Cambridge City Council

Planning

Date: Wednesday, 4 September 2019

Time: 10.00 am

Venue: Committee Room 1 & 2, The Guildhall, Market Square, Cambridge, CB2 3QJ

Contact: democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk, tel:01223 457000

Agenda

Member Briefing - Car Park Management Strategy at Cambridge Science Park
Time - 9:30am to 10am
Officer: Rebecca Ward, Principal Planning Officer

The briefing is not open to members of the public.

Planning Committee – Main Items

1 Order of Agenda

The Planning Committee operates as a single committee meeting but is organised with a three part agenda and will be considered in the following order:

- **Part One**
  Major Planning Applications
  Start time: 10am

- **Part Two**
  Minor/Other Planning Applications
  Start time: 12.30pm

- **Part Three**
  General and Enforcement Items
  Not applicable

There will be a thirty minute lunch break before part two of the agenda is considered. With a possible short break between agenda item two

and three which will be subject to the Chair's discretion.

If the meeting should last to 6.00pm, the Committee will vote as to whether or not the meeting will be adjourned. If the decision is to adjourn the Committee will agree the date and time of the continuation meeting which will be held no later than seven days from the original meeting.

2	Apologies	
3	Declarations of Interest	
4	Minutes	(Pages 19 - 46)
Part 1: Major Planning Applications (10am)		
5	Planning Application 18/1002/FUL - 211 - 213 Newmarket Road And 2 Godesdone Road	(Pages 47 - 120)
Part 2: Minor/Other Planning Applications (12.30pm)		
6	Planning Report - 18/1058/FUL - 60 Trumpington Road and 2 Nightingale Cottages	(Pages 121 - 168)
7	Planning Report - 19/0183/FUL - 3 Saxon Street	(Pages 169 - 178)
8	Planning Report - 19/0046/FUL - The Tivoli, 16 Chesterton Road	(Pages 179 - 202)
9	Planning Report - 19/0400/FUL - 348 Milton Road	(Pages 203 - 218)
10	Planning Report - 19/0707/FUL - 62-64 King Street	(Pages 219 - 228)
11	Planning Report - 19/0252/FUL - 342 Mil Road	(Pages 229 - 236)
12	Planning Report - 18/1319/FUL - 24 Elfleda Road	(Pages 237 - 250)
13	Planning Report - 19/0555/FUL - 84 Ditton Lane	(Pages 251 - 264)
14	Planning Report - 18/1712/FUL - 198A Kings Hedges	(Pages 265 - 276)

Planning Members: Smart (Chair), Sargeant (Vice-Chair), Baigent, Green, Lord, McQueen, Page-Croft and Tunnacliffe

Alternates: Herbert, Porrer and Thornburrow

Information for the public

The public may record (e.g. film, audio, tweet, blog) meetings which are open to the public. For details go to: www.cambridge.gov.uk/have-your-say-at-committee-meetings

For full information about committee meetings, committee reports, councillors and the democratic process:

- Website: http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk
- Email: democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk
- Phone: 01223 457000

Appendix 1 – Development Plan Policy, Planning Guidance and Material Considerations

(Updated October 2018)

1.0 Central Government Advice

1.1 **National Planning Policy Framework (July 2018)** – sets out the Government's economic, environmental and social planning policies for England. These policies articulate the Government's vision of sustainable development, which should be interpreted and applied locally to meet local aspirations.

1.2 **Planning Practice Guidance (March 2014)**

The guidance complements the National Planning Policy Framework and provides advice on how to deliver its policies.

Guidance is provided in relation to the following:

Advertisements (March 2014)
Air quality (March 2014)
Appeals (March 2014)
Before submitting an application (February 2018)
Brownfield land registers (July 2017)
Climate change (June 2014)
Community Infrastructure Levy (March 2018)
Conserving and enhancing the historic environment (February 2018)
Consultation and pre-decision matters (June 2018)
Crown Development (July 2017)
Design (March 2014)
Determining a planning application (July 2017)
Ensuring effective enforcement (February 2018)
Ensuring the vitality of town centres (March 2014)
Environmental Impact Assessment (July 2017)
Flexible options for planning permissions (March 2014)
Flood Risk and Coastal Change (March 2014)
Hazardous Substances (July 2017)
Health and wellbeing (July 2017)
Housing and economic land availability assessment (September 2018)
Housing need assessment (September 2018)
Land affected by contamination (June 2014)
Land stability (March 2014)
Lawful development certificates (March 2014)

Light pollution (March 2014)
Local Plans (September 2018)
Making an application (June 2018)
Minerals (October 2014)
Natural Environment (January 2016)
Neighbourhood Planning (September 2018)
Noise (March 2014)
Open space, sports and recreational facilities, public rights of way and local green space (March 2014)
Permission in principle (June 2018)
Plan making (September 2018)
Planning obligations (May 2016)
Renewable and low carbon energy (June 2015)
Rural housing (May 2016)
Self-build and custom housebuilding (July 2017)
Starter homes (March 2015)
Strategic environmental assessment and sustainability appraisal (February 2015)
Transport evidence bases in plan-making and decision-taking (March 2015)
Travel plans, transport assessments and statements in decision-taking (March 2014)
Tree Preservation Orders and trees in conservation areas (March 2014)
Use of Planning Conditions (June 2018)
Viability (July 2018)
Water supply, wastewater and water quality (March 2015)
When is permission required? (June 2018)

1.3 **Circular 11/95 – The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions (Annex A only):** Model conditions.

1.4 **Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010**

Paragraph 122 Places a statutory requirement on the local authority that where planning permission is dependent upon a planning obligation the obligation must pass the following tests:

(a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
(b) directly related to the development; and
(c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

Paragraph 123 Other than through requiring a highway agreement to be entered into, a planning obligation (“obligation A”) may not constitute a reason for granting planning permission to the extent that

(a) obligation A provides for the funding or provision of an infrastructure project or provides for the funding or provision of a type of infrastructure; and
(b) five or more separate planning obligations that —

(i) relate to planning permissions granted for development within the area of the charging authority; and
(ii) which provide for the funding or provision of that project, or provide for the funding or provision of that type of infrastructure

have been entered on or after 6th April 2010.

1.5 **Planning Policy Statement – Green Belt protection and intentional unauthorised development August 2015**

Sets out changes to national planning policy to make intentional unauthorised development a material consideration, and also to provide stronger protection for the Green Belt.

1.6 **Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard** – published by Department of Communities and Local Government March 2015 (material consideration).

Development Plan policy

2.0 The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan (Development Plan Documents) July 2011

Minerals and Waste Core Strategy : this sets out the Councils' strategic vision and objectives for future development and management of minerals and waste within Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, including strategic site allocations over the Plan period to 2026. The document also contains a suite of development control policies to guide minerals and waste development.

Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan (2012) : this sets out the Councils' allocations for site specific proposals for future development and management of minerals and waste within Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. It identifies site specific land allocations for future minerals and waste management development and other supporting site specific policies.

Proposals Maps: Map A: shows minerals and transport proposals; Map B: shows waste management proposals; Map C: shows Mineral Safeguarding Areas.

3.0 Cambridge Local Plan 2018

Policy 1: The presumption in favour of sustainable development
Policy 2: Spatial strategy for the location of employment development
Policy 3: Spatial strategy for the location of residential development
Policy 4: The Cambridge Green Belt
Policy 5: Strategic transport infrastructure
Policy 6: Hierarchy of centres and retail capacity
Policy 7: The River Cam
Policy 8: Setting of the city
Policy 9: Review of the Local Plan
Policy 10: The City Centre
Policy 11: Development in the City Centre Primary Shopping Area
Policy 12: Fitzroy/Burleigh Street/Grafton Area of Major Change
Policy 13: Cambridge East
Policy 14: Areas of major change and opportunity areas – general principles
Policy 15: Cambridge Northern Fringe East and new railway Station Area of Major Change
Policy 16: South of Coldham's Lane Area of Major Change
Policy 17: Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital) Area of Major Change
Policy 18: Southern Fringe Areas of Major Change
Policy 19: West Cambridge Area of Major Change
Policy 20: Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road Area of Major Change
Policy 21: Station Areas West and Clifton Road Area of Major Change
Policy 22: Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area
Policy 23: Eastern Gate Opportunity Area
Policy 24: Mill Road Opportunity Area
Policy 25: Cambridge Railway Station, Hills Road Corridor to the City Centre Opportunity Area
Policy 26: Old Press/Mill Lane Opportunity Area
Policy 27: Site specific development opportunities
Policy 28: Carbon reduction, community energy networks, sustainable design and construction, and water use
Policy 29: Renewable and low carbon energy generation
Policy 30: Energy-efficiency improvements in existing dwellings
Policy 31: Integrated water management and the water cycle
Policy 32: Flood risk

Policy 33: Contaminated land
Policy 34: Light pollution control
Policy 35: Protection of human health from noise and vibration
Policy 36: Air quality, odour and dust
Policy 37: Cambridge Airport Public Safety Zone and Air Safeguarding Zones
Policy 38: Hazardous installations
Policy 39: Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory, Lord's Bridge
Policy 40: Development and expansion of business space
Policy 41: Protection of business space
Policy 42: Connecting new developments to digital infrastructure
Policy 43: University development
Policy 44: Specialist colleges and language Schools
Policy 45: Affordable housing and dwelling mix
Policy 46: Development of student housing
Policy 47: Specialist housing
Policy 48: Housing in multiple occupation
Policy 49: Provision for Gypsies and Travellers
Policy 50: Residential space standards
Policy 51: Accessible Homes
Policy 52: Protecting garden land and the subdivision of existing dwelling plots
Policy 53: Flat conversions
Policy 54: Residential moorings
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 60: Tall buildings and the skyline in Cambridge
Policy 61: Conservation and enhancement of Cambridge's historic environment
Policy 62: Local heritage assets
Policy 63: Works to a heritage asset to address climate change
Policy 64: Shopfronts, signage and shop security measures
Policy 65: Visual pollution
Policy 66: Paving over front gardens
Policy 67: Protection of open space
Policy 68: Open space and recreation provision through new development
Policy 69: Protection of sites of biodiversity and geodiversity importance
Policy 70: Protection of priority species and habitats
Policy 71: Trees

Policy 72: Development and change of use in district, local and neighbourhood centres
Policy 73: Community, sports and leisure facilities
Policy 74: Education facilities
Policy 75: Healthcare facilities
Policy 76: Protection of public houses
Policy 77: Development and expansion of visitor accommodation
Policy 78: Redevelopment or loss of visitor accommodation
Policy 79: Visitor attractions
Policy 80: Supporting sustainable access to development
Policy 81: Mitigating the transport impact of development
Policy 82: Parking management
Policy 83: Aviation development
Policy 84: Telecommunications
Policy 85: Infrastructure delivery, planning obligations and the Community Infrastructure Levy

4.0 Supplementary Planning Documents

(These have been prepared in parallel with the Local Plan preparation and will be shortly adopted by the Executive Councillor by an out of cycle decision. Significant weight can be attached to them; they were brought before Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee for prior consideration and comment on the dates shown)

4.1 The New Museums Site Development Framework (March 2016) – Sets out the joint aspirations of the council and the University of Cambridge regarding future changes to the site. These should improve the urban form with changes to the public realm, provide better access for all and adopt more sustainable forms of development while respecting the site's heritage and surroundings. Future development on the site offers an opportunity to create an improved, more coherent development and especially to improve the public realm on the site.

4.2 **Ridgeons site Planning and Development Brief (July 2016)** – created to ensure that any future development on this site, allocated for residential development in the 2018 Local Plan as R12, is appropriate to its context and delivers the aspirations as set out in the Local Plan.

4.3 **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Flood and Water (December 2016)** - produced by Cambridgeshire County Council in its role as Lead Local Flood Authority, in partnership with the city and district council. It provides detailed guidance to support the implementation of flood and

water related policies in each of the Cambridgeshire local planning authorities' local plans.

4.4 **Mitcham's Corner Development Framework (January 2017)** - supports Local Plan Policy 22: Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area and is designed to ensure that future development in the area is appropriate to its context and delivers the aspirations as set out in the Local Plan. It provides greater certainty and detail to support delivery of development in the coming years.

4.5 **Mill Road Depot Planning and Development Brief (March 2017)** - supports Local Plan Policy 24: Mill Road Opportunity Area and is designed to ensure that future development on this site, allocated for residential development in the 2018 Local Plan as R10, is appropriate to its context and delivers the aspirations as set out in the Local Plan. It provides greater certainty and detail to support delivery of development in the coming years.

4.6 **Land North of Cherry Hinton (February 2018)** - supports Local Plan Policy 13: Cambridge East, and is designed to ensure that future residential-led development on this site is delivered successfully. It provides greater certainty and detail to support delivery of development in the coming years. It outlines the aspirations for the area, as well as the key issues, constraints and opportunities that will influence how new development will take place.

4.7 **Grafton Area of Major Change - Masterplan and Guidance (February 2018)** - Prepared in partnership with local stakeholders to help guide the development of the area, supporting Policy 12 of the Local Plan. The area is designated in the Plan as the primary location for providing additional comparison retail in the City Centre along with other mixed uses including leisure uses, and the SPD promotes a number of key strategies for change. These aim to take advantage of the opportunities to provide an improved street environment including public realm enhancements as well as a positive and attractive destination to support the vitality and viability of the centre for retail and associated uses. The SPD envisages a phased approach to ensure the area continues to perform as a mainstream City Centre leisure and retail location while ensuring phased improvement will deliver the area's longer-term strategy.

5.0 Former Supplementary Planning Documents

(These documents, prepared to support policies in the 2006 local plan, are no longer SPDs, but are still material considerations.)

5.1 **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.

5.2 **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012)**: The Design Guide provides advice on the requirements for internal and external waste storage, collection and recycling in new residential and commercial developments. It provides advice on assessing planning applications and developer contributions.

5.3 **Cambridge City Council (January 2008) - Affordable Housing**: Gives advice on what is involved in providing affordable housing in Cambridge. Its objectives are to facilitate the delivery of affordable housing to meet housing needs and to assist the creation and maintenance of sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities.

5.4 **Cambridge City Council (March 2010) – Planning Obligation Strategy:** provides a framework for securing the provision of new and/or improvements to existing infrastructure generated by the demands of new development. It also seeks to mitigate the adverse impacts of development and addresses the needs identified to accommodate the projected growth of Cambridge. The SPD addresses issues including transport, open space and recreation, education and life-long learning, community facilities, waste and other potential development-specific requirements.

5.5 **Cambridge City Council (January 2010) - Public Art:** This SPD aims to guide the City Council in creating and providing public art in Cambridge by setting out clear objectives on public art, a clarification of

policies, and the means of implementation. It covers public art delivered through the planning process, principally Section 106 Agreements (S106), the commissioning of public art using the S106 Public Art Initiative, and outlines public art policy guidance.

5.6 **Old Press/Mill Lane Supplementary Planning Document (January 2010)** Guidance on the redevelopment of the Old Press/Mill Lane site.

5.7 **Eastern Gate Supplementary Planning Document (October 2011)** Guidance on the redevelopment of the Eastern Gate site. The purpose of this development framework (SPD) is threefold:

- To articulate a clear vision about the future of the Eastern Gate area;
- To establish a development framework to co-ordinate redevelopment within
- the area and guide decisions (by the Council and others); and
- To identify a series of key projects, to attract and guide investment (by the Council and others) within the area.

6.0 Other Material Considerations

6.1 City Wide Guidance

Air Quality in Cambridge – Developers Guide (2008) - Provides information on the way in which air quality and air pollution issues will be dealt with through the development control system in Cambridge City. It complements the Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document.

Arboricultural Strategy (2004) - City-wide arboricultural strategy.

Balanced and Mixed Communities – A Good Practice Guide (2006) – Produced by Cambridgeshire Horizons to assist the implementation of the Areas of Major Change.

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.

Buildings of Local Interest (2005) – A schedule of buildings of local interest and associated guidance.

Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan (2011) – A SWMP outlines the preferred long term strategy for the management of surface water. Alongside the SFRA they are the starting point for local flood risk management.

Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (November 2010) - a tool for planning authorities to identify and evaluate the extent and nature of flood risk in their area and its implications for land use planning.

Cambridge City Council Draft Air Quality Action Plan 2018-2023 - Sets out Cambridge City Council's priority actions for improving areas of poor air quality in the city and maintaining a good level of air quality in a growing city.

The plan responds to the evidence gathered from air quality monitoring across Cambridge and analysis of the sources of air pollution contributing to the problem. The Identified actions fall in to three main categories: reducing local traffic emissions as quickly as possible to meet national objectives, maintaining pollutant levels below national objectives, and improving public health by reducing population exposure to air pollutants.

Cambridge City Council (2011) - Open Space and Recreation Strategy: Gives guidance on the provision of open space and recreation facilities through development. It sets out to ensure that open space in Cambridge meets the needs of all who live, work, study in or visit the city and provides a satisfactory environment for nature and enhances the local townscape, complementing the built environment.

The strategy:

- sets out the protection of existing open spaces;
- promotes the improvement of and creation of new facilities on existing open spaces;
- sets out the standards for open space and sports provision in and through new development;
- supports the implementation of Section 106 monies and future Community Infrastructure Levy monies

As this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. However, the strategy's new standards will form part of the evidence base for the review of the Local Plan

Cambridge City Nature Conservation Strategy (2006) – Guidance on habitats should be conserved and enhanced, how this should be carried out and how this relates to Biodiversity Action Plans.

Cambridge City Wildlife Sites Register (2005) – Details of the City and County Wildlife Sites.

Cambridge Landscape and Character Assessment (2003) – An analysis of the landscape and character of Cambridge.

Cambridge Sub-Region Culture and Arts Strategy (2006) - Produced by Cambridgeshire Horizons to assist the implementation of the Areas of Major Change.

Cambridge Walking and Cycling Strategy (2002) – A walking and cycling strategy for Cambridge.

Cambridgeshire County Council Transport Assessment Guidelines (2017) - Provides guidance to applicants, developers, their agents and local authority officers on when a Transport Assessment (TA) is required and what it should contain. It also gives guidance on what information may be required for smaller applications through a Transport Statement (TS).

Cambridgeshire Design Guide For Streets and Public Realm (2007): The purpose of the Design Guide is to set out the key principles and aspirations that should underpin the detailed discussions about the design of streets and public spaces that will be taking place on a site-by-site basis.

Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy (2011) - Designed to assist in shaping and co-ordinating the delivery of Green Infrastructure in the county, to provide social, environmental and economic benefits now and in the future. It demonstrates how Green Infrastructure can be used to help to achieve four objectives:

1) To reverse the decline in biodiversity
2) To mitigate and adapt to climate change
3) To promote sustainable growth and economic development
4) To support healthy living and well-being.

Cambridgeshire Quality Charter for Growth (2008) – Sets out the core principles of the level of quality to be expected in new developments in the Cambridge Sub-Region

Contaminated Land in Cambridge - Developers Guide (2009) – Aims to ensure developers are aware of their responsibilities regarding contaminated land. Outlines the Council's requirements and the information needed in order to assess planning applications.

Criteria for the Designation of Wildlife Sites (2005) – Sets out the criteria for the designation of Wildlife Sites.

Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010) – Gives guidance on the nature and layout of cycle parking, and other security measures, to be provided as a consequence of new residential development.

Indoor Sports Facility Strategy 2015-2031 (updated June 2016) – With the Playing Pitch Strategy, forms a guide for the future provision and management of sports pitches, built facilities and community use services to serve existing and new communities in the City and South Cambridgeshire. In line with the NPPF, the strategies set out to evaluate existing built facilities, and assess the future need for sport and active recreation, as the region grows and develops, identifying opportunities for new provision, and the expansion of existing facilities.

Modelling the Costs of Affordable Housing (2006) – Toolkit to enable negotiations on affordable housing provision through planning proposals.

Playing Pitch Strategy 2015-2031 (updated June 2016) – With the Indoor Sports Facilities Strategy, forms a guide for the future provision and management of sports pitches, built facilities and community use services to serve existing and new communities in the City and South Cambridgeshire. In line with the NPPF, the strategies set out to evaluate existing built facilities, and assess the future need for sport and active recreation, as the region grows and develops, identifying opportunities for new provision, and the expansion of existing facilities.

Protection and Funding of Routes for the Future Expansion of the City Cycle Network (2004) – Guidance on how development can help achieve the implementation of the cycle network.

6.2 Area Guidelines

Cambridge City Council (2003)–Northern Corridor Area Transport Plan:

Cambridge City Council (2002)–Southern Corridor Area Transport Plan:
Cambridge City Council (2002)–Eastern Corridor Area Transport Plan:
Cambridge City Council (2003)–Western Corridor Area Transport Plan:

The purpose of the Plans is to identify new transport infrastructure and service provision that is needed to facilitate large-scale development and to identify a fair and robust means of calculating how individual development sites in the area should contribute towards a fulfilment of that transport infrastructure.

Barrow Road Conservation Area Appraisal (2016)
Brooklands Avenue Conservation Area Appraisal (2013)
Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal (2015)
Castle and Victoria Road Conservation Area Appraisal (2012)
Chesterton and Ferry Lane Conservation Area Appraisal (2009)
Conduit Head Road Conservation Area Appraisal (2009)
De Freville Conservation Area Appraisal (2009)
Kite Area Conservation Area Appraisal (2014)
Mill Road Area Conservation Area Appraisal (2011)
Newnham Croft Conservation Area Appraisal (2013)
New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area Appraisal (2012)
Riverside and Stourbridge Common Conservation Area Appraisal (2012)
Southacre Conservation Area Appraisal (2013)
Storeys Way Conservation Area Appraisal (2018)
Trumpington Conservation Area Appraisal (2010)
West Cambridge Conservation Area Appraisal (2011)

Guidance relating to development and the Conservation Area including a review of the boundaries.

Jesus Green Conservation Plan (1998)
Parkers Piece Conservation Plan (2001)
Sheeps Green/Coe Fen Conservation Plan (2001)
Christs Pieces/New Square Conservation Plan (2001)

Historic open space guidance.

Hills Road Suburbs and Approaches Study (March 2012)
Long Road Suburbs and Approaches Study (March 2012)
Barton Road Suburbs and Approaches Study (March 2009)

Huntingdon Road Suburbs and Approaches Study (March 2009)
Madingley Road Suburbs and Approaches Study (March 2009)
Newmarket Road Suburbs and Approaches Study (October 2011)

Provide assessments of local distinctiveness which can be used as a basis when considering planning proposals

Station Area Development Framework (2004) – Sets out a vision and Planning Framework for the development of a high density mixed use area including new transport interchange and includes the **Station Area Conservation Appraisal**.

Southern Fringe Area Development Framework (2006) – Guidance which will help to direct the future planning of development in the Southern Fringe.

West Cambridge Masterplan Design Guidelines and Legal Agreement (1999) – Sets out how the West Cambridge site should be developed.

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING 11 June 2019
10.05 am - 6.00 pm

Present:

Planning Committee Members: Councillors Smart (Chair), Baigent, Green, Lord, Page-Croft, Sargeant and Thornburrow

Officers:
Delivery Manager Development Management: Nigel Blazeby
Principal Planner: Lorraine Casey
Principal Planner: Tony Collins
Principal Planner: Ganesh Gnanamoorthy
Senior Planner: Mairead O'Sullivan
Senior Planning Officer: Lewis Tomlinson
Legal Adviser: Keith Barber
Committee Manager: James Goddard
Committee Manager: Claire Tunnicliffe

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

19/72/Plan Election of Vice Chair

In appointments to Chairs and Vice Chairs agreed by Council on 22 May 2019, the incorrect Councillor was included in the report. Planning Committee agreed to the appointment of Councillor Sargeant as Vice Chair of this Committee for 2019/20.

19/73/Plan Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor McQueen. Councillor Thornburrow attended as the Alternate.

Councillor Tunnacliffe asked for the minutes to record the Committee's thanks to Councillor Hipkin for his work on the Planning Committee as a Member and Chair.

19/74/Plan Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest

Councillor Page-Croft	19/76/Plan	Personal and Prejudicial. Withdrew from discussion and room, and did not vote.
Councillor Baigent	All	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign.
Councillor Baigent	19/77/Plan	Personal: Lives near Cromwell Road.
Councillor Green on behalf of Committee Members		Personal: Application made by Cambridge Investment Partnership. (Established in January 2017, CIP is a joint venture between Cambridge City Council and Hill Investment Partnerships.)
Councillor Sargeant	19/79/Plan	Personal and Prejudicial. Spoke as a Ward Councillor. Withdrew from discussion and room, and did not vote.

19/75/Plan Minutes

The minutes of meetings held on 3 April and 24 April 2019 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

19/76/Plan 18/0806/FUL - 291 Hills Road

Cllr Page-Croft vacated the room and took no part in proceedings whilst this item was determined by the Committee.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a residential development containing 14 flats comprising 8 x 2-bed units and 6 x 1-bed units, along with access, car parking and associated landscaping following demolition of the existing buildings.

The Senior Planner updated his report by referring to details on the amendment sheet:

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

APPROVE subject to: (a) the prior completion of a s106 Agreement to secure planning obligations as identified in paragraphs 8.73 to 8.75 of the 29th August 2018 report; and (b) delegated authority to pursue a viability review mechanism to secure a commuted financial contribution for off-site affordable housing provision, if required, as identified in paragraph 6.7 of the 11th June 2019 report (c) and the following conditions: In the event that the application is refused, and an Appeal is lodged against the decision to refuse this application, delegated authority is sought to allow officers to negotiate and complete the Planning Obligation required in connection with this development

The Senior Planner proposing new conditions/informative referring to:

i. Boundary treatment.
ii. Hedgehog friendly fences.
iii. Electric vehicle charging points.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a local resident.

The representation covered the following issues:

i. Referred to the extract of the site plan he circulated at committee.
ii. Referred to concerns and comments regarding the basement access ramp gradient made by Councillor Thornburrow at the 29 August 2018 Planning Committee. The design had been reconfigured but was still impractical:
    a. The ramp would not be covered along its entire length.
    b. There would be no delivery vehicle area due to ramp.
    c. Residents' had on-going concerns.

Mr Griffiths (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor McGerty (Queen Edith's Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application:

i. Advised the Committee that Councillor Page-Croft had taken no part in campaigning about this planning item. Any information to the contrary was erroneous.
ii. Expressed concern about the (lack of any) affordable housing provision.
iii. Expressed concern about the type of accommodation provided through this scheme. The City needed the right type of accommodation.
iv. Referred to P47 (paragraph 6.6) of the agenda pack and sought clarification on the proposed clawback clause. This clause would ensure

that if the development delivers more revenue than predicted by the viability assessment, the applicant would be required under the terms of a planning obligation to pay a financial contribution to the Council for the delivery of affordable housing off-site.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 4 votes to 3) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, amendment sheet and subject to additional boundary treatment and EV charging point conditions, and an informative regarding hedgehogs.

19/77/Plan 19/0288/FUL - Development Land at 75 Cromwell Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of 295 dwellings including 40% affordable housing; a nursery and community facility (D1), access, car and cycle parking, including basement car park, play equipment and landscaping, substation and associated works.

The Committee received representations in objection to the application from two residents of Cromwell Road.

The representations covered the following issues:

i. The area needed housing.
ii. Expressed concern regarding the size of the development and the stress it would place on local infrastructure.
    a. Would exacerbate existing traffic flow and access issues.
    b. Impact on demand for local GP surgery services.
iii. Proposed development would impact on existing neighbours:
    a. Overlooking homes and gardens.
    b. Overbearing.
    c. Loss of light.
iv. Queried if the boundary wall would be removed between proposed and existing properties. Plans were unclear. Requested the wall be retained.
v. Suggested the plans were inaccurate and did not reflect reality. Nor did the model available for inspection by members of the committee and public.

Mr Belton (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Robertson (Petersfield Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application:

i. The application was a vital part of the City Council's scheme to provide affordable housing for residents.
ii. The site had been purchased on the open market, but the City Council was still able to provide affordable housing as it was designed in.
iii. Open space was provided because of underground parking facilities which freed up space for housing and open areas at ground level.
iv. The intention was to be an exemplar site.
v. The site was a commercial depot for Ridgeon's, it could now be used for housing so neighbouring residents should experience similar or fewer traffic levels to what they were used to.

The Committee adjourned 11:55am until noon to view a model of the proposed development. The Principal Planner said the model was a representation and did not have the same weight as the plans and drawings which accompany the application.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include hedgehog friendly fences to be included in condition 32. (Suggested to Principal Planner pre-committee).

The amendments were **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers plus amended condition.

Condition 32 should now read as follows:

No development above ground level shall commence until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority a plan indicating the positions, design, materials, type of boundary treatments to be erected and provision for hedgehog dispersal. The boundary treatment shall be completed before the use hereby permitted is commenced and retained thereafter. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure an appropriate boundary treatment is implemented (Cambridge Local Plan 2018; Policies 55, 57 and 59).

19/78/Plan 18/1993/FUL - Land Between 21 And 29 Barton Road (including 27 Barton Road And Croft Gardens)

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the redevelopment of the site for new college accommodation. The proposal includes demolition of 1-12 Croft Gardens and the existing storage and garage buildings on site. No 27 Barton Road is the only building proposed to be retained on site. The site is proposed to be redeveloped to include 3 crescent buildings which form a set piece. The two buildings which run perpendicular to the road are proposed to be graduate family accommodation. The block to the south is proposed to be graduate rooms. A further building is proposed to the front of the site adjacent to 29 Barton Road. This would also provide graduate rooms.

The Senior Planner updated her report by referring to details on the amendment sheet:

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

Conditions are to be amended as follows:

18. Prior to occupation of the development, a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatments to be erected shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority Boundary treatments to adjoining gardens should include sufficient gaps (150mm X 150mm) to allow access for hedgehogs. The boundary treatment shall be completed in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation or the bringing into use of the development (or other timetable agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority) and retained as approved thereafter.

Reason: To ensure an appropriate boundary treatment is implemented in the interests of visual amenity and privacy and to ensure it allows movement of hedgehogs (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 57, 59 and 70).

25. Trigger now prior to occupation.

33. Prior to occupation a plan shall be provided detailing the full extent of the woodland area to the rear of the site. This agreed area of the site shall not be available as amenity space and shall only be accessed for upkeep and maintenance purposes. Details of the means of controlling access (for example a fence and gate) shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and installed in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of the development and retained thereafter.

Reason: to prevent noise, disturbance and loss of privacy to 4C Millington Road (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 56 and 57).

The Senior Planner proposing a new condition restricting the accommodation to King's College and sought delegated powers to confirm the wording after Committee.

The Committee received representations in objection to the application from the following:

- The Co-Chair of the South Newnham Neighbourhood Forum.
- A local resident.
- Mr Dadge (Agent for local residents who were objecting).

The representations covered the following issues:

i. The National Planning Policy Framework was clear on the need for consultation. The South Newnham Neighbourhood had been excluded, which was an injustice.
ii. The building did not protect or enhance the area so the application should be refused.
iii. The Applicant's report was based on old information from the 1980s. The Buildings of Local Interest (BLIs) were not in good condition.
iv. The existing site was a haven for wildlife.
v. Expressed concern about:

a. Noise and disturbance to neighbours as the new building would only be 15m away from neighbours.
b. The application would be too high, overbearing and out of scale with the area.
c. Loss of privacy.

Dr Carne (representing King's College (Applicant)) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Cantrill ((Newnham Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application:

i. The existing buildings had contributed to the West Cambridge Conservation Area as evidenced in various ways:
    a. Buildings were given BLI status.
    b. Historic England had requested the existing building be retained on-site.
    c. The current buildings were not in good condition or maintained by the owner (Kings College).
ii. The new scheme would not contribute to the character of the area.
    a. Overdevelopment of the site had compromised the scheme. Intensification of the site (through the proposal) meant there was too much on it. The Applicant was trying to fit in more buildings and open space than the site could accommodate.
    b. Expressed concern about building height and massing.
    c. The new design would not meet the standard of the old one.
    d. Trees and residential amenity were also factors to consider.

