

Application Number	09/1015/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	30th October 2009	Officer	Miss Amy Lack
Target Date	25th December 2009		
Ward	Queen Ediths		
Site	52 Glebe Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 7SZ		
Proposal Applicant	Replacement dwellinghouse following demolition Mr & Mrs Liam Collins 52 Glebe Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 7SZ		

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 52 Glebe Road is a detached, two-storey, three bedroom dwelling, standing on the south side of the street, approximately 70 metres east of and on the opposite side of the road from, Baldock Way. The house is rendered and painted grey with a pitched concrete tile roof. There is planting in the front and rear gardens. The plot has frontage to the road of approximately 13 metres and a depth of about 70 metres.
- 1.2 The street is residential in character, with a mix of detached, semi-detached and terrace dwellings on a staggered building line, no one type of dwelling is predominant but buildings are largely two storeys in height, with pitched roofs and 'traditional' in design. The houses to the west are generally more substantial, semi-detached or detached dwellings, those to the east generally a little smaller with more terraced property.
- 1.3 Immediately to the east is another detached house (no. 50), with a projecting bay window under a small gable above which is a hipped roof facing the street; to the rear it has been extended by the addition of a two-storey 'wing' away from the boundary with 52, with a single storey element between that and the boundary with 52 and behind the two storey 'wing' another single storey addition. To the west is a pair of semi detached

houses with small front wings projecting wings at the outside and hipped roofs rising away from the 'outside' boundaries. A flat roof garage stands between the side of the house (no 54) and the common boundary with 52, projecting slightly forward of the main dwelling.

- 1.4 There are individual access points to each of the dwellings and areas of lawn and hardstanding for cars between the houses and the road. All have some hedging on the front boundary and more substantial planting between the house and the street.
- 1.5 The site does not fall within a City of Cambridge Conservation Area, nor is it located within the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ).

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a replacement dwellinghouse, with accommodation on three floors. The ground floor accommodates an open plan kitchen, dining and living area, a utility room, an inner and outer lobby, a toilet and a study; the first and second floor levels provide seven bedrooms, three bathrooms, and a utility/laundry room. Minor changes have been made to the proposal removing a flue and illustrating cycle and refuse storage proposals.
- 2.2 The building has a maximum width of 10.6 metres and a maximum depth of 19.5 metres. It comprises:
 - a front, single storey element, set back approximately 6 metres from the public highway, which is 2.2m deep and 4.2m wide (under a 5m wide mono-pitch roof rising, east to west, from 2.6m to 4.0m) providing a lobby and toilet; on the west side of this is an entrance canopy falling (east to west - from about 3.1 to 2.6m).
 - a first floor element projecting 0.5m forward of the front line of the neighbour at No.50; this is 14m deep in total, but on the east side, adjacent to no.50, it is 10.6m long (at a distance of 1.9m off the common boundary) before stepping away a further 1.4m from that boundary before projecting another 3.4m south, into the garden. Again there is an overhanging mono-pitch roof rising east to west, from 4.75m to 6.9m, and is only 1.2m off the boundary with no. 50.

- a third floor element 10.6m long and 5.2m wide, set 3.35m off the common boundary and flank of 50. Again, there is an overhanging mono-pitch roof rising east to west, which comes to within 2.6m of no.50, that rises from 7.5m to about 9m, east to west;

- at the north-west corner of the building is a slightly taller 'tower', set back a bit further from the road than the two-storey element, that is 4metres wide and 4.2m deep. It projects about a metre forward of the neighbour to the west no. 54 and again has a mono-pitch roof form (this time rising west to east - from about 8.3m to 9.7m). This element is set about 2.0m from no.54.

To the rear at ground and first floor levels the pitches come together to provide a shallow but conventional roof form. Details of bicycle and bin storage along the eastern side of the building are also shown

2.3 The materials to be used for the exterior are a mixture of render, wood and slate panels, with slate panels for the roof and dark grey aluminium frame glazing.

