

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING – 28 July 04**

### **Committee Additional Sheet**

#### **Planning Applications**

ITEM: 2      APPLICATION REF: C/04/0510/FP

Location: Cambridge College for Further Education, Young Street

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

#### Reasons for Refusal

1. The proposed development by virtue of its scale and massing, its design and detailing, landscaping and the materials of its construction fails to respect the constraints of the site or to relate well to the character of the surrounding area. In particular the development introduces an over-articulated building style that lacks the coherence of the traditional terraced forms which are the predominate building form in the area, fails to respond to the scale and massing of buildings within and adjacent to the site, incorporates a landscaped area which fails to relate well to its surroundings or to demonstrate its long term contribution to the streetscene and introduces a mixture of materials that does not reflect the homogenous nature of building materials in the area. For these reasons, the proposals fails to accord with Structure Plan Policies P1/2, P1/3 & P7/6, Local Plan Policies BE1, BE2, BE4 and BE32, the Housing Development and Design Guide (2001) in terms of design and layout, and government guidance contained in PPG3 Housing (2000) and PPG15 Planning and the Historic Environment (1994).
2. The use of glass blocks to the ground floor street elevations of the proposed dwellings results in a 'dead frontage' which would not make a positive contribution to this part of the Conservation Area and which would restrict opportunities for natural surveillance to the detriment of crime prevention. In so doing the development fails to present a high standard of design and layout and does not constitute excellence in urban design. For these reasons, the proposals fail to accord with Structure Plan Policies P1/2, P1/3 & P7/6, Local Plan Policies BE1, BE2, BE4, BE15 and BE32, the Housing Development and Design Guide (2001) in terms of design and layout, and government guidance contained in PPG3 Housing (2000) and PPG15 Planning and the Historic Environment (1994).
3. The proposed pedestrian access arrangements to serve the development would be likely to provide opportunities for anti-social activities which would increase the fear of crime and have a detrimental affect on the residential amenity of future occupiers of the development. In so doing the development fails to present a high

standard of design and layout and does not constitute excellence in urban design. For these reasons, the proposals fail to accord with Structure Plan Policies P1/2, P1/3 & P7/6, Local Plan Policies BE1, BE2, BE4, BE15 and BE32, and supplementary planning guidance in the form of the Housing Development and Design Guide (2001) in terms of design and layout, and government guidance contained in PPG3 Housing (2000), PPG15 Planning and the Historic Environment (1994), and PPG1 General Policies and Principle (1997) which advises that development should be judged against the yardsticks of good neighbourliness and fairness.

4. The proposed individual vehicular accesses fail to provide adequate visibility splays and their use would be likely to have an adverse impact on highway safety. In the absence of any justification for a reduction in the scale of visibility splays or evidence that highway safety will not be prejudiced the proposal is contrary to policy P1/3 of the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Structure Plan (2003) and Policy TR27 of the Cambridge Local Plan (1996).
5. The proposed garages are of insufficient width to allow them to be accessed by drivers and in consequence are unlikely to be used, leading to increased pressure on on-street parking in an area where competition for the use of such parking is high. For this reason, the proposals fail to accord with Local Plan Policy TR22, and Supplementary Planning Guidance in the form of the Cambridge City Council Car & Cycle Parking Standards (2003).
6. The proposed development incorporates a vertical storage system for bicycles. In the absence of any evidence to demonstrate that the cycle parking system will be user friendly and secure, the proposal fails to comply with Local Plan Policy TR18, and Supplementary Planning Guidance in the form of the Cambridge City Council Car & Cycle Parking Standards (2003).
7. The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for public open space, community development facilities, education and life-long learning facilities, transport mitigation measures, public art, in accordance with the following policies, standards and proposals RL3, RL4, RL26, TR2 & TR3, CS3 and RL26 of the Cambridge Local Plan 1996; and policies P6/1 P8/2, P8/3, P9/9 and P9/8 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003; and as detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy 2002, Eastern Corridor Area Transport Plan 2002, Provision of Public Art as Part of New Development Schemes 2002, Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation of Open Space Standards 2002, adopted as supplementary planning guidance by Cambridge City Council.