Councillor Green proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation by deleting condition 33.

This amendment was **carried by 5 votes to 3**.

Councillor Sargeant proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to require effective Proctoral parking control to avoid spill-out parking into the neighbouring streets.

The Senior Planner agreed to amend condition wording to limit Proctoral parking approval to 8 cars.

<u>The Committee:</u>

Members sought clarification on whether affordable housing should be provided as part of the application. The Development Manager recommended deferring the application so officers could investigate whether affordable housing should be provided. A report would be brought back to Committee in future.

Unanimously resolved to defer the application.

19/79/Plan 18/1245/FUL - Former Hamilton Lodge Hotel 156 - 160 Chesterton Road And Land Rear Of 162 Chesterton Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the construction of two blocks with basement car park comprising 46 serviced apartments (Sui Generis use); 32 x studio units and 14 x one bed units. Hard and soft landscaping including a garden room, and cycle and refuse storage associated with the use are proposed.

The Senior Planner updated her report to say the Applicant had clarified that flats 20 and 27 were suitable for wheelchair users.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Sandy Lane.

The representation covered the following issues:

i. Had no objections to the design of the application.
ii. Expressed concern about traffic and parking in the area:
    a. The application would exacerbate existing issues.
    b. Several BnBs plus AirBnBs were already in the area.
    c. Sandy Lane was not designed to service the number of vehicles already using it. The application could lead to more. It would be hard to control and monitor.

Mr Brown (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Sargeant (West Chesterton Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application:

i. The developer had got into difficulties by moving away from student accommodation to another use. This could lead to higher car usage.

ii. Took issue with details in the Applicant's Transport Statement.
    a. Any cars not parking on-site would put pressure on neighbouring areas.
    b. Making a comparison between the serviced apartments in this application and local apart-hotels was not a suitable comparison. Apart-hotels generally provided more car parking spaces.
    c. Details about bus routes servicing the area around the application were erroneous, so public transport links were not as listed in the Transport Statement.
iii. Sandy Lane was not a suitable area for overflow parking.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 3 votes to 1) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

19/80/Plan 18/1930/FUL - Redevelopment Area Of Mill Lane Cambridge

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the redevelopment of site to form expansion of Pembroke College comprising repurposing of existing buildings, demolition and erection of new buildings for a mix of uses comprising 94no. student residential units, 1478sqm B1 College office floorspace, 1773sqm D1 teaching space, 1004sqm D2 College leisure and community floorspace, 363sqm commercial A1, A2, A3, A4 retail, food and drink floorspace; and ancillary uses comprising landscaping and hard surfacing, formation of new courtesy crossing at Trumpington Street, highways, vehicular and cycle parking, and associated works and infrastructure.

After the presentation from the Principal Planning Officer Councillor Tunnacliffe proposed the following motion which was seconded by Councillor Lord:

- The application be deferred and considered after a Members' guided site visit had taken place.

On a show of hands the proposal was **lost by 3 votes to 4 Votes**.

The Committee received representation in objection to the application a representative of Camcycle.

The representation covered the following issues:

i. Disagreed with the proposal of an informal crossing in front of Pembroke College; this area was already difficult for pedestrians and cyclists especially when crossing Trumpington Street.
ii. An informal crossing would not improve the situation but a Zebra crossing would.
iii. The most recent design still creates a serious hazard for those cycling down Trumpington Street.
iv. Vehicle drivers could squeeze cyclists up against the bollards which do not have a cycling bypass; to get through a bus driver must pull out into the oncoming lane and sweep to back left to straighten out. Both of these movements were potentially hazardous.
v. The highway was very narrow on Trumpington Street and when vehicles were queuing to the Grand Arcade Car Park; the queue could go past the bollards which would impact on the south bound buses.
vi. An informal crossing was not good enough and could create further hazards unless changes were made to the street layout which gave increased priority to pedestrians and cyclists.
vii. A formal crossing should be considered as there were three nearby examples in the same Conservation Area; a zebra crossing was therefore a possibility.
viii. Further discussion should take place regarding the plans for the northern part of the site which included Silver Street; proposals to change the priority of the junction around would improve pedestrian and cyclists' safety.
ix. With regards to proposed condition 48, the Committee should consider changing the word 'informal' to 'a revised street design which included a safe and convenient pedestrian crossing'. Delete the reference to 'drawing plan' and 'crossing' and leave the text 'approved design'.
x. With regard to the pre-committee amendment to the recommendations (No 2) to grant office delegation; the Committee should provide specific guidance to the design containing the bollards placed in the carriage way.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of St Mary's Lane.

The representation covered the following issues:

i. The properties were the only non-university properties adjoining the site.
ii. Thirty comments on the application had been raised by residents of St Mary's Lane but would highlight six with the Committee.
iii. The properties on St Mary's Lane were delicate; most were over 300 hundred years old, listed and some of single skin whose boundaries went right up to the existing boundary wall with some of the properties attached to the boundary wall.
iv. As the proposed plans built right up to the boundary wall there was a serious risk of damage to the properties during the development.
v. While the bollards on the proposed development had been put into place the properties had been shaking.
vi. Maintenance on the properties would be made more difficult; access to the rear access to the properties would be lost with a reduction in parking for maintenance vehicles.
vii. The application had suggested a reduction of 40% of natural light and there has been an offer of compensation which has not been taken forward.
viii. Windows on the new building directly faced into the properties bedroom and workrooms.
ix. Stated that Pembroke College had a history of not managing their sites well. The College were responsible for a property in the Lane where there had been four incidents of anti-social behaviour in the last twelve months.
x. No response had been received from Pembroke College in response to the thirty comments made.
xi. Would have a detrimental impact on the community; one resident had already moved out due to the risk of noise, another had been told they could only rent to students and a third rhad had their property devalued by 20%.
xii. The view was emerging that the Lane would only survive as student housing rather than private living accommodation.
xiii. Requested that the Committee considered the longer term future of the Lane.

Lord Smith (Master of Pembroke College) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

County Councillor Harrison (Market Ward) addressed the Committee about the application.

The representation covered the following issues:

i. Welcomed the development and understood the importance but was concerned to hear the issues raised by the resident on St Mary's Lane.
ii. The issue of the pedestrian crossing seemed to have become a bigger issue than it should be.
iii. It was the responsibility of Cambridgeshire County Council to set out clear requirement in terms of what highway crossing was necessary.
iv. The City Council conservation officers had been opposed to a formal pedestrian crossing on the site but they were all over the city.
v. There should not be a situation where pedestrian safety was sacrificed and the College agreeing to a five year safety review to resolve the issue of the crossing.
vi. The issue of pedestrian safety was a very important component of the development for the both the public and students; safety was vital and had to be dealt with immediately.
vii. The matter seemed to have become complicated for the simple reason the conservation officers did not like pedestrian crossings.
viii. Expressed support for Camcycle's proposal that the option of a form of pedestrian crossing should be kept open; a zebra crossing would be adequate.
ix. The north side of the junction should also be changed to a zebra crossing so that they matched which would have minimal visual impact.
x. The cycling officer did not welcome an informal pedestrian crossing but this information was not in the report to the Committee.
xi. The safety audit could show that an informal safety crossing was not a safe option.
xii. Requested the Committee amended proposed condition 48 so it would be easy to move to a formal crossing if identified.
xiii. As cycle parking on site would be accessed from Mill Lane, this would increase the number of cyclists from Pembroke Street to Mill Lane and back and again; a possible mitigation as suggested by Camcycle would be to switch priority so the traffic priority was into Pembroke Street. County Council officers had suggested both advantages and disadvantages to this proposal.
xiv. Suggested a new condition be included to carry out an evaluation of highway management options which could improve cycle safety on the junction which would read as follows:

> "An assessment should be made for potential highways management measures to improve cycle safety at the Mill Lane, Trumpington Street, Pembroke Junction and any recommended measures shall be implemented

Councillor Sargeant proposed an amendment to proposed condition 48 to bring it in line with the recommendation made by Camcycle.

The Principle Planning Officer recommendation the following amendment (deleted text struck through)

20. Amend new Condition 48 (ex-49) to read (deleted text ~~struck through~~: 'No development shall take place until a plan showing the layout and design of a~~n informal~~ pedestrian crossing of Trumpington Street between the application site and the main Pembroke College porters' lodge, ~~in broad accordance with drawing ref: 6991-WSP-01-XX-DR-TP-022 P05~~, has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved crossing design shall be implemented prior to any occupation of the student accommodation hereby approved.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report and amendment sheet, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers, but with the following additional amendments:

i. The decision to **APPROVE** the application is subject to the satisfactory submission of a sustainable drainage strategy and its supporting calculations.
ii. **DELEGATED AUTHORITY** is granted to officers to approve such a strategy.
iii. Amend Condition 48 to read 'No development shall take place until a plan showing the layout and design of a pedestrian crossing of Trumpington Street between the application site and the main Pembroke College porters' lodge has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved crossing design shall be implemented prior to any occupation of the student accommodation hereby approved.'

iv. Amend Condition 39 by replacing the words 'Phase 2 of the development' by 'the student residential accommodation'.
v. Add Condition 50: 'Development shall take place only in accordance with the approved Sustainable Drainage Strategy (version number to be added) and supporting calculations, submitted on (date to be added.)'

Reason: To ensure appropriate drainage of surface water. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 31 and 32).

19/81/Plan 18/1931/LBC - Redevelopment Area Of Mill Lane Cambridge

The Committee received an application for listed building consent.

The application sought approval for the demolition of rear two storey extension to Kenmare House, dwarf wall of Kenmare House fronting Trumpington Street, narthex, foyer spaces, lobby, two storey school rooms and north gable end of Emmanuel United Reformed Church; and alterations to 1 Mill Lane, Kenmare House, and Emmanuel United Reformed Church, in connection with expansion of Pembroke College.

The Committee received representations in objection to the application from a representative of Camcycle and a resident of St Mary's Lane under application 18/1930/FUL.

Lord Smith had already addressed the Committee in support of the application under application 18/1930/FUL.

Ward County Councillor Harris (Market Ward) had already addressed the Committee under application 18/1930/FUL.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to grant the application for listed building consent accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

19/82/Plan 17/2265/FUL - Homerton College, Hills Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of existing conference reception building and construction of a new dining hall, buttery area, kitchens and associated facilities and new areas of hard and soft landscaping.

The Committee received representations in objection to the application from a resident of Harrison Drive.

The representation covered the following issues:

i. Welcomed the design of the dining hall but objected to the waste collection element which utilised the residential area of Harrison Drive as a service yard.
ii. Considered the service yard to be unsafe, unsightly and unsociable as it did not comply with Local Plan policies, 35, 55 and 56.
iii. Believed there was a better alternative to the proposed service area on the applicant's site with the use of security barriers preventing out of hours deliveries. The benefits would include CCTV camera's and wide roads where vehicles could drive in and without having to reverse. This location would be safe, quiet and out of sight and responded to Local Plan policies 35, 55 and 56.
iv. The collection site was currently further away from the proposed location and the waste collection could still be heard; the noise level would increase with the relocation of the service area.
v. Had video evidence of vehicles collecting glass at 5.30am.
vi. The applicant's proposals trusted their supply chain to comply with conditions but to date they had not.
vii. The planning officer stated the environmental health officer had raised no concerns so it would be unreasonable to impose condition of hours of delivery under para 8.20 of the report but strongly disagreed as supported by Local Plan policy 35.
viii. Requested a similar condition to 10.4 of the report to restrict collections and deliveries outside normal working hours.
ix. The waste facility design had a large industrial door 8m x3 on the building frontage which could be left open, noisy in operation, dysfunctional over time and offered a poor visual view to the resident's living opposite.
x. Felt the conservation officer had not recognised the issues with the door and this should be clarified. A large industrial sized door did not constitute good detailed design.
xi. Stated the urban design officer had not received the latest design, as in their acceptance of the scheme stated the door is at the side and not at the front.

xii. The planning officer had advised that as the highway on Harrison Drive was not adopted the highway authority had no comment to make. This was socially unacceptable.
xiii. Had been advised that signage would be a solution but there was already a large number of signage on Harrison Drive.
xiv. Potential risk injury of unsafe vehicle movements from waste vehicles.

Councillor McGerty (Queen Edith Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application.

The representation covered the following issues:

i. Harrison Drive was a residential street which the college choose to develop for residential use which housed a number of families and a developing community.
ii. The applicant as landlords had a responsibility to respond to residents' concerns.
iii. The applicant had recently removed 100 metres of hedgerow for a temporary footpath opposite a separate development which they were currently undertaking.
iv. While the applicant had said there were no plans to increase student numbers the College had been allowed to grow to become the largest College in Cambridge.
v. Access to the staff car park was at the end of Harrison Drive; the Hills Road end has the Facility of Education.
vi. Harrison Drive was in continuous use for service vehicles making deliveries and collections. Vehicles used the layby to make u turns nearer to Hills Road although the noise was still disruptive to occupants.
vii. The proposal to move the layby would mean it would sit directly opposite resident's front doors. This would have an adverse impact on residents.
viii. A mature protected tree would be cut down to accommodate the relocation of the layby.
ix. A large TPO tree had already been taken down without authorisation. In total four trees would be lost but the drawings did not reflect this.
x. Would question if the Committee had all the information to consider the environmental loss.
xi. The environmental officer did not support the application as outlined in pages 420 & 423 of the agenda pack.
xii. Requested the Committee added a condition to install a bollard on the junction of Harris Drive and Scholars Court to prevent large vehicles performing u turns.

xiii. The College needed to respond positively to the surrounding environment and avoid leaving its own tenants with an unreasonable number and dangerous vehicle movements on the road where they lived.

xiv. Any conditions applied were likely to be ignored and difficult to enforce.

The Senior Planning Officer proposed that the Committee agreed to grant delegated powers to officers to discuss with the College the restriction of delivery and collection times, in conjunction with the Chair and Spokes.

Unanimously resolved to do so.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers plus delegated power to Officers to deal with a condition to restrict delivery hours.

19/83/Plan 17/2266/LBC - Homerton College, Hills Road

The Committee received an application for Listed Building Consent.

The application sought approval for the demolition of the existing conference reception building and construction of a new Dining Hall. The application is accompanied by an application for full planning permission which will be heard concurrently at Planning Committee.

Professor Ward had already addressed the Committee in support of the application under application 17/2265/FUL

Councillor McGerty (Queen Edith ward councillor) had already addressed the Committee under the application 17/2265/FUL.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to grant the application for Listed Building Consent in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

19/84/Plan 18/1807/FUL - India House, 31 Newnham Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of new building comprising of a single A1 or A3 (in the alternative) unit at ground floor and seven self-contained flats above.

Matt Hare (Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application on behalf of the applicant.

A statement in support of the application on behalf of a member of South Newnham Residents' Association was read out to the Committee.

Councillor Dr Gehring (Newnham Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application as follows:

i. The most sensitive location in all of Newham; an exposed location which was viewed by thousands of visitors to the City when dropped off by tourist coaches.
ii. The proposed design would change the character of the historic street scene.
iii. The redevelopment of the Cambridge University Arms had shown it was possible to replicate certain heritage elements sensitively; this application did not reproduce any of the historical elements which were being taken down.
iv. The application would have an adverse effect on the existing street scene.