2.4 The application is accompanied by a Design and Access Statement

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
09/0635/FUL	Erection of a three-storey, flat roof dwelling.	REFUSED
C/03/0708	Erection of two storey front and rear extensions and single storey side extension	A/C
C/81/0092	The erection of a detached bungalow	REF
C/72/0811	Outline application for the erection of one pair semi-detached houses or bungalows	REF

The previous application 09/0635/FUL was refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed replacement dwelling is unacceptable in that it would introduce a large, alien, flat roof form with a very pronounced overhang, which would occupy almost the full width of what is a relatively narrow site. There is little in the design submitted that demonstrates that the site has responded positively to the local character and its context, or drawn inspiration from its surroundings. Instead of proposing a new building that will have a positive impact on its setting, the height, width, massing, detailing and materials proposed will all have a negative impact on the local townscape, and in appearing cramped and intrusive will also detract from the street scene. The proposal constitutes poor design and for this and the reasons given above is contrary to the East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV7, to policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and to advice in Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development (2005).
2. The proposed replacement dwelling is unacceptable because the height and mass and the large flat roof with its pronounced overhang, in such proximity to the neighbouring common boundaries, would unduly dominate and be overbearing in its relationship with the neighbouring properties to the east and west. The proposal would as a consequence cause the occupiers of those dwellings to suffer an unreasonable sense of enclosure and an unacceptable loss of the amenity they should reasonably expect to enjoy. The proposal will not have positive impact on its setting and is out of context with its surroundings. For these reasons the proposal constitutes poor design and is contrary to the East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV7, to policies 3/4 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and to advice in Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development (2005).

4.0 PUBLICITY

4.1 Advertisement:	No
Adjoining Owners:	Yes
Site Notice Displayed:	No

5.0 POLICY

5.1 Central Government Advice

5.2 **Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development (2005):**

Paragraphs 7 and 8 state that national policies and regional and local development plans (regional spatial strategies and local development frameworks) provide the framework for planning for sustainable development and for development to be managed effectively. This plan-led system, and the certainty and predictability it aims to provide, is central to planning and plays the key role in integrating sustainable development objectives. Where the development plan contains relevant policies, applications for planning permission should be determined in line with the plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

5.3 **Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing (2006):**

Sets out to deliver housing which is: of high quality and is well designed; that provides a mix of housing, both market and affordable, particularly in terms of tenure and price; supports a wide variety of households in all areas; sufficient in quantity taking into account need and demand and which improves choice; sustainable in terms of location and which offers a good range of community facilities with good access to jobs, services and infrastructure; efficient and effective in the use of land, including the re-use of previously developed land, where appropriate. The statement promotes housing policies that are based on Strategic Housing Market Assessments that should inform the affordable housing % target, including the size and type of affordable housing required, and the likely profile of household types requiring market housing, including families with children, single persons and couples. The guidance states that LPA's may wish to set out a range of densities across the plan area rather than one broad density range. 30 dwellings per hectare is set out as an indicative minimum. Paragraph 50 states that the density of existing development should not dictate that of new housing by stifling change or requiring replication of existing style or form. Applicants are encouraged to demonstrate a positive approach to renewable energy and sustainable development.

5.4 **Planning Policy Statement 22: Renewable Energy (2004):**

Provides policy advice to promote and encourage the

development of renewable energy sources. Local planning authorities should recognise the full range of renewable energy sources, their differing characteristics, location requirements and the potential for exploiting them subject to appropriate environmental safeguards.

5.5 Planning Policy Statement 25: Development and Flood Risk

(2006): States that flood risk should be taken into account at all stages in the planning process to avoid inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding, and that development should be directed away from areas at highest risk. It states that development in areas of flood risk should only be permitted when there are no reasonably available sites in areas of lower flood risk and benefits of the development outweigh the risks from flooding.

5.6 Circular 11/95 – The Use of Conditions in Planning

Permissions: Advises that conditions should be necessary, relevant to planning, relevant to the development permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects.

