Urban Design Forum
AGENDA
DATE 24/02/2023
Please fill in DM officer name, ref, address of case
DM Admin – Please save to anite and route to applicable officer as 'COMMENT'

Officer/Case	Site Constraints – FZ, CA, LB, TPO's, Related Application?	Actions agreed	UD Officer
HH Formal Consultation: 24/00259/FUL 147A Crosshall Road Eaton Ford St Neots : Erection of four dwellings following demolition of existing detached outbuildings together with associated works (inc new access to serve existing property)		**Context** The application site relates to No. 147a Crosshall Road and previously undeveloped land to the rear. The site has previously been subject to outline planning consent for residential development ref 0502041OUT. It is understood the site was subject to a pre-application enquiry in 2010 (ref 1007947PENQ) however no information is available under this reference on annite. A later withdrawn application (ref 22/01998/FUL) was submitted for the 'Proposed erection of 2 x three storey 5-bedroom detached houses including access, carports and associated parking' on land to the rear of No. 147a. This application proposed using an upgraded access serving Nos. 149 and 149a. Previous Urban Design comments recommended refusal as the 3-storey height of the units would have been contrary to the established character and would have resulted in adverse amenity impacts (overlooking and overbearing impacts) to neighbouring dwellings. The latest application now seeks to demolish No. 147a Crosshall Road and erect a new single storey 4-bed bungalow (Plot 4) in its place with a further 3 4-bed bungalows to the rear (Plots 1-3). A new access is proposed from Crosshall Road, between the existing accesses serving No. 147a (which is to be used to serve Plot 4) and No. 149. Plot 4 includes an integral garage, whilst Plots 1-3 include separate detached double garages. The site is located within the St Neots Conservation Area and boarders the rear gardens of Nos. 149 and 149a Crosshall Road to the north, No. 147 Crosshall Road to the east, Nos. 1-7 Stevenson Court to the south and 20-24 Milton Avenue to the east. Comments on the impact to the character and appearance of the conservation area should be sought from Conservation colleagues in the first instance. The site slopes west to east towards the river from approximately 28.84m AOD to 17.30 AOD as shown on the Topographical Survey dwg ASC.24.365. Crosshall Road is characterised by loose grain detached dwellings set within generous plots, with significant vegetation and tree planting reinforcing the green and verdant character of the conservation area. Units are setback from the road behind front gardens and landscaping with large gardens extending to the rear. There have been limited proposals for back land / infill development to the rear of Nos. 149 and 151 (Nos. 149a and 151a), however these maintain the established character and feature tree planting between plots and generous rear	**MP**

gardens.

Properties within Stevenson Court to the south and Milton Avenue to the east comprise a finer grain character of detached dwellings with narrower gaps between units, setback behind front gardens and parking with approximately 13-17m deep rear gardens backing onto the application site.

Proposals
Note the submitted Design and Access Statement (including Heritage statement) only includes the first two pages and a complete copy should be provided.

The proposals include a loss of taller mature Poplar, Western Red Cedar and Sycamore trees as well as Layland Cypress trees abutting the northern, western and southern boundary from the site. It is noted that trees A001, G002, G004, G005, G007, G008, G009, G010, G011, G012, G014, G015, G016, G017, G018 and T001 were approved for felling as part of application 24/01243/TRCA. The submitted Arboricultural report now includes the additional felling of trees A002, G001, G003, G006, G020, G021, H001, H002, H003, H004, H005, T001-T022 and T024 to accommodate the development. Comments on the loss of these trees and the proposed landscaping set out within Tree and Hedge Planting Framework should be sought from Tree and Landscape colleagues in the first instance. Note the proposed Site Layout Plan shows trees to be retained which are proposed to be removed within the AIA documentation. Urban Design are concerned the significant loss of vegetation, particularly adjacent to the northern boundary between Nos. 147a, 149 and 149a, and to the site frontage will impact the green and verdant character of Crosshall Road.

Urban Design raise the following comments and observations:

- Access – the proposals introduce a new access between the existing driveway for No. 147a and the access road leading to Nos. 149 and 149a which extends westwards into the site terminating in a large turning head that abuts the northern site boundary. The arrangement of the access and turning head results in a significant loss of tree planting / vegetation across the northern site boundary and gaps between proposed sections of planting.

- The garage for Plot 2 forms a poor vista stop at the end of the access. vistas should be terminated by dwellings or soft landscaping. The garages associated with Plots 1 and 2 should be aligned with, or setback from the building frontage in accordance with the HDC Design Guide SPD page 94.

- Plots 3 and 4 feature 6.4m and 9m deep gardens respectively and form uncharacteristically small rear gardens compared to adjacent existing dwellings within Crosshall Road, Stevenson Court and Milton Avenue.

- Plot 4 features an integral garage and whilst this reflects the arrangement of the existing integral garage within No. 147, the proposed garage would project approximately 2.3m forward of the dwelling and would dominate and detract from the appearance of the dwelling. Furthermore, the plans and elevations for Plot 4 do not correctly show the level of the integral garage. The garage would be required have a lower GF FFL to relate to the parking / driveway (19.325m AOD), compared to the GF FFL of the dwelling (20.30m).

Amendments are required to address the above concerns. There is an opportunity to setback the access behind soft landscaping and tree planting, retaining the landscaping buffer between Nos. 147a and 149. It is recommended that Plots 1-3 are orientated to face north, fronting the access with south facing rear gardens. A shallower house type should be provided for Plot 3 to increase the rear garden depth. Garages should be located between Plots and setback behind the building line to incorporate the turning head. The integral garage for Plot 4 should either be setback from the frontage or detached and located to the rear of the dwelling.