Councillor Cantrill (Newnham Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application as follows:

i. A complex and sensitive site in relation to the architectural and heritage content of the area.
ii. No objection to the redevelopment and demolition of the site.
iii. If a sensitive design were to be delivered it would achieve more than the original building offered to the existing street scape.
iv. Had spoken with the architect and the South Newnham Residents' Association on various occasions to determine a design in nature and form worthy of the location; many of the aspects had reflected those discussions.
v. The proposed design was using high quality materials, respected the space, while addressing the sites which surrounding the building, Newham Road; the Mill Pond and Victoria Road.
vi. Despite all the positives, the design did not go far enough concerning the massing of the three storey component and how it related to Newham

Road. The dominance of the building and how it relays to the surrounding buildings.

vii. The application should not be approved in its current form.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 6 votes to 1) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers subject to the following changes:

i. Revision to condition 27 to refer to new rather than existing building.
ii. Additional condition requiring sample materials.

19/85/Plan 18/1859/FUL - 39 Akeman Street

This item was postponed until the meeting of the Planning Committee on 17 June 2019.

19/86/Plan 18/1520/FUL - 11 Napier Street

This item was postponed until the meeting of the Planning Committee on 17 June 2019.

19/87/Plan 18/1887/FUL - 57 Peverel Road

This item was postponed until the meeting of the Planning Committee on 17 June 2019.

The meeting ended at 6.00 pm

CHAIR

PLANNING 3 July 2019
10.00 am - 2.50 pm

Present:

Planning Committee Members: Councillors Smart (Chair), Baigent, Green, Lord, McQueen, Thornburrow and Tunnacliffe

Officers:
Delivery Manager Development Management: Nigel Blazeby
Principal Planner: Lorraine Casey
Principal Planner: Ganesh Gnanamoorthy
Senior Planning Officer: Lewis Tomlinson
Planner: Mary Collins
Legal Adviser: Keith Barber
Committee Manager: Toni Birkin
Committee Manager: James Goddard

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

19/16/Plan Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Sargeant and Page-Croft. Councillor Thornburrow attended as the (Labour) Alternate.

Councillor McQueen left after the consideration of item 19/23/FUL.

19/17/Plan Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Baigent	All	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign.
Councillor Green	19/19/Plan and 19/20/Plan	Personal: Application made by Cambridge Investment Partnership. (Established in January 2017, CIP is a joint venture between Cambridge City Council and

		Hill Investment Partnerships.)

19/18/Plan Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 and 18 June would be reviewed at a future meeting.

19/19/Plan 19/0261/FUL - 74-82 Akeman Street

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of 3 no. retail units (2 x use class A1 and 1 x use class A5), 1no. Community Centre (use class D1) and provision of 14 no. dwellings (8 flats and 6 maisonettes) following demolition of existing commercial units and flats).

Mr Longstaff (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed amendments to the Officer's recommendation to include:

i. Condition 50 to be amended to include "Installation" (not just sign-off) of electric vehicle charge points.
ii. Amend wording of condition 24 requiring the development a scheme for ecological enhancement after any demolition work but before the first occupation on-site.

The amendments were **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers plus amended conditions and delegated powers for officers to amend wording.

Condition 24 should now read as follows:

24. Prior to the commencement of development above ground, with the exception of demolition, a scheme for ecological enhancement including native planting, measures to allow dispersal of hedgehogs and in-built features for nesting birds and roosting bats shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The measures shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed scheme.

    Reason: To improve the bio-diversity contribution of the site (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 69).

Condition 50 should now read as follows:

50. Prior to the installation of any electrical services, an electric vehicle charge point scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The charging points shall be installed in accordance with the approved details and retained thereafter.

    Reason: In the interests of encouraging more sustainable modes and forms of transport and to reduce the impact of development on local air quality, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2019) paragraphs 105, 110, 170 and 181, Policy 36 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) Cambridge City Council's adopted Air Quality Action Plan (2018).

19/20/Plan 18/1859/FUL - 39 Akeman Street

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for temporary change of use of 39 Akeman Street as a Community Centre Office for a period of 55 weeks involving the widening of a rear door and the installation of an access ramp.

Mr Longstaff (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

19/21/Plan 19/0263/FUL - Future Business Centre, Kings Hedges Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The Senior Planner requested delegated authority to seek s106 contributions from the County Council. Hitherto no response to the consultation had been received in this regard from the County.

The application sought approval for the proposed erection of extensions to the Future Business Centre and installation of car and cycle parking, installation of substation and associated works.

Ms Hyde (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed amendments to the Officer's recommendation to include:

i. Installation of electric vehicle charge points in all 5 car bays.
ii. Sufficient parking space for cargo bikes be provided.

The amendments were **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers plus:

i. Delegated powers of approval for Officers to resolve the outstanding issue of whether Cambridgeshire County Council require a contribution. If a contribution is required, a S106 will need to be completed prior to the permission being issued.
ii. Additional condition requiring EV charge points in all 5 car bays.
iii. An informative encouraging provision for cargo bikes as part of the cycle parking scheme.

19/22/Plan 18/1520/FUL - 11 Napier Street

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a change of use of existing first floor staff accommodation to bed and breakfast (11no rooms).

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a local resident.

The representation covered the following issues:

i. Concerned that priority for the cycle route had been lost over time.
ii. Was pleased that the allocated disabled parking bay was to be relocated so that it did not block the cycle route.
iii. Hoped that enforcement of parking restriction that protected the cycle route would be enforced.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

19/23/Plan 18/1887/FUL - 57 Peverel Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of a detached 3-bed dwelling to the side of 57 Peverel Road.

The Committee requested that additional wording be added to draft condition 5 in order to make application compliant with requirement for hedgehog permeable boundaries.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers subject to the hard and soft landscaping condition (no.5) being amended to include a requirement for hedgehog gaps in the boundary treatment.

19/24/Plan 18/1952/FUL - 6 Wilberforce Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for retrospective permission for the erection of a bike store.

The Committee noted that the application was part retrospective with details of modifications to the current building outlined in the amendment sheet.

The Committee received representations in objection to the application from local residents. A representative of the West Cambridge Preservation Society addressed the Committee on behalf of the Society and other local objectors:

The representation covered the following issues:

i. The cycle store was out of keeping with the conservation area.
ii. Building damages the street scene.
iii. Had an adverse impact on the local landscape.
iv. The aesthetic of the area was important.
v. Application contravened Local Plan policies.
vi. Green landscaping needed to be protected.

Joe Sanghera (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Local residents addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Cantrill sent a statement in support of the application.

Councillor Gehring (Newnham Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee in support of the application and made the following comments:

i. The proposed design was sympathetic to the local area.
ii. Use of bicycles was to be encouraged and safe storage of cargo bikes would be needed.
iii. Cargo bikes had been shown to reduce car journeys.
iv. Soft landscaping was important and the proposed greening of this building was welcomed.

The Committee expressed support for the application and suggested that the design was in keeping with the area. It also responded to the Council's policies regarding Climate Change.

The Chair reminded the Committee of the policy test required for an application in a Conservation Area: that they must improve and/or conserve the area.

The Committee suggested that the existing building might have been approved without the proposed revisions. It was noted that, should enforcement action be needed in the future, the Committee would likely be consulted in advance of any such action.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 5 votes to 1) to reject the officer recommendation to refuse the application.

Unanimously resolved to grant the application for planning permission contrary to Officer recommendation, for the following reason:

> The development, as amended, is considered to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Notwithstanding this, any harm would be mitigated by the benefits the development would bring in providing secure cycle storage for the property which is consistent with the Council's policies on sustainability and climate change.
>
> The description of the application would need to be modified to reflect the fact that the proposal is part retrospective and subject to the following conditions:
>
> 1. Approved drawings
> 2. Requirement for soft landscaping scheme

19/25/Plan 19/0015/FUL - 11 Hinton Avenue

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of detached two bedroom dwelling and associated works at 11 Hinton Avenue, Cambridge.

The Committee noted the error in the description of the Proposal in the Committee report which incorrectly stated that the proposal was for a three bedroom property.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a local resident.

The representation covered the following issues:

i. As owner of the property next door to the site he had concerns.
ii. Property would overshadow outdoor space.
iii. Shadow study was incorrect and in winter months his garden would receive no direct sunlight.
iv. Amended design was not an improvement.

v. Would be overbearing and would create a feeling of enclosure.
vi. Main living area of property would be facing the new building.
vii. Would have a negative impact on the streetscape.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed an additional condition regarding the visibility splay of the proposed on-site parking space access route.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers but with modification to the boundary treatment condition to refer to visibility splays, and the inclusion of an informative regarding hedgehogs.

The meeting ended at 2.50 pm

CHAIR

PLANNING COMMITTEE **4th September 2019**

Application Number	18/1002/FUL	**Agenda Item**	
Date Received	27th June 2018	**Officer**	Lorraine Casey
Target Date	26th September 2018		
Ward	Abbey		
Site	211 - 213 Newmarket Road And 2 Godesdone Road Cambridge CB5 8HA		
Proposal	Demolition of existing buildings at 211-213 Newmarket Road and construction of a hotel (C1 use), with change of use and conversion of 2 Godesdone Road to C1 use, and provision of associated infrastructure.		
Applicant	MPMerchant (NR) Ltd and easyHotel C/O Agent		

A. Adjourned decision protocol

A.1 At the Planning Committee meeting held on 17th June 2019, Members were minded to refuse the application, contrary to Officer recommendation, and therefore triggered the Adjourned Decision Protocol. I will set out and assess the three minded to refuse reasons in full below:

1: The proposed development would conflict with Policy 77 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 due to the location of the site partly on a residential road and as insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that there is a need for this type of accommodation in this location over and above that identified in the Hotel Futures Study, upon which this policy is framed.

2: Insufficient information has been submitted with the application to demonstrate that the development would not have an unacceptable transport impact. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy 81 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 and notably paragraph 8.22 which aims to achieve a zero increase or reduction in car traffic in locations including Newmarket Road.

3. Due to the absence of amenities in the proposed hotel and the absence of adequate drop-off and pick-up arrangements on site, the development would result in unacceptable levels of noise and disturbance to occupiers of adjacent residential properties through comings and goings, and visitors congregating in Godesdone Rd and through increased vehicle and notably taxi movements in the area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy 35 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

A.2 Since the Committee meeting, the applicant's agent and representatives of the Residents' Association have submitted further representations. The residents' comments essentially collate concerns that have been raised in previous submissions insofar as they relate to these specific issues and both the residents' and agents' key comments have been referred to in the assessment below.

Reason 1

The proposed development would conflict with Policy 77 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 due to the location of the site partly on a residential road and as insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that there is a need for this type of accommodation in this location over and above that identified in the Hotel Futures Study, upon which this policy is framed.

A.3 The first minded-to reason for refusal relates to Policy 77 which covers the development of visitor accommodation. During the discussion at Committee, Members were concerned that the policy only supports high quality hotels and not further budget hotels; that there is no proven demand for the type of accommodation proposed (the Cambridge Hotel Futures Study indicates that demand fur budget accommodation in Cambridge has largely been satisfied); and that the location of the site, being accessed off a residential rather than main road, is not supported by Policy 77.

A.4 With regards to the concern regarding the type/quality of accommodation proposed, the advice received from the Policy team and clarified within their presentation to Members prior to the 17th June Committee meeting is that the focus on 'high quality' is in specific locations within the City Centre including

new developments (Old Press/Mill Lane) and areas near the Stations, as well as other City Centre locations, NW Cambridge and the Biomedical Campus. This is set out in the first two paragraphs of Policy 77 and referred to in the supporting text to the policy (para 8.48) which states that the Hotel Futures Study (HFS) aspires to high quality hotels (namely 3-star rating and above) being located within the City Centre.

A.5 The third paragraph of Policy 77 specifies other locations that may be suitable for visitor accommodation, with the key criteria being that accommodation should be located on the frontages of main roads, and within a mixed-use area within walking distance of bus route corridors and with good public transport accessibility. Paragraph 8.49 of the supporting text states that visitor accommodation covered by the policy takes many forms, including traditional hotels, guesthouses, hostels and serviced apartments.

A.6 Taking the above into consideration, it is clear that the policy supports many forms of visitor accommodation. There is an aspiration to direct high-quality accommodation towards the City Centre but, outside this area (as the application site is), the policy supports a range of accommodation (not just high-quality hotels) and the key consideration relates to the sustainability of the location.

A.7 Officers' advice to Members is that refusing the application on the basis that the proposal does not satisfy the requirement for 'high-quality' accommodation would be flawed as the policy does not specify this. Officers also consider that the location of the site satisfies the third paragraph of the policy by being located on the frontage of a main road (Newmarket Road), within a mixed use area, and in a location with good public transport, cycling and walking links. Whilst the road from which the site would be accessed (Godesdone Road) is a primarily residential street rather than a main arterial road, the emphasis of this part of the policy is upon new hotel accommodation being sited in a sustainable and accessible location, and the fact that the site bounds a residential road to one side does not alter its suitability from a sustainability point of view. As a result, Officers consider that it would not be justifiable to refuse the application on the basis that the location would be unacceptable insofar as it relates to Policy 77.

A.8 The third element of this ‘minded-to’ reason relates to the lack of proven need for further budget accommodation. A consultancy study, entitled ‘Cambridge Hotel Futures’ was undertaken, and finalised in April 2012, in order to assess the supply of and demand for hotel and short-stay accommodation in Cambridge to 2031, and Policy 77 was framed upon the findings of this study. This study identified a strong demand for significant new hotel development in Cambridge, approximately 1500 new hotel bedrooms (based on a medium growth scenario), in order to widen the accommodation offer of the city, encourage longer stays and enhance the competitiveness of the city as a visitor destination. This included an anticipated requirement, based on a medium-growth scenario, for 460 budget rooms. 498 budget rooms have been delivered to date at Orchard Park and on Newmarket Road thereby satisfying the anticipated need in the study for budget accommodation. The high growth scenario stated a likely need for 594 budget rooms and, if the Grafton Centre hotel were to come forward (this is currently the subject of another application), this would deliver 153 rooms, taking the total above the need identified at the time of the study.

A.9 Whilst it is understandable that these findings would lead Members to conclude that there is no need for a further budget hotel in Cambridge, the latest evidence available suggests that the situation has changed and evolved significantly, and that there is a much greater need and demand for budget accommodation than identified and anticipated at the time of the 2012 study. The findings of the 2012 study are therefore dated and a new Visitor Accommodation Study is being commissioned to inform the Greater Cambridge Local Plan. Planning applications are required to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The evidence provided both by the applicants in support of their application and by the Planning Policy Team regarding the City’s increased and changing accommodation needs are material issues that should be taken into account by Members in assessing the application.

A.10 A ‘Hotel Needs Assessment’ was submitted with the application, and this explained that a combination of the following factors has resulted in an increased demand for hotel rooms:

- Average hotel room occupancy has increased from 73.8% in 2010 to 76.5% in 2017, and this exceeds the 70% threshold above which demand is considered to outstrip supply.
- Average Achieved Room Rates and Average Revenue per Available Room have both increased since 2010.
- There has been a higher forecast job growth in Cambridge than anticipated at the time of the study.
- There has been a higher growth rate in the UK Visitor Economy and an associated increase in accommodation and food/beverage services.
- There has been strong passenger growth at nearby airports including a 44% increase at Stansted from 2011 – 2016.

A.11 The Planning Policy team has advised that data available from 'Visit Cambridge and Beyond', and 'Gateway to the East: A position statement for the development and growth of the Greater Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Visitor Economy' shows that, from 2010 – 2017, the number of visitors to Cambridge increased from 4m to 8.1m (including 950,000 staying trips), with the economic value increasing from J393m to J835m and proportion of employment increasing from 14% to 22%. There is also a growing demand from Chinese visitors, with trips out of China forecast to increase to 132m by 2022 and 264m by 2030, with Cambridge being top of Chinese visitors' list of destinations to visit in the UK.