5.7 East of England Plan 2008

SS1 Achieving sustainable development
T14 Parking
ENV7 Quality in the built environment
WM6 Waste management in development

5.8 Cambridge Local Plan 2006

3/1 Sustainable development
3/4 Responding to context
3/7 Creating successful places
3/11 The design of external spaces
3/12 The design of new buildings
5/1 Housing provision
8/2 Transport impact
8/4 Walking and Cycling accessibility
8/6 Cycle parking
8/10 Off-street car parking

5.9 Supplementary Planning Documents

Cambridge City Council (May 2007) – Sustainable Design and Construction: Sets out essential and recommended design considerations of relevance to sustainable design and construction. Applicants for major developments are required to submit a sustainability checklist along with a corresponding sustainability statement that should set out information indicated in the checklist. Essential design considerations relate directly to specific policies in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. Recommended considerations are ones that the council would like to see in major developments. Essential design considerations are urban design, transport, movement and accessibility, sustainable drainage (urban extensions), energy, recycling and waste facilities, biodiversity and pollution. Recommended design considerations are climate change adaptation, water, materials and construction waste and historic environment.

5.10 Material Considerations

Biodiversity Checklist for Land Use Planners in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (March 2001) - This document aims to aid strategic and development control planners when considering biodiversity in both policy development and dealing with planning proposals.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Engineering)

- 6.1 No Objection is made, but detail of the car parking spaces is requested and advice given that they should be surfaces in a bound material to prevent loose material being transported onto the highway. Informatives are also suggested.

Head of Environmental Services

- 6.2 No objection, but an hours of operation condition is suggested.

Cambridge City Council Access Officer

- 6.3 Recognises the particular needs of the applicant – but has some concerns about the lifetime homes issue.
- 6.4 The above responses are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the consultation responses can be inspected on the application file.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

- 7.1 Two representations have been received. The representations can be summarised as follows:

50 Glebe Road

- 7.2 The occupiers of 50 Glebe Road have written objecting to the demolition of the existing dwelling and its replacement by what is proposed. They bought their house in August 2009 unaware of the previous application (09/0635/FUL) but when they became aware were relieved it was refused as it would have overlooked and overshadowed their house and caused great loss of privacy.

- 7.3 The view taken is that the current proposal has not overcome the two principal reasons identified on the previous report. The proposal is still substantially too large, projecting considerably forwards /backwards of the front/rear of the neighbours to either side. The single storey rear projection to the rear of their property adjacent to the dining room has one velux and one french door and the sunlight to them will be severely affected by the new three-storey dwelling. A large number of windows and doors will overlook the dining room and reception room, both of which are single storey and to the rear, causing loss of privacy. In summary, the depth, height and mass will overshadow, cause a loss of sunlight, an unreasonable sense of enclosure and an unacceptable loss of the amenity.

54 Glebe Road

- 7.4 The owners/occupiers of 54 Glebe Road have written to support this proposal, favouring it over not only the earlier refusal of a new house (09/0635/FUL), but also the earlier approval of substantial extensions (C/03/0708)

7.5 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 and from my inspection of the site and the surroundings, I consider that the main issues are:

1. Principle of development
2. Context of site, design and external spaces
3. Renewable energy and sustainability
4. Disabled access
5. Residential amenity
6. Refuse arrangements
7. Highway safety
8. Car and cycle parking
9. Third party representations
10. Planning Obligation Strategy

Principle of Development

8.2 This proposal is for a one-for-one replacement of an existing dwelling, within an established residential area. The principle of residential development is, in my view, firmly established, and there can be no objection to the proposal, in broad policy terms, to a new dwelling on this site though there are sustainability issues in such replacement.

8.3 Given the context of the site in an urban area with good service provision, I consider that the principle of additional residential use on the site is appropriate, and would be in accordance with policy 5/1. It is nonetheless necessary to test the specific proposal against other policies and among these policies 3/1, 3/4, 3/7, 3/12, are significant and will have to be addressed.

Context of site, design and external spaces

8.4 There is a mix of styles, types and scale of housing along Glebe Road and the immediate surrounding residential area, but the essential character is of 20th Century dwellings of different sizes and styles, but in what can broadly be described as being 'traditional' in appearance.