To Note: Additional comments from Head of Engineering Services (on behalf of the Highway Authority)

The issue raised in Reason for Refusal 4, above, would require a redesign of part of the frontage to remove obstacles within the visibility splay.

Regarding the issue raised in Reason for Refusal 5, above, the size of garage complies with guidance for minimum sizes of parking spaces, but these would normally exist side by side with other spaces and a certain degree of shared space would exist to open doors. The constrained nature of the manoeuvring space exacerbates this problem. The alternative result may be that people use smaller cars, but given that this is the sole space for a family car serving a dwelling with many bedrooms, this is less likely.

ITEM: 3      APPLICATION REF: C/04/0511/FP

Location: Cambridge College for Further Education, Young Street

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

#### Reasons for Refusal

1. The proposed development by virtue of its scale and massing, its design and detailing and the materials of its construction fails to respect the constraints of the site or to relate well to the character of the surrounding area. In particular the development fails to satisfactorily address the changing scale of development in the vicinity of the site, to emphasise the corner of New Street and Sturton Street, to respond to the scale and massing of adjacent buildings and introduces a mixture of materials that does not reflect the homogenous nature of building materials in the area. For these reasons, the proposals fails to accord with Structure Plan Policies P1/2, P1/3 & P7/6, Local Plan Policies BE1, BE2, BE4 and BE32, the Housing Development and Design Guide (2001) in terms of design and layout, and government guidance contained in PPG3 Housing (2000) and PPG15 Planning and the Historic Environment (1994).
2. The proposed development fails to make acceptable provision for access by disabled people to the proposed dwellings. In so doing the development fails to present a high standard of design and layout and does not constitute excellence in urban design. For these reasons, the proposals fails to accord with Structure Plan Policies P1/2, P1/3 & P7/6, Local Plan Policies BE1 and BE2.
3. The proposed development by virtue of the juxtaposition of buildings, the incorporation of balconies, the location of private open space and the position of the vehicular access, would result in a poor level of residential amenity for future occupiers resulting from overlooking and noise, fumes and disturbance. In so doing the proposed development fails to respect the constraints of the site and does not constitute excellence in urban design. For these reasons the proposal fails to

comply with Structure Plan Policy P1/3 Local Plan Policies BE1, BE2, and Supplementary Planning Guidance in the form of the Housing Development and Design Guide (2001). The proposal is also contrary to government guidance contained in PPG3 Housing (2000) and PPG1 General Policies and Principle (1997) that advises that development should be judged against the yardsticks of good neighbourliness and fairness.

4. The proximity of the front door of plot 4 to the car park entrance would result in conflict between pedestrians and vehicles to the detriment of highway safety and residential amenity of future occupiers of the development. In so doing the development fails to present a high standard of design and layout and does not constitute excellence in urban design. For these reasons, the proposal fails to comply with Structure Plan Policy P1/3 Local Plan Policies BE1, BE2, and Supplementary Planning Guidance in the form of the Housing Development and Design Guide (2001). The proposal is also contrary to government guidance contained in PPG3 Housing (2000) and PPG1 General Policies and Principle (1997) which advises that development should be judged against the yardsticks of good neighbourliness and fairness
5. The proposed boundary treatment at the junction of New Street and Sturton Street will form an obstacle in the public highway to the detriment of highway safety. In the absence of any justification for the proposed form of boundary treatment or evidence that highway safety will not be prejudiced the proposal is contrary to Policy P1/3 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003) and Policy TR27 of the Cambridge Local Plan (1996).
6. The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for public open space, community development facilities, education and life-long learning facilities, transport mitigation measures, public art, in accordance with the following policies, standards and proposals RL3, RL4, RL26, TR2 & TR3, CS3 and RL26 of the Cambridge Local Plan 1996; and policies P6/1 P8/2, P8/3, P9/9 and P9/8 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003; and as detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy 2002, Eastern Corridor Area Transport Plan 2002, Provision of Public Art as Part of New Development Schemes 2002, Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation of Open Space Standards 2002, adopted as supplementary planning guidance by Cambridge City Council.

To Note: Additional comments from Head of Engineering Services (on behalf of the Highway Authority)

Regarding the issue raised in Reason for Refusal 5, above, this could be overcome by straightening the fenceline, to remove the kink.