A.12 The Council's policy seeks to increase the number of tourists staying overnight in Cambridge, to help secure economic tourism benefits and to smooth out tourist activity caused by having so many day trips. The number of Airbnbs in Cambridge is estimated between 300-450 properties, and this represents an unmet demand for visitor accommodation some of which falls within the same price bracket as Easyhotel and Travelodge. Emerging trends such as Airbnb, serviced apartments, and whether hotels such as Easyhotel are another form of budget hotel or fall within a separate category of 'Superbudget' will be considered as part of the Visitor Accommodation Study that will update the Hotel Futures Study. Whilst this document has not yet been commissioned, and there is therefore no formally adopted document to counter the findings of the Hotel Futures Study and no specific figures on the need for overnight accommodation, it is anticipated that due

to the recent and projected rise in visitor numbers, the increased use of Airbnbs by local property owners, the fall in value of the J, and the increase in Cambridge's Average Daily Rate of accommodation to J95 in 2018 (obtained from Colliers UK Hotels Market Index), the Study is likely to conclude that there is insufficient hotel/visitor accommodation capacity to meet Cambridge's needs.

A.13 As a result of this up-to-date evidence base, Officers are extremely concerned that refusing the application based upon the findings of/figures quoted within the Hotel Futures Study is highly unlikely to be successful at appeal. This is because, in the event of an appeal, Officers would be required to provide evidence demonstrating why there is no need for the category of hotel proposed in this application, and the most up-to-date evidence available simply does not support this position.

Reason 2

Insufficient information has been submitted with the application to demonstrate that the development would not have an unacceptable transport impact. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy 81 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 and notably paragraph 8.22 which aims to achieve a zero increase or reduction in car traffic in locations including Newmarket Road.

A.14 Local Plan Policy 81 states that developments will only be permitted where they do not have an unacceptable transport impact. New development will therefore require sufficient information to enable the transport impact to be assessed; a travel plan for all major development proposals; and reasonable and proportionate financial contributions/mitigation measures to make the transport impact acceptable. The supporting text to this policy explains that such documentation would need to be assessed by the County Council as the Highways Authority.

A.15 A Transport Statement was submitted with the application and, in response to the request for further information from County Highways, additional Technical Notes were provided by the applicant's transport consultants. The assessment considered the impact upon highway safety (including the safety of pedestrians and cyclists) in comparison to the trip generation of the former retail use (which is the lawful/established use of the

site). This has demonstrated that the site is in a sustainable location, and that there are opportunities for employees, guests and visitors to travel to the site by modes other than by car. To encourage travel by sustainable means, the Travel Plan notes that bicycles would be provided for use by guests, that a map showing walking routes from local car parks would be provided to guests on booking, and that, at night, taxis will only stop on Newmarket Road.

A.16 The applicant has also agreed to undertake a survey and that, if guests are found to be parking unlawfully in the CPZ, to meet the cost of increased charges to residents, and also to contribute J120,000 towards highways improvements.

A.17 Residents have raised concerns that the TRICS data is flawed and vehicle trip estimates unrealistic; that the proposal increases the risk of vehicle collision and cyclist safety due to vehicles cutting across Godesdone Road to the layby; and that the bus and cycle lanes would be obstructed by taxis dropping off on Newmarket Road at night. These concerns have been relayed to the Highways Authority who have advised that it considers the information provided as part of the application to be sound and robust and that, when comparing the proposal to the traffic impacts associated with the lawful retail use and the already busy nature of Newmarket Road, the application is acceptable from a highway safety perspective subject to mitigation conditions and financial contributions.

A.18 The Highways Authority has advised that it would have no basis upon which to recommend an objection to the proposals or the associated technical work presented. I would therefore recommend to Members not to refuse the application on highway safety grounds, as this would be contrary to the Highways Authority's advice (who are the statutory consultee on such matters) and, in the event of an appeal, could result in a successful challenge on cost grounds against the Council.

Reason 3

Due to the absence of amenities in the proposed hotel and the absence of adequate drop-off and pick-up arrangements on site, the development would result in unacceptable levels of noise and disturbance to occupiers of adjacent residential properties through comings and

goings, and visitors congregating in Godesdone Rd and through increased vehicle and notably taxi movements in the area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy 35 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

A.19 Local Plan Policy 35 states that development will be permitted where it is demonstrated that it will not lead to significant adverse effects upon the health and quality of life/amenity from noise and vibration impacts to adjacent properties.

A.20 The Council's Environmental Health Officer raised concerns during the course of the application regarding the potential impact of the development upon the amenities of adjacent residents. Further information was provided by the applicants that considered the impact compared to the lawful retail use and existing background noise levels. This predicted either a negligible or no change noise impact on Newmarket Road and River Lane in the short and long-term during weekdays and Saturdays; a negligible impact on Godesdone Road on weekdays; and a minor impact on Godesdone Road on Saturdays in the short term, reducing to negligible in the long term.

A.21 There are two key issues to take into account in this instance when assessing the extent of harm on noise grounds. Firstly, the site lies in an area that experiences relatively high background noise levels, as a result of the estimated 30,000 cars that pass daily along Newmarket Road. Secondly, the site has an existing established retail use (Coopers furniture store) that has no restrictions relating to hours of use that would help to control noise levels. Whilst it appears that the use recently operated on a relatively low-key basis, it could be used more intensively without requiring planning permission and this fallback position needs to be taken into consideration. Local residents will have suffered noise and disturbance arising from collections and deliveries in Godesdone Road by large vehicles, customer car parking and comings and goings.

A.22 The proposal includes a number of measures to minimise noise disturbance to nearby residents including:

- Additional noise insulation to No.4 Godesdone Road.
- Restricted delivery hours (representing an improvement over the existing unrestricted situation).

- Location of drop-off layby opposite the commercial premises on the opposite side of Godesdone Road rather than outside No.4.
- Travel plan that would discourage guests from travelling by car.

A.23 The submitted documentation and proposed measures have satisfied the Environmental Health Officer that in terms of noise/vibration, air quality, odour and contaminated land considerations, the proposal is acceptable and can be mitigated against through planning conditions.

A.24 The one area that does differ from the previous use is that the proposed development is likely to result in a discernible increase in activity levels at night and after normal shop closing hours. The Environmental Health Officer has continually raised concerns regarding the noise impact from taxi movements and associated sounds such as slamming doors, voices, car stereos and engines revving, albeit has advised that a formal objection cannot be raised on such grounds given that these activities would take place off site.

A.25 In response to these concerns, the applicant's agent has advised that Easyhotel will require guests who use taxis to be dropped off at night (from 11pm onwards) on Newmarket Road, and I am satisfied this would therefore minimise disruption to local residents during the late evening hours.

A.26 Further concerns raised by Members at Committee centre around the fact that, as the proposed hotel has no associated amenities such as restaurant/café etc and, in particular, no amenity/break-out areas within the confines of the building for guests' use, this would result in guests congregating in the street to smoke/drink and consequent noise and disturbance to nearby residents. I cannot dispute that this is a likely consequence of the proposal but, in view of the high background noise levels, is not considered to constitute such a significant noise nuisance as to warrant refusal of the application on such grounds.

Additional consideration – Surface water drainage issues

A.27 Since Committee, concerns have been raised by Councillor Davey and local residents that, in response to queries raised by

Members at the meeting, Officers advised there had been no known sewage/drainage issues in the area. Councillor Davey has commented that this is incorrect and that there were two localised flooding events in Riverside in 2012 and 2015 (both caused by heavy summer rainfall and overloading of the drains). Since these events, remedial work was carried out (organised by the City Council in conjunction with Anglian Water, the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority). He has commented that, as the site is at a higher level than Riverside, if surface water from the proposed development would go into the same storm drains and down to Riverside, it could compromise the remedial work that has been undertaken.

A.28 I have forwarded these concerns onto the Council's Drainage Engineer who has advised that the team was aware of these issues in making its comments on the proposal, and that the proposal is considered acceptable following the submission of further details during the course of the application to address their initial concerns. The Drainage Engineer has advised that there will be a reduction in the amount of stormwater entering the sewers due to a restricted discharge rate, and that this is in line with local policy. The site currently outfalls at an unrestricted rate and is almost 100% impermeable, and the proposal would therefore result in an improvement as the current site use already increases the amount of rainwater entering the network.

A.29 In light of the above advice, I am satisfied that consultees were aware of the recent nearby surface-water flood events, that their comments took this into consideration, and that the proposal is acceptable in terms of its surface water drainage impacts subject to the conditions recommended by the City and County Councils' Drainage teams.

Conclusion

A.30 In conclusion, Officers reiterate the advice provided to Members at the 17th June Committee, namely that the proposal is considered acceptable, subject to conditions and a S106 Agreement. It is considered that a refusal on highway safety and policy 77 grounds cannot be substantiated, and that the noise impacts, whilst a valid concern, are not significant enough to justify a refusal on this basis.

APPENDIX 1 – REPORT CONSIDERED AT 17TH JUNE PLANNING COMMITTEE

SUMMARY	The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons: The proposed hotel would be acceptable in principle and the building would be in character in the locality and would not result in any significant harm to existing residential amenity or highway safety.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL subject to conditions

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

1.1 The site comprises 211-213 Newmarket Road and 2 Godesdone Road. The site currently contains a collection of single-storey buildings and a lorry port which form J. H. Cooper and Son, a furniture shop, and a 2-storey (3-bed) end-of-terrace building (2 Godesdone Road) used for small furniture/flat pack and dressing item storage. The site area is 693 sq.m.

1.2 There is a vehicle access to Godesdone Road with staff/lorry/customer parking to the rear.

1.3 The surrounding area is residential in character to the north of Newmarket Road with mainly commercial uses to the main road frontage and on the opposite side of Newmarket Road to the south, including two hotels and a retail park.

1.4 The site lies within the Eastern Gate Opportunity Area and within the Riverside Section of the City of Cambridge Conservation Area No.1 (Central). The site is within a controlled parking zone.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

2.1 The proposal is for the demolition of the existing buildings and the conversion of 2 Godesdone Road and the erection of a building, together forming a 90-bedroomed hotel. The hotel

would have a reception area near the front door but would not provide any eating or drinking facilities.

2.2 The new building would be two-storey to the Newmarket Road elevation with a three-storey section set back behind this. The three-storey section would also be set behind the retained (and converted) 2-storey house such that it would be well back from the frontage onto Godesdone Road.

2.3 No car parking spaces would be provided on site. A bicycle store would be provided with 24 spaces. It is proposed that any people arriving by private vehicles will park at The Grafton Centre and walk to the hotel or people will be dropped/picked up from the hotel by taxi/mini-cab. A refuse store would be provided.

2.4 In response to requests for additional information, the applicants submitted further details (including a letter from the proposed occupiers) and a supporting representation from a neighbouring occupier.

2.5 The application has been supported by the following documents:

- Planning Statement and Site Sequential Assessment
- Design and Access Statement (revision 4)
- Built Heritage Statement
- Archaeological Statement (desk based)
- Daylight and Sunlight Assessment
- Hotel Needs Assessment
- Air Quality Statement
- Noise Impact Assessment
- Ecology Appraisal
- Flood Risk Assessment and Surface Water Drainage Statement
- Transport Statement
- Contamination Statement (desk-based)
- Ventilation Statement
- Energy Statement
- Utilities Statement
- Statement of Community Engagement
- Views (verified)
- Letter from the proposed operator (Easyhotel)

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
None Relevant		

4.0 PUBLICITY

4.1 Advertisement:	Yes
Adjoining Owners:	Yes
Site Notice Displayed:	Yes

5.0 POLICY

5.1 See Appendix 1 for full details of Central Government Guidance, Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan 2018	1 6 23 28 29 31 32 33 34 35 36 42 55 56 57 58 59 61 62 64 65 77 80 81 82 85

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework February 2019 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance from 3 March 2014 onwards Circular 11/95 (Annex A)
Supplementary Planning Documents /Other	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012) Eastern Gate SPD (Oct 2011) (Management Framework) Cambridge Hotel Futures (April 2012)

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Planning Policy

6.1 The NPPF includes a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Hotel uses are included within the NPPF's definition of main town centre uses. The NPPF also prioritises such uses in centres before other locations are considered such that at para.24 it requires a sequential test to be undertaken for any proposals in an "edge of centre" location.

6.2 Cambridge Hotel Futures Study (June 2012) indicates that when the study was undertaken, once Premier Inn and Travel Lodge (at Orchard Park and along Newmarket Road) were delivered, that this would meet the predicted need for budget accommodation. The report made no reference to "super-budget" operators which is a new type of hotel which has emerged since the Study was undertaken.

6.3 Policy 77 of the Local Plan allows for the expansion of visitor accommodation and requires that this is located on the frontages of main roads or in areas of mixed-use within walking distance of a bus route corridor with good public transport accessibility. The proposed site meets these criteria.

6.4 There is recognition that there are a number of hotels opened in recent years or in the pipeline amounting to some 1740 rooms with other potential sites coming forward which could deliver another 480 rooms with potential areas for new aparthotels/serviced apartments including Cambridge Railway Station (one is currently under consideration) and at Park Street car park.

6.5 Recently there has been substantial redevelopment to Newmarket Road to reinvigorate the area including offices, two hotels, residential and student accommodation and investment in the Grafton area including retail, leisure, hotel etc.

6.6 The site is considered to be in a suitable location in land-use planning terms in principle but this does need to be balanced against the cumulative total of hotel rooms in the two existing hotels with this hotel in close proximity. Nonetheless, the proposed "super-budget" hotel will not provide a bar or restaurant and, as such, is more likely to result in occupiers relying on and supporting the local pubs and restaurants bringing increased prosperity to the local economy.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

6.7 These comments are further to a Technical Note dated 29th November, provided by SLR Consulting Limited.

Forecast Trips – TRICS - In its previous response, CCC requested the full TRICS outputs to confirm that the sites used within the assessment are appropriate. The developer has provided further details of the TRICS assessment, which is now considered acceptable.

The vehicular trip generation to 27 trips in the weekday AM peak, 15 trips in the PM peak and 21 trips in the Saturday peak

period. The daily vehicular trip generation for a weekday/Saturday would be 279 trips.

Forecast Trips – Newmarket Road Travelodge and Liverpool easyHotel
To complement the TRICS assessment the applicant has also assessed (i) the Travelodge hotel site opposite, and (ii) an existing easyHotel on the edge of Liverpool. These sites were surveyed to understand arrivals and departures, and in the case of the Travelodge, taxi movements.

The vehicular trips associated with the assessment are lower than the TRICS assessment.

CCC have previously requested either (a) a junction assessment for the below junctions, or (b) a detailed technical note demonstrating why a junction assessment is not required.
Junction 1: Site Access / Godesdone Road; Junction 2: Godesdone Road/Newmarket Road Junction 3: River Lane/Newmarket Road; and Junction 4: Newmarket Road/Elizabeth Way Roundabout.
The additional information provided includes (b): a narrative relating to the impact at each junction. CCC accepts the rationale provided.

No objection subject to the mitigation package proposed relating to a contribution of J120,000 towards the Greater Cambridge Partnership's emerging scheme on Newmarket Road/East Road, a parking monitoring strategy (and if needed, J25,000 towards consultation relating to expansion of the Controlled Parking Zone), construction management plan and a Travel Plan.

Urban Design and Conservation

6.8 The site is within the Riverside and Stourbridge Common area of the Central Conservation Area. There have been pre-application discussions on the proposals for this site

Eastern Gate Development Framework - In March 2011, a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was adopted for the 'Eastern Gate Area'. The SPD provides clear guidance on the City Council's aspirations for the area by providing a framework to co-ordinate redevelopment. The document went through

significant public consultation with local residents and stakeholders to shape the content and aspirations contained within it.

With regards to the proposal site, the SPD provides guidance for the site on the overall heights likely to be acceptable and appropriate as well as articulating a number of more general good design principles that new development would need to respond to.

The SPD identifies the need for new development to repair street frontages in a coherent way to create fine grained active frontages (Section 3.4). The SPD also identifies the important visual cues that new development should pick up on to ensure that developments are compatible with the finer urban grain setting that characterise the Riverside and Stourbridge Common area.

1. Response to context: heritage and conservation area

The scheme has taken into consideration the existing fine grain of the properties in the conservation area which has resulted in a varied ridge height and use of a range of materials for the facades. It is considered that the proposals will preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area provided that appropriate materials are used and that the construction workmanship is of the highest order.