8.5 Examples of new dwellings that are not of traditional design and which have been erected following (or not) the demolition of

previous dwellings, but which sit alongside dwellings of 'traditional' design in the area have been appraised in the accompanying Design and Access Statement. The statement explains how new can sit comfortably with old. That is not, of itself, the issue. There are examples locally of new buildings that have been introduced to sites adjacent to existing more traditional buildings, which have worked well and added to the street scene. However, in looking at any site it is not only design that is material, but also the scale and mass of what is proposed and those issues have to be considered in the context of the particular site. The last proposal on this site was considered unacceptable because of its mass and particularly the scale and form of the top mansard roof element and the depth of the parts of the building at two or three storey height (about 20m and 17m respectively). This application is very different and must be considered on its own merits and in its particular context.

- 8.6 There is a personal issue in this particular case because of the needs of the clients and their large family, but that cannot be the overriding consideration. A previous proposal for a considerable extension to the property for the previous owners was approved, but that does not meet the need of the current occupants. That previous planning application to extend the property, reference 03/0708/FUL, granted permission to considerably increase the footprint of the existing property of 61.8metres² (+ garage = 75) to about 138metres². The overall proposal was two storeys in height with what would be regarded as a conventional roof form.
- 8.7 The most recent, refused, replacement dwelling (09/0635/FUL) proposed a footprint of about 159 sq metres in a three-storey form with a mansard roof and a flat cap. In order to provide the accommodation required, and despite the very considerable increase in footprint, it was only possible to achieve what was sought by means of a roof form that was not characteristic and was massive. The mansard roof was 18 metres long (at the base – 16.5m at the top), rising from about 5.7 m to 8 m in height. Although efforts had been made to try and mitigate its likely impact by reducing the width of the building as it stepped away from the road, the overall mass was still excessive and demonstrated that the scheme was fundamentally flawed and seeking to put too much on the site.

- 8.8 The current scheme has increased the footprint yet again, this time to about 165sq metres, but in doing so has fundamentally changed its relationship to its neighbours. Although the 2 storey element of the building does project 0.5m forward of the neighbour at 50, and the three-storey 'tower' element 1.0m forward of the garage to 54, I do not consider that either that, of itself, or the single storey entrance, which is substantially further from both properties and another 2.2m forward into the street, has a material impact upon the neighbours or the street. What is more I do not consider it to intrude into the street scene in the manner of the previous proposal, where the first 2 storeys stood 2.6m forward and the top floor 2m forward of no.50.
- 8.9 What is more, instead of some hybrid mansard roof form, what is now proposed is a clearly modern form, with interacting mono-pitch roof forms at different levels, which although at its highest point in the 'tower' is about 900mm higher than no. 54, is helped in street scene terms by that roof form being only 5m deep, the back thereby aligning with the main body of no.54, but at the same time masking the much narrower three - and only slightly narrower two- storey element behind, when seen from the west. From the east the mono-pitch forms step up through three layers, but also at first and second floor level step away from the boundary with No.50.
- 8.10 The principle of a single storey front bay is acceptable and not untypical of many other houses in the street. The eaves and top edge line of the two-storey element are lower than the adjacent houses, though clearly the tower and three-storey element are higher. It is however how those roof profiles work together, with the relatively shallow pitch, and the relatively narrow element under most of the roofs, and the tower form at the corner will give the proposal as a whole an entity, and which will, in my view I feel will have a positive impact in terms of the location and wider townscape impact.
- 8.11 In terms of the windows, I think that there is more work to be done because while they give a strong vertical emphasis I think the detailing, the balance of glazing and panelling needs too be considered further. They do not however, look industrial which was the case with the previous application. This matter can however be addressed buy condition (Condition 8).

