neighbouring and Proposed Properties

- 18.2 Concerns of overlooking and overbearing has been raised. The proposed dwelling will be located circa 32m from the rear of 80-82 rear dwelling walls and approximately 18m from the rear garden fence. These would be the closest dwellings to the proposed dwelling. The closest gardens will be those belonging to no.84 (circa 11m from rear garden, 34m to no.84) and no.78 (approximately 1.9m from garden, 37m to no.78). The proposed dwelling is a 1.5 storey dwelling. Given the separation distances between

the proposed site and the surrounding dwellings, and the small scale of the dwelling, officers consider the dwelling would not achieve views into neighbouring gardens above and beyond of what is typically expected of dense residential areas. The closest garden boundary to the proposed dwelling is that of no.78 (approximately 1.9m). The garden of no.78 is long (56m). The proposed dwelling will be near the latter part of the garden. No windows are proposed on the side elevations of the proposed dwelling therefore the only opportunity for overlooking would be to the front and rear of the proposed dwelling. As the dwelling will be overlooking the latter part of the garden and would achieve views expected residential areas, officers do not consider the proposal would adversely overlook, overbear or overshadow neighbouring properties.

- 18.3 Concerns of the dwelling being used as house of multiple occupation (HMO) has been raised. The application does not state the dwelling will be used as an HMO and therefore officers are unable to assess the application under these terms.
- 18.4 Traffic and parking concerns have been raised. Lovell Road is a busy road which does not benefit from restricted parking measures. Each dwelling will benefit from at least one car parking space. As officers cannot restrict on street parking officers cannot directly address the parking concerns, however the off-street parking proposed at the new dwelling is considered to ensure on-street parking will not be adversely impacted by the proposed development.
- 18.5 Other concerns relating to pedestrian safety from users of the highway network have been raised. While the issues with the internal pedestrian safety have been addressed in the above report, this concern relates to pedestrians crossing the new proposed access when walking down Lovell Road. The Local Highways Authority have been consulted on the application and consider the visibility splays provided at the mouth of the access is sufficient in addressing pedestrian safety.
- 18.6 Concerns relating to noise, air pollution and dust impact during the construction period and the blockages of Lovell Road from construction vehicles have been raised. Officers consider the construction period to be temporary and can be addressed via condition.
- 18.7 Concerns for the loss of biodiversity from the wider site being stripped has been raised. As this has been done prior to the application had been made officers cannot comment any further than the evidence provided within the submitted ecology reports. The ecology officer has been consulted and considers the ecological measures on site to be appropriate and can be achieved via condition.
- 18.8 There is a level of suspicion of support comments received as these comments have no connection to Lovell Road. The planning system does not discriminate on who can and can't comment, therefore these comments are legitimate and have been considered.

18.9 It has been stated the whole of Lovell road was not notified. To clarify, neighbouring properties that adjoin the submitted red line will have been notified, everyone else will be notified via a site notice which was erected on the 24th of January and the 12th of February 2025. This is as per the Statement of Community Involvement.

18.10 Concerns have been raised that the introduction of dwellings to the rear will promote developers to buy dwellings along Lovell road to do the same and ultimately outbidding families who want family homes has been raised. While the introduction of backland development is a planning matter, the subsequent financial market consequences of this is not a consideration for this application. Officers cannot control the market once permission have been approved.

Future Occupants

18.11 Policy 50 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) requires all new residential units to meet or exceed the Government's Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standards (2015).

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

Unit	Number of bedrooms	Number of bed spaces (persons)	Number of storeys	Policy Size requirement (m ²)	Proposed size of unit	Difference in size
1	3	5	3	99	122	+23

18.13 The table above shows the proposal would be in accordance with policy 50 of the Local Plan.

18.14 Garden Size(s)

18.15 Policy 50 of Cambridge Local Plan (2018) states that all new residential units will be expected to have direct access to an area of private amenity space which should be of a shape, size and location to allow effective and practical use of the intended occupiers.

18.16 The proposed garden space for the new dwelling is considered acceptable.

18.17 Policy 51 requires all new residential units to be of a size, configuration and internal layout to enable Building Regulations requirement part M4(2) accessible. Officers consider this requirement could be delivered via condition.

19. Other matters

19.1 Bins

19.2 Policy 57 requires refuse and recycling to be successfully integrated into proposals. Each property will benefit from an individual bin store. The bin store for the proposed dwelling will be located on the access road, circa 30m from the dwelling and 20m from the road side collection point. This is in accordance with recap. The new bin store from the existing dwellings is not in accordance with recap but as these are not new dwellings it would not be reasonable to impose recap standards on these properties.

19.3 Officers consider the proposal has successfully integrated refuse and recycling into the proposal and is in accordance with policy 57 of the local plan.

20. Planning balance

20.1 Planning decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan unless there are material considerations that indicate otherwise (section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and section 38[6] of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

20.2 Summary of harm

20.3 Planning decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan unless there are material considerations that indicate otherwise (section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and section 38[6] of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

20.4 The proposal would see the introduction of backland development; backland development is not characterful of Lovell Road and would therefore be contrary to the pattern of development of the street. Consequently, the proposal would be contrary to policy 52 of the Cambridge City Local Plan 2018.

20.5 The application fails to demonstrate there would be no harm to neighbouring occupants from the use of the proposed access road in between properties 80-82. The proposed access road fails to prioritise pedestrian movements from nos. 80-82 Lovell Road within the site. The lack of footways, primarily from the front doors of the existing properties which will face onto the access road, is contrary to policies 52, 57 and 80 of the Cambridge City Local Plan 2018 and paragraph 117 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).

20.6 The cycle storage will be 2m in depth and 2m in width. To store three cycles, a store of 2m x 2.2m is required. The proposed store is too small to provide the necessary number of cycles, consequently the proposal fails to provide

cycle storage for the necessary number of cycles. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to policy 81 and Appendix L of the Cambridge City Local Plan (2018).

20.7 Summary of benefits

20.8 The proposal would provide a self-build dwelling which will marginally contribute to addressing the need for this type of build.

20.9 In conclusion, having taken into account the provisions of the development plan, NPPF and NPPG guidance, the views of statutory consultees and wider stakeholders, as well as all other material planning considerations, the proposed development is recommended for refusal.

21. Recommendation

21.1 **Refuse** for the following reasons:

1. The dwellings which face onto Lovell Road benefit from large gardens, few to none have been subdivided. The proposal would introduce backland development which is contrary to the existing pattern of development along Lovell Road. As the proposal would not be appropriate to the surrounding pattern of development and the character of the area the proposal would be contrary to policy 52, 55, 56 and 57 of the Cambridge City Local Plan 2018 and paragraphs 135 and 139 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).
2. The proposal would see the introduction of an access road between no. 80-82 Lovell Road to serve the dwelling to the rear. The front doors of no.80 and 82 will face directly onto this access road. The access road is 4.1m (3.1m of road) in width, this is not enough space to accommodate an access road and footpaths for pedestrians. Therefore, the occupants of no.80-82 will be required to walk on the access road to enter and leave their homes. This would adversely impact the amenity and safety of existing occupants. In terms of parking, the proposed access road will impact ease of access to the existing driveways of no.80-82 Lovell Road. While no.80 benefits from a drop kerb across the entirety of the driveway, no.82 does not. The access road will remove part of the access to this driveway encouraging occupants to drive over the grass verge on the highway. The access road will adversely impact how occupants of the existing dwellings will access their parking spaces. Overall, the conflict the access road poses in terms of existing residential amenity and safety is contrary to policies 52, 57 and 80 of the Cambridge City Local Plan 2018 and paragraph 117 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).