The retention of no. 2 Godesdone Road is welcomed as it is a building which is important to the character of the street and the conservation area. With the proposed new use of the building, the applicants should ensure that the ventilation for the refuse on the ground floor of this building is not on the front elevation or in a sensitive location on the roof. In addition, in order to preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area, the internal refuse use for the ground floor should not be clearly visible through the windows on the front façade.

The double gable end onto Godesdone Road breaks up the bulk and massing of the building, responding to the character and proportions of this part of the conservation area. The Urban Design and Conservation Team wait to be convinced that the composite cladding is of high enough quality for this location within the conservation area. The use of brick to create a

pattern to the elevations is considered to be a good way to create variation and interest.

2. Movement and Access

The main entrance for guests into the hotel is clearly defined and appropriately scaled. A highly transparent reception area is located in a logical location that will assist with the legibility of the proposal. The reception area and hotel room windows will help to activate the ground floor frontage of Newmarket Road. The reception area wraps around the corner of the building, presenting a large window onto the junction of Godesdone Road, which will provide a degree of surveillance onto the street. A recessed secondary entrance provides access for servicing as well as the opportunity for guests to borrow bikes. The treatment of this secondary access point, which will accommodate bike and bin movement, needs to be robust in order to prevent damage to the wall and finishes. This detail can be secured by way of condition. The location of the cycle store within the scheme is supported. However more information is required to understand how the provision meets the City Council's Cycle Parking Guide and the local plan requirements for guests and staff members. Conditions are to be attached in relation to detailed layout of the cycle storage area to demonstrate compliance with the Cycle Parking Guide and dedicated staff cycle provision requires.

3. Scale and massing

The SPD identifies in figure 39: Built Form, Scale and Massing Strategy (page 45) that the site could allow buildings up to 2+1 storeys (the +1 either being accommodation in the roofscape or a setback upper floor) along the Newmarket Road frontage. These heights were informed by the site's proximity to established residential properties and the character of the conservation area, as well as the wider intention of the SPD to create varied rooflines. The proposal is 2 storeys with the 3rd floor accommodated within the roofscape, which is in line with the SPD. Assuming 3m floor to floor heights the SPD guidance of 2+1 storeys equates to a maximum height of 9m or 10m with an increased 'commercial floor' height at ground floor. Measured to the top of the ridge the development is 10m along Newmarket Road which is consistent with the SPD in this regard. The approach taken to the scale and massing of the proposals along the frontages is to create a character and

appearance that reflects the fine grain diversity of the historic high street to the west and the narrow plots of the Conservation Area. The volume of the Newmarket Road frontage building is broken down through a stepped façade, consisting of distinct bay elements of varied widths reflecting the mixed but overall close grain plot character to west and north of the site. This plot based expression, has been further reinforced through the pitched roof forms which step to provide a subtle variation in roofscape. The incorporation of roof vents provides further articulation and interest to the roofscape. Along Godesdone Road the double gable ends successfully break up the bulk and massing of the building responding to the domestic proportions of a typical gable in this part of the Conservation Area. The glazed link between the retained No 2 Godesdone Road and the new development creates breathing space between the proposal and the existing terraced forms.

4. Biodiversity opportunities

The SPD under paragraph 3.3.6 promotes the enhancement of local biodiversity through new development in the area. Clearly, given the almost 100% site coverage enhancing local habitat though trees and shrub planting is going to be limited. However the roofscape could provide the opportunity for biodiversity enhancement, through a brown roof within the flat roofed plant area for example.

5. Elevations and Materials

The Eastern Gate SPD provides an analysis of the prevailing character of Newmarket Road in figure 40. It highlights how the buildings along this road are characterised by an *'orderly composition and grouping of elements which creates a strong vertical rhythm'*. It also highlights the variation in rooflines and local variation in the scale of adjacent buildings. The proposed elevations successfully translate these key contextual elements in a contemporary way. The fenestration is ordered and the roofscape articulated within a series of distinct bays, all of which reflect the plot based rhythm and vertical grain of the conservation area. The use of a buff brick is acceptable in principle, however we suggest that a darker buff-grey brick with multi variation would work better with the more the varied tones found within the conservation area.

A sample panel on site of the whole palette will need to form a condition to ensure that the external materials work for the entire scheme.

The scheme should preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area. The application is supported due to the proposals being appropriate in Urban Design and Conservation terms for this location in the conservation area.

The external materials/sample panel, window details, roof mounted equipment, piping/flues etc., secondary access and full cycle store details should be conditioned, should permission be granted.

Environmental Health

6.9 Concerns have been raised in previous responses regarding Plant impact assessment re-evaluation, structural separation from 4 Godesdone Road, and consideration of plant room noise/vibration emissions, air quality, contaminated land, odour, traffic/plant noise and deliveries. Additional information was also submitted concerning the taxi noise impact, basement plant & ground floor refuse and bike store including Technical Note dated 22nd October 2018 (002-Rev02).

- In relation to taxi noise, environmental health cannot object to taxi movements within the highway on noise grounds as this noise occurs off site. However, noise impact from taxi movements and patron use related to the application site is likely to adversely impact the locality such as from slamming doors, voices, car stereos and engine revving.

- In relation to the proposed basement plant, the Technical Note advises that the basement plant room is located 6m from the boundary. When considering this distance, along with the 200mm concrete perimeter wall and type of plant to be located within the plant room, the plant noise impact would be insignificant. This is reasonable.

- The ground floor refuse and bike store shares a party wall with 4 Godesdone Road. The noise impact associated with 2 tier cycle racking systems is difficult to quantify and no specific acceptability standard exists. The racks should be isolated from the party wall to prevent structural / ground-

borne vibrations and re-radiated building noise transmission. The addition of sound insulation on the party wall is recommended and a bike rack condition is recommended to ensure details of the bike rack and noise / vibration mitigation measures concerning the bike rack installation and bike store wall insulation are provided.

- The bin store should also contain additional sound insulation and practical measures to prevent excessive structural and air borne noise generated from the use. Doors to bin stores should be sufficient in widths to allow the movement of bins at their widest. A bin store condition is required.

- Standard construction/demolition/delivery noise/hours and dust conditions are recommended.

- An acoustic compliance condition is recommended to ensure the glazing and ventilation scheme, as recommended within the MLM assessment is fully implemented.

- A plant noise condition is recommended.

- There would be no dining onsite and therefore an odour impact assessment is not required.

- It is recommended that a condition is attached to limit deliveries to or dispatches from the site to only between 07:00 – 23:00hrs on Monday to Friday, 08:00 – 13:00hrs on Saturday and at no time on Sundays or public holidays.

- The site has a long history of commercial use and there is a risk that residual land contamination may be present. The applicant has fully acknowledged this and has already begun the risk assessment process. The completion of the risk assessment process can be secured with the imposition of the standard suite of contaminated land conditions.

- The development is for an intensification of use within the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) with the proposed development consisting of a 90 bedroom four storey hotel. Based on predicted traffic movements, an air quality mitigation plan should be secured by condition.

Landscape

6.10 The development proposed is **acceptable** subject to the imposition of condition(s)/informative(s) relating to Hard and soft landscaping, boundary treatment and SUDS provision.

LLFA/Drainage

6.11 Comments following submission of additional information:

The proposal is acceptable on the basis that the proposed surface water drainage system includes a pumped outfall which is considered least sustainable and normally not supported by the local planning authority. However due to the shape, form and footprint of the development there are no other options. The proposals have been amended to include additional measures to ensure that the pumps and chamber can be managed and maintained. An indicative management and maintenance plan has been written which is acceptable at this stage but this would need further enhanced enhancement and information must be provided through the further detailed design of the system If the pump can be adequately managed and maintained then the system should perform adequately and due to the previous site being unattenuated, may provide a local reduction in flood risk. A suitable condition should be attached to require the details.

Cambridgeshire Police

6.12 The application is supported. Based on details contained within the Design and Access Statement and the Company regarding their management of their chain of hotels across the UK and other countries, I am happy that If there were any incidents requiring the Police, they would not only contact them but have the management practices in place to deal locally. I am aware of the large number of complaints that this Application has provoked. I can only comment on crimes and incidents that have been reported to the Police regarding anti-social behaviour and drugs in the vicinity of the other hotels on Newmarket Road. I have spoken at length to both local shift officers and senior management. There are some calls regarding anti-social behaviour (mostly drunken behaviour) on Newmarket Road in the last 18 months – they amount to around 3 a month which are dealt with by officers. We see a similar number of reports across the County at other sites where budget hotels are based

in large towns or cities. The allegations made on this Application cannot be backed up by officers from their interaction with the hotel chains and other local businesses. That being said any serious allegation would of course be investigated, but there are no current concerns.

6.13 If planning approval is given, it is requested that a condition be applied regarding management plans, exterior lighting and use of CCTV on the grounds of promoting community safety and reducing vulnerability to crime. I am also happy to be consulted by the Applicant should there be a requirement for a Security Needs Assessment as part of any BREEAM accreditation being sought.

Archaeology

6.14 The application site lies in an area of high archaeological potential. Suitable conditions should be attached to require the submission and implementation of a programme of archaeological work to be undertaken.

Nature Conservation

6.15 The submitted document is acceptable in relation to ecological surveys and the recommendation to install integral bird boxes is supported. Given the location I would encourage the provision of an agreed number of swift boxes. The specification, number and location could be secured through condition. In addition I would request that the provision of a biodiverse green roof be explored on the flat section of roof proposed between the two linked pitches. As wider landscape is minimal this would provide the best opportunity to seek a net gain in biodiversity for the site.

Sustainability Officer

6.16 Following clarification that CHP would not be used, the development is acceptable subject to the imposition of conditions relating to renewable energy implementation and the requirement to submit a water efficiency specification.

Environment Agency

6.17 No objection in principle to the proposed development. In line with the recommendation of the MLM report we recommend that conditions are appended to any subsequent planning approval relating to contaminated land assessments and investigation, remediation measures and a verification plan, contamination found during development and surface water drainage scheme

Disability Panel

6.18 Accessible rooms - These seem particularly poor. Not only are they located as far from the lifts as possible; the size of the rooms and positioning of the furniture does not allow for a wheelchair turning circle or transfer from both sides of the bed.

Reception - This does not appear to include a hearing induction system.

Lifts - As these are not fire evacuation lifts, details need to be provided on the evacuation/refuge arrangements. (Particularly given the location of the accessible rooms as mentioned above.)

Kerb - There does not appear to be a level threshold at the entrance making access extremely difficult for wheelchair users

Conclusion - In the Panel's view, good quality accessible rooms should be provided.

Access Officer

6.19 Would ideally like one on site blue badge space for each accessible room, albeit it is not considered this could be conditioned. Details regarding where the hotel will park its cars should be secured by condition rather than relying on valet parking which is not good for disabled people. The design of the building should also seek to arrange all accessible rooms closer to the main entrance and on the ground floor if a fire fighting lift is not installed. The hoist is a great feature.

Developer Contributions Monitoring Unit

6.20 The Developer Contributions Monitoring Unit (DCMU) does not propose to seek specific S106 financial contributions under the Council's Planning Obligation Strategy SPD 2010, as Cambridge City Council does not seek S106 financial contributions from such developments. The Public Art Officer has indicated that this scheme should provide some public art.

MOD Safeguarding

6.21 No safeguarding objection to this proposal.

Anglian Water

6.22 No objection subject to a planning condition relating to surface water disposal.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

7.1 Councillor Richard Johnson has written to ask that the Design and Conservation Panel review the (originally submitted) application on the basis that the scheme needs to be in character in the Central Conservation Area, especially in respect to the scale, fine grain character, roof form and it acting as a gateway to the residential area beyond as part of the Eastern Gateway and also to raise concerns that the proposal would not meet Policies 77 or 22 (now 23) of the new local plan, in particular as the hotel does not meet the need for high end hotels identified in the Hotel Futures report and as it may not be of "domestic" scale as to be in character in this part of the Eastern Gate Opportunity Area and the Conservation Area.

7.2 Councillors Haf Davies and Nicky Massey, together with Councillor Richard Johnson, have written to indicate that they, as Abbey councillors, are aware that an application for a Premier Inn hotel at the Grafton Centre was submitted last month (19/0512/FUL). They ask that this new application should be treated as a material consideration when application 18/1002/FUL is determined at planning committee on the grounds that:

- The new application fundamentally undermines the case for a third hotel on Newmarket Road for the following reasons:

- it is sequentially superior,

- there is a City commitment to a hotel at the Grafton Centre (Grafton Centre Masterplan adopted at Full Council in December 2018),

- that no change of use is required to enable a hotel at the Grafton Centre (unlike at the Newmarket Road site) and the Grafton Centre better meets city centre need than the easyHotel site,

- a third hotel on Newmarket Road would result in a local monoculture, loss of local amenity and a loss of retail space in an area with a growing number of new residents.

- the Grafton Centre is a more sustainable location as The Grafton Centre has on-site shops and is a public transport hub, as well as being closer to the city, all factors likely to reduce vehicle use. It also has dedicated parking facilities and taxi access

- 18/1002/FUL provides no parking or taxi access and private cars are unlikely to park at The Grafton Centre 12-15 mins away such that they are likely to drive around the Riverside area looking for on-street parking, while taxis would idle outside residential properties then drive round the block or make u-turns to exit, or cause obstruction by waiting on the busy Newmarket Road.

7.3 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations:

- Riverside Residents group
- Camcycle
- Abbey Street – 10B, 14, 21
- Abbey Road – No.s 32, 35, 42, 46, 50, 60, 63, 69
- Ainsworth Place – No. 28
- Bartholomew Court – No.46
- Beacon Rise – No. 73
- Beche Court – No. 4
- Beche Road – No.s 15, 16, 19, 20, 24, 26, 36, 37, 39, 42, 52, 58, 60, 62, 64, 67, 68, 69, 70, 75, 83, 86, 92
- Brookside Lane – No.3
- Church Lane, Girton – No. 22

- Garlic Row – No. 18
- Godesdone Road – No.s 3, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 22d
- Newmarket Road – No.s 151, 171/173, 251 (flat 3), 413
- New Street – No. 158A
- Priory Road – No.s 12, 22, 25, 27, 30, 33, 39, 40, 43, 92
- Riverside – No.s 15, 19, 21, 27, 31, 30, 33, 35, 40, 41, 42, 45, 47, 50, 37, 51
- Riverside Place – No.s 22, 35, 36, 34, 78, 42, 69
- River Lane – No.s 69, 77, 79
- Saxon Road – Nos. 1, 9, 12, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22
- Shelly Garden – No. 15
- Silverwood Close – No.s 26, 27, 64
- Stanley Road – No.s 58, 85
- The Mallards – No. 2

7.4 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- The use is inappropriate and would be contrary to national and local planning sustainability and hotel policies
- The proposed low-cost visitor accommodation would result in unacceptable levels of anti-social behaviour (including littering); and criminal activity, including prostitution and drugs
- There is no need for this hotel type in Cambridge
- Road safety issues, congestion and uncontrolled parking resulting in detriment to residential amenities; the Highway Authority's comments are not acceptable as they are based on the applicant's inaccurate assessments
- The hotel should provide communal indoor space to prevent people congregating outside and being a nuisance
- Unacceptable noise and disturbance caused by taxi drop-off and pick up, noise from guests of the hotel, noise associated with wheeled suitcases, idling vehicles and additional HGVs especially during quieter hours
- Noise and disturbance during construction (including piling)
- The cycle parking arrangements are unsuitable, there is a lack of visitor/guest cycle parking and there is no cycle hire available
- Unworkable arrangement for taxis and no on-site deliveries
- Inconsiderate parking will occur in residents only and private parking areas

- The loading bay is too close to the junction and will be used by taxis. It is dangerous for other road users, including pedestrians, cyclists and mobility scooter users
- The access officer's comments re mobility impaired access need to be addressed
- The Transport Assessment does not include vital details and is inaccurate; the existing use does not have high levels or large (HGV) vehicles accessing it
- The proposed Travel Plan will not work, as is clear from the existing two hotels nearby
- Taxis bringing people to the no-car hotel are likely to do so without due regard for highway safety, as is already the case with the two nearby hotels
- The application does not contribute to the Eastern Gateway projects (SPD)
- The applicant should pay for the residents parking zone to be extended, including the hours of use and pay for the existing resident's permits (both residents and visitors permits) in perpetuity
- Legal agreements and strong conditions would be needed to penalise the hotel for any non-compliance with any conditions set to prevent illegality including parking and waiting
- The supporting documents are factually incorrect
- The site is better used for affordable housing, community facilities or other uses
- Having no parking on site will not result in a limited impact from car/vehicle use as there will be cars attracted to the site to drop off and pick up customers
- Unacceptable levels of noise and disturbance
- Overlooking and loss of privacy
- Light and other pollution would increase while air quality would reduce
- overdevelopment
- The overall scale and height of the building would be overly dominant of the existing adjoining domestic scale development
- Adverse impact on the character of the Conservation Area/area generally due to form, appearance, height and scale and signage
- Loss of another shop results in a diminution of community feeling

- Those supporting the application are involved in the current business or live so far away that they won't be affected
- There are two other hotels proposed at the Grafton Centre and in East Road which are better located than this site
- The proposal will result in a clustering which could become a "hotel ghetto"
- There is no demonstrable need for a budget/super-budget hotel on this site
- Taxis will cause a danger to other road users, particularly in Godesdone Road and other surrounding residential streets
- The City should support affluent tourists rather than people who cannot afford to drink cappuccinos or dine out
- The two hotels on Newmarket Road have not benefitted the local economy and another hotel won't either
- With the two hotels and student accommodation there is already too much transient/short term accommodation to the detriment of the permanent resident's communities
- While the furniture store is not of high architectural merit, it is in keeping and should therefore be retained
- The proposal would be located hard against the back edge of the highway leaving no room for soft landscaping which would be detrimental to the area/Eastern Area (and relevant SPD)
- There would be unacceptable noise from plant and machinery associated with the hotel

7.5 The current owners of the site have written in support of the hotel proposal on the grounds that they can no longer support a viable business on the site, that the proposal would meet relevant policies and that the scheme would offer a long-term solution which would be in character with recent development along Newmarket Road.