- 8.12 The materials proposed are a mix of brick, render and timber, under what will probably be a zinc roof. Many of the houses have a mixture of brick and render and having some timber at the upper level will, in my view, be positive. Again the detail can be addressed by condition (Condition 2), but the balance currently shown looks to me to be appropriate.
- 8.13 For the reasons set out above, I do not consider that this proposal will appear cramped and intrusive, which was my view of the previous scheme, nor that it will detract from the street scene, but that it will create a good relationship between new and existing and that it would sit well in its context.
- 8.14 In my opinion the proposal is in conflict with East of England Plan (2008) policy ENV7, and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/12.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

- 8.15 The proposal has potential amenity implications for residents across the street and for those to either side of No.52. Those across the street will not in my view suffer any material adverse impact, as there is only one non-landing/stair window at second storey level and as the distance across the street is at least 30m, I do not think that any possible overlooking would be materially different from that already experienced.
- 8.16 In the west elevation, facing the flank of 54, two windows are shown at each level. Those on the ground floor will have no material impact on the neighbours because of the boundary treatment; those on the top floor will have no material impact because they are high level with the bottom of the glazing about 2.5 m above finished floor level. The windows at first floor level give me most cause for concern, but because of the very acute angle required to look back into the neighbouring garden, which could only really be achieved by someone with the nose pressed to the window, and the fact that the bottom of the glazing is about 1.4m above finished floor level, I do not think the potential impact is sufficient to warrant refusal.
- 8.17 In the east elevation there are one door and one ground floor flank window serving a utility room and kitchen; three windows at first floor, serving a laundry, bathroom and bedroom; and two bathroom windows at second floor level. At ground floor I do

not consider the door to the utility room will cause a problem, as it will be a space relatively little used and opens onto the blank flank wall of the house, while the kitchen window glazing is at least 1.5 above finished floor level and looks to the blank flank wall of the rear extension to No.50; the windows at first and second floor level can be obscure glazed without any loss of amenity, save for the window serving 'Luke's room'. This window could however be obscure glazed, if the rear-facing window in the same room was made deeper to allow more light into the room and a 900mm deep screen the height of the window introduced, precluding overlooking of the immediate neighbour. This has been suggested to the applicant who accepts such a solution.

8.18 In terms of massing I consider that the current proposal is a significant improvement over what was promoted through the last, refused application. That said, what is proposed is very substantial and the overall height has certainly increased. Most of the two and three storey elements overlap with the neighbouring house, 50, which has a rather more than approximately 10.8m long blank flank wall as the boundary with the application site, on the common boundary; about 7.5m metres is two-storey, the rear 3.3 metres, single storey. The two storey element of what is proposed that is closest to that boundary is 10.5m long, with 0.5 m forward of no 50. At the southern end of that 10.5m, the building steps away from the boundary by a further 1.4m (a little over 3.0m in all), and extends a further 3.4m (3.8m including the overhang) into the rear garden at first floor level; at second floor level the new house is 3.4 m away from the common boundary and extends 1.2 metres (1.6m with the overhang) - beyond the neighbour. This second floor extension is not as deep (by about 0.6m) as the extensions previously approved to the house (which were also only 1.8m from the flank wall of no.50), but the first floor.

8.19 Although the depth of the two storey element will project beyond the end of the lean-to extension to no.50 built on the common boundary, given that it will be well off the boundary by this point, I do not consider the sense of enclosure will be untoward. The lean-to extension to 50 has a rooflight and that will get less sunshine at the end of the day, but as that is only one window to the space, I do not consider that it justifies refusal of the application. No. 50 also has a two storey rear addition, on the far side (the East side), away from 52, that projects out as far as

the lean-to, and beyond that a single storey rear extension projecting further into the garden that has a door and window that face west, toward 50. I think that it is in the outlook from those windows in the single storey rear wing that occupiers of 50 will have the greatest awareness of the new house, but as the house has by that stage stepped down to being single storey only, with a conventional but shallow pitches over the rear ground floor element (3.4 m high to ridge but about 9m or more from the relevant windows, I do not think that the new house will have such an impact as to justify refusal.

- 8.20 This is not a clear cut case, but I am nevertheless strongly of the opinion that although the proposal is big, the house does adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and I consider that it is compliant with East of England Plan (2008) policy ENV7, and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 3/7.