Recommended amendments (without prejudice):



Other comments:

- Massing - The proposed units all form large footprint single storey bungalows with consistent 2460mm eaves heights and a mixture of 5650mm (Plots 1 and 2), 5320mm (Plot 3) and 5940mm (Plot 4) ridge heights (measured above DPC level). The overall height is supported and resolves adverse amenity impacts highlighted in comments on the previous withdrawn application.

- The units have broadly similar footprints and appearance and form a variation of the same H-shaped footprint with hipped roofs and lower hipped roofs over the front and rear gable projections. Elevations show a mixture of buff facing brickwork, grey roof tiles, exposed rafter feet eaves detailing and white single, double and triple casement windows. The appearance of the units is accepatble. Details of the facing brick, roof tile, window reveal depth and location and colour of flues, vent extracts and meter boxes should be confirmed by way of condition.

		• Boundary Treatments need to be confirmed, particularly those in front of Plots 2 and to the north of Plot 1. The boundary to the west of Plot 3 appears to form a retaining wall given the approximately 1.6m level difference between the dwelling / patio and the parking space – details of this wall need to be provided. A similar retaining wall appears to be proposed surrounding the rear garden of Plot 4. • Refuse collection arrangements should be confirmed – no tracking details have been provided (other than for a fire appliance) and as such it is assumed refuse collection will take place from Crosshall Road, however no collection point is indicated. The arrangement of units means Plots 1 and 2 towards the rear of the site would have upwards of 50m drag distance to reach the collection point, significantly further than the recommended 30m drag distance for a resident to bin to the collection point / kerbside as set out within the HDC Refuse Collection Checklist. • Refuse storage points should be confirmed. In the current arrangement a level access path should be provided to from the rear gardens of Plot 3 and 4 to the access road to improve maintenance access to the rear garden and facilitate the removal of wheelie bins. It is unacceptable to require future occupants to manoeuvre wheelie bins up a flight of stairs. • Full levels details should be provided by way of condition and include finished ground levels of all parking areas, footpaths and gardens. • The internal dimensions of the integral double garage for Plot 4 (6.3m x 6m) and detached double garages for Plots 1-3 (5.75m x 6.1m) are accepatble and accord with the minimum dimensions for double garages set out within HDC Design Guide SPD 2017. It is noted that each dwelling has a driveway and as such the garages are not required to be dedicated parking spaces and could accommodate cycle storage. **Recommendations:** seek amendments to site layout as set out above.	
HH Formal Consultation: 25/00150/FUL Land Rear Of 27 Ravenshoe Godmanchester Proposed Self Build erection of 1 x 3 bedroom dwelling including formation of new access off the		The application follows approval of 23/02059/FUL for the erection of a two storey 3-bed dwelling, prior to this the site had planning in principle approval for one dwelling under application ref 20/02240/PIP. The revised scheme seeks the erection of a 3-bed self-build dwelling and forms a similar length and width to the previous approved application, with a narrow gable frontage and deep floor plan. The dwelling maintains the 8m setback from the site boundary with the A1198, with a tandem driveway and single garage positioned to the south / left hand side of the dwelling. The amendments include squaring of the kitchen/dining area to the rear of the dwelling together with amendments to the arrangement of windows. The revised proposals maintain three bedrooms; however the ridge height has increased from 7.1m to 9.4m creating a 2.5 storey dwelling, with bedroom 3 together with a walk in wardrobe and ensuite bathroom now located within the pitched roof space. The taller ridge height is considered accepatble and the proposed dwelling would still sit below the ridge height of the adjacent 2 storey Plots 19-24 within the 20/00505/REM development to the	**MP**

A1198.		south owning to the level changes across the site frontage as shown on the street scene contained on dwg H10160/01D. The 2.5 storey height is also consistent with the 2.5 storey gable fronted dwelling further south, on the opposite side of the A1198 within the Romans Edge development. The revised proposals also include a single detached garage positioned to the rear of the tandem parking. This has an internal measurement of 7m x 3m and accords with the HDC Design Guide SPD requirements for single garages and is sufficient to accommodate both a parked car together with the necessary cycle parking for the dwelling. Elevations include Grantchester Blend facing bricks, Sandtoft old English Pantile antique slate roof tiles, anthracite grey roof tiles and black UPVC roof tiles. The white render previously included for the front and rear gable elevations of the 23/02059/FUL application have been replaced with facing bricks in accordance with previous recommendations. However, as raised in previous comments the TBS Grantchester Blend forms a red-multi facing brick, whereas a gault/multi-buff facing brick is required to reflect the predominantly buff appearance of units immediately to the south (within Pippin Close) and opposite (within the Romans Edge development). The proposals include first floor bathroom and ensuite windows on the north elevation – these should be opaque glazed and fitting with opening restrictors to prevent overlooking to the rear garden of No. 25 Ravenshoe to the north and improve piracy. The second floor rooflights are missing from the building section but would appear to allow high level overlooking to neighbouring rear gardens of Nos. 25 and 29 Ravenshoe. These rooflights should be fitted with obscured glazing. The application is acceptable in design terms subject to conditions to agree materials, boundary treatments, opaque glazing and hard and soft landscaping.	

For PENQS: The above comments represent informal officer views and are therefore without prejudice to the determination of any planning application should one be submitted. Furthermore the views expressed will not bind the decision of Members should a planning application be submitted, nor prejudice the formal decision making process of the council.