7.6 Owners/occupiers of 2 Godesdone Road have written to support the application as is would remove an existing large asbestos building and increase light/daylight for the neighbouring property. Other occupiers writing in support of the application are: 54 High Street, Teversham, 44 George Street 16 Corona Road, 48 Pelham Close, Cottenham, 5 Burnham Close, 115 Speedwell Close, 69 High Street, Great Wilbraham and 33 Chartfield Road.

7.7 A Development Control Forum (DCF) was undertaken on Friday, 7 September 2018. Notes of the meeting are appended to this report (Appendix A).

7.8 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 relating to the planning application are:

1. Principle of development
2. Context of site and design, including impact on the Conservation Area
3. Residential amenity for existing occupiers
4. Inclusive access
5. Refuse arrangements
6. Highway safety
7. Car and cycle parking
8. Crime and fear of crime
9. Light pollution, noise and disturbance
10. Third party representations
11. Planning Obligations/Public Art

Principle of Development

8.2 The proposal is for the redevelopment of existing commercial buildings/land to provide a 90-bed hotel. It is not proposed to provide a restaurant or bar on site such that the type of facility is termed “super budget”. It is also not proposed to provide any car parking on site although a lay-by is proposed close to the proposed hotel entrance on Godesdone Road for pick-up/drop-off.

8.3 The principle issues are whether a hotel is acceptable in this location and, whether it would be in line with the aims of the Opportunity Area. Policies 23 and 77 of the Cambridge Local Plan are therefore the most relevant.

8.4 The site does not fall within an area where retail uses are protected, and the loss of the existing A1 Use (shop) is therefore acceptable in principle.

8.5 Policy 77 relates to the development and expansion of visitor accommodation. The policy indicates that high quality visitor accommodation will be supported in the city centre and identifies that larger high quality hotels may come forward beyond the city centre. It states that new visitor accommodation should be located on the frontages of main roads or in areas of mixed use or within walking distance of bus route corridors with good public transport accessibility.

8.6 The supporting text to the policy indicates that visitor accommodation takes many forms from traditional hotels, guesthouses and hostels to apart-hotels and serviced apartments and that policy 77 applies to visitor accommodation within any of these (or similar) formats.

8.7 The reasoned justification also indicates that a study was undertaken entitled “Cambridge Hotel Futures” which was published in 2012 which assessed the supply and demand for hotel and short-stay accommodation in Cambridge to 2031. This study showed that there is a very strong and continuing market demand for significant new hotel development in the city and on its outskirts which would include the need for new hotel bedrooms to widen the accommodation offer of the city, to encourage longer stays and to enhance the competitiveness of the city as a visitor destination. The Study indicated that there was a shortfall in higher-starred (3, 4 and 5 star) and boutique accommodation in the city.

8.8 Since the 2012 Study, latest tourism figures indicate a significant increase in visitor numbers to Cambridge since 2010. The overall demand for visitor accommodation is therefore greater than anticipated at the time the study was conducted, and it is therefore considered that a more flexible approach is required in order to adapt to the evolving market situation. As referred to in the Policy Officer’s response, the hotel market has also seen the emergence of a new type of hotel – the “super-budget” hotel, aimed at people travelling at low cost and are provided on a “no frills” basis. I note recent comments from Councillors Johnson, Davies and Massey querying the need for the development in light of the recently submitted application for

a Premier Inn at the Grafton Centre. However, in light of the increasing demand for a range of visitor accommodation in Cambridge, the need is considered to exceed that provided by a single development.

8.9 Policy 77 relates to all visitor accommodation types. While it clearly identifies a need for higher starred and boutique hotels, it does not preclude other hotels in seeking to provide for visitor bed-spaces during the plan period. Paragraph 3 of the policy is relevant to the type of visitor accommodation, i.e. that it should be located on main roads. On the basis that the Cambridge Hotel Futures Study was undertaken before super-budget hotels emerged, it is clear that the Study did not consider "super-budget" type of accommodation or take such accommodation into consideration. Planning Policy consider that the proposed hotel bedrooms would help meet the rising need for hotel accommodation in the City and, while it would not be likely to be 3-Star and above, it would meet the rising demand for cheaper accommodation. It would broaden the range of accommodation in the City.

8.10 The proposed hotel would meet the criteria identified in Policy 77 in respect of the scheme assisting in meeting the expected need, the site having a main road frontage location, being in an area of mixed-use (commercial, residential, public houses and a retail park with restaurants etc.) and within walking distance of bus routes/public transport and the City Centre's facilities.

8.11 The proposed hotel would, as no bar or eating facilities would be provided, also help to support the local economy including existing retail outlets, public houses, restaurants etc. in the locality.

8.12 Policy 23 is an Opportunity Area policy which relates specifically to the Eastern Gate area. This policy requires that development proposals will be supported if they enhance the character of the area, improve connectivity and increase activity in line with Figure 3.9 of the Local Plan. Figure 3.9 indicates that the Opportunity Area extends approximately half way up Godesdone Road from its junction with Newmarket Road and, for the application site, that it is a potential development site, that there is an opportunity to improve the gateway to residential neighbourhoods and that it forms a primary frontage. The Figure shows a 2+1 storey height, adjacent to a site

indicated for a 3+1 storey height. It is proposed that there would be Highway Network improvements on Newmarket Road, outside the application site. While the details of the scheme are considered further in the section below, I consider that the proposal for a hotel on this site would be acceptable in principle in relation to Policy 23.

8.13 I consider that the proposal would be sustainable development which would regenerate an existing commercial site in line with Policy 23. While Policy 77 does indicate that high quality visitor accommodation will be supported and that the reasoned justification indicates that this would be to ensure that accommodation is provided to meet the needs identified in the study, it does not specifically exclude the provision of less than 3-star accommodation in the City, indicating in para 8.49 of the Local Plan that the policy applies to all types of hotel accommodation. It is a material consideration that super-budget hotels have emerged since the Cambridge Hotel Futures study was undertaken and that this proposal would provide a type of hotel accommodation which would be new to the City. Since super-budget hotels have become part of the range of hotel types, there is a need to consider whether such a hotel is acceptable in principle.

8.14 I consider that the proposal is acceptable in principle in accordance with Policies 23 and 77 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

Context of site, design and external spaces

Response to context

8.15 The context is that the property already lies within a mixed area where there is commercial use to the main road frontage with residential to the rear (in this case to the north). The site comprises mainly one-storey accommodation, however, much of this is showroom with attendant greater floor-to-ceiling heights and the lorry “car”-port to the rear is equivalent to 2-storey height directly adjacent to the boundary with 4 Godesdone Road to the north. The two-storey former house used for commercial storage is of domestic scale.

8.16 In line with the Eastern Gate Opportunity Area policy (policy 23), it is expected that this site would be redeveloped and that

the character of the area would be enhanced by buildings being developed of a scale and massing which responds to the site's context. The proposed building height to the main road frontage would be 2+1 storey as indicated on Figure 3.9 of the Local Plan and is, of itself considered to meet the parameters for this site as indicated in Policy 23. The return element would be higher than the existing building's corner element and, as this would provide the entrance to the hotel, I consider that this would act as a new "gateway" to the residential area beyond.

8.17 To the rear of the 2+1 storey aspect of the scheme, the existing former residential property would be retained to the side road's, Godesdone Road, frontage. As such, from a streetscene view, there would be no increase in the impact of this building on visual amenities.

8.18 Behind the proposed frontage development, the hotel is proposed to increase in height and this would be located adjacent to the boundary with the adjoining Godesdone Road property and would be visible from the back of (albeit where windows are at right-angles to the application site) residential properties in Godesdone Road and especially from the rear gardens of these properties.

8.19 The nearest neighbor at No.4 Godesdone Road has written in support of the application as it would remove the existing 5m high flat roof asbestos structure (the lorry "car"-port) which would be replaced by a significantly lower eaves level.

8.20 I consider that while adjoining and nearby residents would be able to view the rear of the new hotel building, that it would not result in a building which has a significant overbearing impact or that it would be out of context, in part as there are larger scale buildings to the south on Newmarket Road (including the Premier Inn and Travel Lodge Hotels) which are 5-storey and also to the north-east abutting the Godesdone Road rear boundaries (identified as 2-3 +1 in Figure 3.9) and recently constructed student housing directly to the east of the site of 3+1 height (Anglia House). In addition, the residential properties to Godesdone Road are 2-storey as are buildings to the west of the site. It is acknowledged and accepted that redevelopment of this site would have a significantly greater impact than the current relatively small scale buildings fronting onto Newmarket Road, in line with Policy 23.

8.21 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 23 and 55, 57.

Impact on the Conservation Area

8.22 The application site lies in Riverside Conservation Area. The River Cam is located to the north of the application site beyond the far end of Godesdone Road. The application site sits at the outside edge of the Conservation Area.

8.23 The Conservation Area comprises mainly residential properties to the north but also the commerical uses to the west of the application site fronting onto Newmarket Road. Consideration was given to the Conservation Area status of the site before including it in the Eastern Gate Opportunity Area. The application site was considered to make a contribution to the Conservation Area. However, the shop, made up from a number of buildings and the van-port with its corrugated roof are not considered to be a positive element in the Conservation Area. The end of terrace property at No.4 Godesdone Road would be retained. I consider that the loss of the commercial buildings would not result in significant harm to the Conservation Area. Providing the building is replaced by a building of a high quality of design and layout the less than substantial harm to the historic asset is acceptable. I consider that the proposal is of a high quality design and layout which would at least preserve, if not enhance, the special character and appearance of the Conservation Area in accordance with Policy 61 of the Local Plan.

Residential amenity for existing occupiers

8.24 The proposal would replace the existing buildings with a hotel building which would be larger in terms of footprint and height than the existing mainly single-storey commercial buildings.

8.25 The main neighbours affected are those in residential properties on the even side of Godesdone (eastern) Road. The proposed building would abut the garden of No.4 Godesdone Road. The occupiers of this property have written in support of the proposal, nonetheless the planning issues arising from the scheme must assess the impact on all adjoining occupiers.

8.26 Impact on neighbours – sunlight and daylight. An assessment was submitted which indicates that while there would be some loss of sunlight and daylight to the properties in Godesdone Road, that this would meet the BRE criteria. As such, and given that the proposal would result in the removal of the van/truck-port, I consider that it would be acceptable in this respect.

8.27 Overlooking and privacy - The applicants have confirmed that the rear dormer windows would be located at least 1.7m above the internal finished floor level, such that there would be no overlooking issues arising.

8.28 The hotel would result in an increase in the number of people visiting the site (although this is to be expected as the current use as a furniture store has been declining for some time). It would also result in activity in the evening and during the night both from the use of the bedrooms and from people arriving and departing. While most people would expect to arrive/depart from hotels during the day, there would clearly be some users of the hotel's 90 bedrooms who would arrive later and/or over night. A layby is proposed to be provided outside the hotel entrance in Godesdone Road. It would not extend in front of the residential properties in Godesdone Road to this side, nonetheless it is considered that there would be some noise and activity associated with both the use of the hotel entrance and use of this layby.

8.29 The hotel has indicated that it would require any taxi or private hire vehicles to drop off/pick up from Newmarket Road to avoid noise to adjoining properties' occupiers during later/over-night hours. While this is contested by a group of residents, given that travel along Newmarket Road does lessen at night, stopping on double yellow lines for as long as is reasonably necessary for the purpose of picking up or dropping off passengers and their luggage is legal as long as no other restrictions are in force.

8.30 The open car/lorry parking and loading area and open-sided van-port at the rear of the existing commercial property would be lost resulting in the removal of existing vehicle noise, fumes and activity from the rear gardens of properties in Godesdone Road. This is a positive benefit.

8.31 Concerns have also been raised regarding the plant room (including noise and vibration), separation between the hotel

and the attached residential property, 4 Godesdone Road, air quality, contaminated land, odour, traffic / deliveries. Environmental Health Officers have considered these aspects of the scheme and consider that suitable mitigation measures are proposed and/or that conditions could be attached to a planning approval and, on this basis, consider that the proposal would be acceptable. In relation to traffic noise/noise outside the hotel, they have confirmed that they have no authority to control such noise and that such activity etc. would need to be considered by planning as general noise and disturbance issues. I consider that, while there would be some noise associated with the proposal, that it would not result in so significant harm that the hotel should be refused planning permission.

8.32 Other properties in the locality are otherwise sufficiently distant from the application site or are across public areas such that I consider there would be no harmful loss of residential amenities to the other nearest properties.

8.33 In my opinion the proposal is in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 35, 57 and 58.

Inclusive access

8.34 Further to initial concerns raised by the Access Officer, a meeting was held with the architect, and the following details confirmed:

- The hotel would comply with Building Regulations.
- A valet parking service will be offered for disabled guests.
- There will be a hearing loop at reception and a low level reception desk.
- All rooms located near to refuge points and as close as possible to lifts and reception.
- One electrically operated hoist to be installed.
- Use of colour contrasting throughout.
- Dropped kerb allowing level entrance to the hotel.

8.35 In my opinion, subject to the conditions I have recommended, the applicants have suitably addressed the issues, and the proposal is in accordance with the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

Refuse Arrangements

8.36 Suitable refuse and recycling bins are to be provided. A suitable condition requiring provision and retention will need to be attached to any planning permission. In my opinion the proposal is compliant in this respect with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 57.

Highway Safety

8.37 The proposal involves the demolition of the existing commercial use which had a dropped kerb access onto Godesdone Road leading to an existing car and van parking/servicing area and van-port to the rear of the shop and a dropped kerb (mainly unused) onto Newmarket Road.

8.38 The applicants indicate that the proposal would not provide any car parking, also known as “car-free” development. It is nonetheless clear that both customers and staff would use some form of transport to access the hotel and make trips while in Cambridge from it, whether this be by private car, taxi/mini-cab, bicycle or on foot.