Refuse Arrangements

- 8.21 Refuse storage is shown on the plans to the eastern side of the property, behind a gate. There is adequate space to meet the needs of this large house and family. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with East of England Plan (2008) policy WM8 and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

Highway Safety

- 8.22 The Highway Authority are satisfied that there will be no significant adverse impact upon the Public Highway. I recognise the concern about the size of parking spaces, but do not think this can be required when technically policy allows for a single space or no off street parking. The material of the surface can be required by condition. The existing house has off street provision and the street traffic is not so busy that it would be reasonable to refuse the application for lack of off-street parking. I consider the proposal compliant with East of England Plan (2008) policy T1 and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Car and Cycle Parking

- 8.23 Off-street parking is provided as is rehearsed above. Adequate space is shown to the side of the house to provide cycle parking, even for this large house.

- 8.24 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with East of England Plan (2008) policies T9 and T14, and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10.

Third Party Representations

- 8.25 The concerns of neighbours have been addressed through the report.

Planning Obligation Strategy

- 8.26 As this is a one-for-one replacement dwelling there is no requirement for a section 106 agreement.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The application is still proposing a large dwelling, but I have given a lot of mind to the much reduced scale of what is proposed particularly at first and second floor level. I am of the opinion that the building will sit well in the street, will have a strong vertical emphasis and does allow enough distance between what is proposed and what exists for it to make positive impact

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate. (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV7 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 3/14)

3. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no extensions, or additions or garages shall be erected other than those expressly authorised by this permission.

Reason: To protect the amenity of adjoining properties, and to prevent overdevelopment of the site. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 3/14)

4. Prior to the commencement of development, details shall be submitted to the local planning authority for approval, which is to be given in writing, of the proposed vehicle parking and turning areas to be provided to the front of the proposed house. The details shall demonstrate that the areas will be made of porous materials, or that provision is made to direct run-off water from the surfaces to a permeable or porous area or surface within the curtilage of the dwellinghouse and that it will not be of loose material that could be spread onto the highway. The details as agreed shall be implemented before the additional dwelling hereby approved is first occupied.

Reason: To ensure that this aspect of the development is delivered in a sustainable manner. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/12)

5. Except with the prior written agreement of the local planning authority in writing no construction work or demolition shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours to 1800 hours Monday to Friday, 0800 hours to 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

6. The three first floor windows and the two second floor windows in the eastern wall of the proposed dwellinghouse shall all be obscure glazed when first introduced into the dwelling and shall remain as such thereafter, unless any variation is first agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason To safeguard the amenity of the neighbouring dwelling (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/4)

7. Before the development hereby permitted is commenced details of the following matters shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing.

i) contractors access arrangements for vehicles, plant and personnel,

ii) contractors site storage area/compound,

iii) the means of moving, storing and stacking all building materials, plant and equipment around and adjacent to the site,

iv) the arrangements for parking of contractors vehicles and contractors personnel vehicles.

Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties during the construction period. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

8. Final details of the windows in the north elevation and the west elevation of the 'tower' at the north-west corner of the building shall be agreed in writing with the local planning authority before development commences.

Reason To ensure that the final details of the windows are sympathetic to the rest of the building (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/12)

9. Prior to the first occupation of the dwelling a full room height obscure 900mm deep glazed screen to the satisfaction of the local planning authority shall be introduced to the southern end of the eastern wall of the dwelling outside 'Luke's Room' to preclude overlooking of the area immediately to the rear of the neighbouring property.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of the neighbouring property (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 - policies 3/4 and 3/7)

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985

Under Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972, the following are “background papers” for each report on a planning application:

1. The planning application and plans;
2. Any explanatory or accompanying letter or document from the applicant;
3. Comments of Council departments on the application;
4. Comments or representations by third parties on the application as referred to in the report plus any additional comments received before the meeting at which the application is considered; unless (in each case) the document discloses “exempt or confidential information”
5. Any Structure Plan, Local Plan or Council Policy Document referred to in individual reports.

These papers may be inspected by contacting John Summers (Ext.7103) in the Planning Department.