8.39 The applicants have therefore included within the proposal a lay-by outside the proposed hotel in Godesdone Road and a cycle store. They have also clarified that they expect people (and that they will direct customers) arriving by private car would park in The Grafton Centre car park during their visit to Cambridge and walk to the hotel from there.

8.40 On the basis of the initial details submitted, the Highway Authority raised concerns regarding the proposed traffic implications of the proposal. However, additional information was submitted (Technical Note by MLM and a letter from the proposed operator Easyhotel). In light of the additional information submitted the Highway Authority have subsequently withdrawn their objection instead requesting that conditions are attached to any approval, together with a legal agreement to be signed in relation to a Travel Plan being finalised and to require that monies are paid towards some environmental/highway improvements.

8.41 Objectors have objected to the Highway Authority's comments suggesting that the information submitted by the applicants cannot be relied upon. However, the Highway Authority is the Council's expert highway engineers and, while the objectors have raised concerns, the Highway Authority have considered both the submitted documentation and their own/public databases (such as accident data from the Police) and knowledge of the Highway landscape in making their recommendation that the proposal is acceptable in highway traffic and transport terms.

8.42 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 81.

Car and Cycle Parking

8.43 No car parking is proposed. A cycle store would be provided.

8.44 The proposal would provide a suitable cycle store within the converted existing store (formerly 2 Godesdone Road). A suitable condition would be attached to require that the store is provided and retained and a condition requiring details of any mechanical racking arrangements is also proposed to be attached.

8.45 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 82.

Crime and the fear of crime

8.46 It is reasonable to consider whether a particular land use results in concerns over the fear of crime or crime itself. There have been recent concerns raised regarding the provision of budget hotels as being the possible source of both anti-social behaviour and also criminal activities such as those relating to the drug trade and prostitution.

8.47 Crime itself is a Police matter and planning alone cannot either safeguard people from nor prevent entirely any crime being committed whether in a hotel, in the surrounding area, or indeed, in any residential or commercial property nearby. Of itself a hotel building, whether high class or budget, does not cause crime. Nonetheless people using such facilities could be capable of committing either anti-social behaviour or crime. The

Police have written in support of the application which they do not view as unduly likely to be a source of crime.

8.48 Without any Policy backing, uses such as hotels cannot be refused permission on the grounds of possible crime as this needs to be balanced against the positive benefits of the proposal. Such positive benefits include increase in visitors to Cambridge resulting in economic benefits such as direct employment, indirect employment (nearby shops and public houses for example), boosting the local and City economy.

8.49 While the Police are the Authority for dealing with crime and criminal activity and the Council deals with much of the anti-social behaviour in the City, Planning can help to reduce any such occurrences by, for example, requiring the provision of CCTV cameras, management arrangements for when crime is reported which can be attached to any consent. Suitable conditions can be attached to any approval to require details to be submitted.

Light pollution, noise and disturbance

8.50 The proposal will increase level of activity at the site which would change from an existing furniture store to a 90-bed hotel. The activities, apart from sleeping, would include arrivals and departures, general noise and activities from the use of the rooms for other purposes (such as talking, music playing etc.), people congregating on the street outside the hotel, for example to smoke and vehicle noises associated with deliveries/servicing and collecting/dropping off guests. Cycles will also be used and mechanical racks can also cause noise. Plant and laundry services are provided within the building and ventilation of the internal spaces may also be mechanical resulting in some noise.

8.51 The current use is not operating at its maximum capacity and as a result levels of noise and activity at the furniture store are lower than might normally be associated with such a commercial use. However, the use is not controlled by conditions such that it could operate at any hours. It should also be noted that planning permission would not be required for changes to uses which have a higher noise and activity level than currently, such as restaurants or (subject to prior approval)

residential or assembly and leisure uses including trampoline parks and other indoor sport uses.

8.52 The proposed building and its use would result in increased light especially after normal shop closing hours. However, the level of lighting within the hotel from windows is not considered to amount to light pollution and external lighting could be controlled by a suitably worded condition. It does need to be noted that Policy 23 for the regeneration of this site identifies development of 2+1 storeys such that light from windows at second and third floor levels would be expected in accordance with this policy.

8.53 In relation to activity levels, hotels are generally quieter during night hours due to sleeping guests and the hotel management can control activities of guests so that they are restricted from high levels of noise within rooms at such quieter times – ultimately being able to eject any unruly occupiers. A condition can be attached to require details of how guests would be managed to control possible noise/disturbance to existing residents.

8.54 As with any hotel there are likely to be guests who arrive late or leave early – if they are dropped off by taxi/mini-cab, then there is likely to be some noise/disturbance associated with this. Objections have been raised that either this would result in neighbours being disturbed or that dropping off/pick-ups on Newmarket Road itself would be dangerous for other highway users. The proposed layby would be located directly outside the hotel and double yellow lines do allow for pick-up and drop off, as such, no vehicles would need to stop outside any residential property in Godesdone Road. Newmarket Road is a main road and while traffic noise levels are likely to diminish overnight, I do not consider that the noise/disturbance associated with guest arrival/departure during the night hours on such a main road would be so unacceptable as to refuse planning permission on this ground alone.

8.55 There will be some noise and disturbance etc. caused during the construction process which is expected and will be controlled through the attachment of suitable conditions.

Third Party Representations

8.56 The issues raised by the neighbouring occupiers are substantial and relate to every facet of the proposal including making objections to the Council's consultee's comments; where these relate to the planning issues identified, they have been addressed above. Where comments relate to other authorities, such as the Police in dealing with criminal acts, only those aspects which can be secured though the planning process such as the provision of a management plan to ensure that any anti-social behavior or criminal activity is reported and the provision of CCTV cameras can be provided to deter criminal activity; it is recognized that the planning system is not the authority responsible for crime and the Police have recommended that the scheme is acceptable subject to suitable conditions.

Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

8.57 The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010 have introduced the requirement for all local authorities to make an assessment of any planning obligation in relation to three tests. Each planning obligation needs to pass three statutory tests to make sure that it is

(a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
(b) directly related to the development; and
(c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

In bringing forward my recommendations in relation to the Planning Obligation for this development I have considered these requirements.

8.58 In line with the CIL Regulations, councils can pool no more than five S106 contributions towards the same project. The new 'pooling' restrictions were introduced from 6 April 2015 and relate to new S106 agreements. This means that all contributions now agreed by the city council must be for specific projects at particular locations, as opposed to generic infrastructure types within the city of Cambridge.

City Council Infrastructure (Traffic and Transportation)

8.59 The Highway Authority has recommended that contributions be made to the following projects: highway mitigation package, a parking monitoring strategy (and if needed, J25,000 towards consultation relating to expansion of the Controlled Parking Zone), a construction management plan and a Travel Plan

8.60 I agree with the reasoning set out above that contributions towards these projects meet the requirements of the CIL regulations. Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure this infrastructure provision, I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 81 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010.

Planning Obligations Conclusion

8.61 It is my view that the planning obligation is necessary, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably in scale and kind to the development and therefore the Planning Obligation passes the tests set by the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.

Public Art

8.62 While there is no formal requirement for public art, an etched glass feature will be provided which is welcomed.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 The proposal would assist in meeting a need for visitor accommodation in Cambridge and is acceptable in principle in line with Policy 77 of the Local Plan. The hotel would provide visitor accommodation which is transient in nature, nonetheless it would be located on an existing commercial site at the southernmost edge of a residential area and on a busy arterial route between the City centre and the Airport. The proposal would therefore represent a sustainable development which would regenerate the area resulting in an improvement in the Eastern Gateway Area in line Policy 23 of the Local Plan. The proposal would be acceptable in terms of its impact on the Conservation Area and surrounding area.

9.2 While it is recognised that there would be some impact on existing residential amenities, subject to a legal agreement and the attachment of suitable conditions to regulate the use, I do not consider that this would be so harmful as to refuse planning permission.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to the signing of a legal agreement in relation to a highway mitigation package and a parking monitoring strategy (and if needed, J25,000 towards consultation relating to expansion of the Controlled Parking Zone) and 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 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as listed on this decision notice.

   Reason: In the interests of good planning, for the avoidance of doubt and to facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

3. Submission of Preliminary Contamination Assessment:

   Prior to the commencement of the development (or phase of) or investigations required to assess the contamination of the site, the following information shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

   (a) Desk study to include:
   -Detailed history of the site uses and surrounding area (including any use of radioactive materials)
   -General environmental setting.

-Site investigation strategy based on the information identified in the desk study.
(b) A report setting set out what works/clearance of the site (if any) is required in order to effectively carry out site investigations.

Reason: To adequately categorise the site prior to the design of an appropriate investigation strategy in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

4. Submission of site investigation report and remediation strategy:

Prior to the commencement of the development (or phase of) with the exception of works agreed under condition 3 and in accordance with the approved investigation strategy agreed under clause (b) of condition 3, the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:
(a) A site investigation report detailing all works that have been undertaken to determine the nature and extent of any contamination, including the results of the soil, gas and/or water analysis and subsequent risk assessment to any receptors
(b) A proposed remediation strategy detailing the works required in order to render harmless the identified contamination given the proposed end use of the site and surrounding environment including any controlled waters. The strategy shall include a schedule of the proposed remedial works setting out a timetable for all remedial measures that will be implemented.

Reason: To ensure that any contamination of the site is identified and appropriate remediation measures agreed in the interest of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

5. Implementation of remediation.

Prior to the first occupation of the development (or each phase of the development where phased) the remediation strategy approved under clause (b) to condition 4 shall be fully implemented on site following the agreed schedule of works.

Reason: To ensure full mitigation through the agreed remediation measures in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

6. Completion report:

Prior to the first occupation of the development (or phase of) hereby approved the following shall be submitted to, and approved by the Local Planning Authority.
(a) A completion report demonstrating that the approved remediation scheme as required by condition 4 and implemented under condition 5 has been undertaken and that the land has been remediated to a standard appropriate for the end use.
(b) Details of any post-remedial sampling and analysis (as defined in the approved material management plan) shall be included in the completion report along with all information concerning materials brought onto, used, and removed from the development. The information provided must demonstrate that the site has met the required clean-up criteria.

Thereafter, no works shall take place within the site such as to prejudice the effectiveness of the approved scheme of remediation.

Reason: To demonstrate that the site is suitable for approved use in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

7. Material Management Plan:

Prior to importation or reuse of material for the development (or phase of) a Materials Management Plan (MMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The MMP shall:
a) Include details of the volumes and types of material proposed to be imported or reused on site
b) Include details of the proposed source(s) of the imported or reused material
c) Include details of the chemical testing for ALL material to be undertaken before placement onto the site.
d) Include the results of the chemical testing which must show the material is suitable for use on the development

e) Include confirmation of the chain of evidence to be kept during the materials movement, including material importation, reuse placement and removal from and to the development.

All works will be undertaken in accordance with the approved document.

Reason: To ensure that no unsuitable material is brought onto the site in the interest of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

8. Unexpected Contamination:

If unexpected contamination is encountered whilst undertaking the development which has not previously been identified, works shall immediately cease on site until the Local Planning Authority has been notified and the additional contamination has been fully assessed and remediation approved following steps (a) and (b) of condition 4 above. The approved remediation shall then be fully implemented under condition 5.

Reason: To ensure that any unexpected contamination is rendered harmless in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

9. Prior to any demolition/ground clearance of the site, a demolition method statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This method statement shall demonstrate how the hard standing across the site will be removed in order to prevent the rupturing of, and retain the integrity of, all existing underground fuel and storage tanks, equipment, and supply lines. The removal of the hard standing shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved method statement.

Reason: To ensure the integrity of the below ground condition of the site is not compromised (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33)

10. No construction work or demolition work shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours and 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 2018 policy 35)

11. There shall be no collections from or deliveries to the site during the demolition and construction stages outside the hours of 0800 hours and 1800 hours on 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 2018 policy 35)

12. In the event of the foundations for the proposed development requiring piling, prior to the development taking place, other than demolition, the applicant shall provide the local authority with a report / method statement for approval detailing the type of piling and mitigation measures to be taken to protect local residents from noise and/or vibration. Potential noise and vibration levels at the nearest noise sensitive locations shall be predicted in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228-1&2:2009 Code of Practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

    Due to the proximity of this site to existing residential premises and other noise sensitive premises, impact pile driving is not recommended.

    Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35)

13. No development shall commence until a programme of measures to minimise the spread of airborne dust from the site during the demolition / construction period has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 36.

14. Prior to the occupation of the development or the commencement of the use, a noise assessment detailing noise levels emanating from all plant, equipment and vents, relative to background levels, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.

    If the assessment demonstrates that noise levels exceed the background level at the boundary of the premises, having regard to adjacent noise sensitive premises, a mitigation scheme for the insulation of the plant in order to minimise the level of noise emanating from the said plant shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced.

    Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35)

15. Prior to the commencement of development a cycle / bike store noise insulation scheme to include full details of the two-tier or 'double-stacker' cycle storage racks, including measures to minimise airborne noise and structural / ground-borne vibrations and re-radiated building noise transmission shall be submitted in writing to, and approved by, the local planning authority. Details shall also include the sound insulation of the bike store internal walls to prevent adverse noise impacts and structural anti-vibration / isolation mounting for cycle racks. The noise insulation scheme and cycle racks shall be installed in accordance with the approved details prior to bringing into use of the development, and shall be maintained thereafter to remain in accordance with those details

    Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35)

16. Prior to the commencement of development, a bin store noise insulation scheme and full details of the on-site storage facilities for waste including waste for recycling shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Such details shall identify the specific positions of where wheeled bins will be stationed and the noise insulation measures of the bin store to minimise noise emanating from the store.

    Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35)

17. No refuse / waste or recycling material associated with the approved use / site shall be emptied into external refuse / waste or recycling receptacles or refuse / waste or recycling stores and the said receptacles shall not be taken out externally or moved around the external of the site between the hours of 2100-0700 hours.

    Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35)

18. The noise insulation scheme and mitigation requirements as stated within the MLM "noise impact assessment" dated 21st May 2018 (doc ref: 101975-MLM-ZZ-XX-RP-U-0001) shall be fully implemented prior to commencement of the use and shall be maintained thereafter.

    Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35)

19. Deliveries to or dispatches from the site shall not be made outside the hours of 07:00 - 23:00hrs on Monday to Friday, 08:00 - 13:00hrs on Saturday or at any time on Sundays or public holidays.

    Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35)

20. No external lighting or floodlights shall be installed without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

    Reason: In order to preserve the amenity of the locality (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 34 and 55).

21. No development shall take place above ground level, other than demolition, until samples of the external materials to be used in the construction of the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

    Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the development does not detract from the character and appearance of the area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 57 (for new buildings) and/or 58 (for extensions))

22. A sample panel of the facing materials to be used shall be erected on site to establish the detail of bonding, coursing and colour, type of jointing shall be agreed in writing with the local planning authority. The quality of finish and materials incorporated in any approved sample panel(s), which shall not be demolished prior to completion of development, shall be maintained throughout the development.

    Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policy 61).

23. No development above ground level, other than demolition, shall commence until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include proposed finished levels or contours; means of enclosure; car parking layouts, other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials; minor artefacts and structures (eg furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting); retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant. Soft Landscape works shall include planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate and an implementation programme.

All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The maintenance shall be carried out in accordance with the approved schedule. Any trees or plants that, within a period of five years after planting, are removed, die or become in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced as soon as is reasonably practicable with others of species, size and number as originally approved, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that suitable hard and soft landscape is provided as part of the development. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 57 and 59)

24. No development above ground level, other than demolition, shall commence until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatments to be erected. The boundary treatment shall be completed in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation or the bringing into use of the development (or other timetable agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority) and retained as approved thereafter.

Reason: To ensure an appropriate boundary treatment is implemented in the interests of visual amenity and privacy (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 57 and 59)

25. Prior to the commencement of installation of any roof mounted equipment, full details of all roof top plant and solar panels and/or photovoltaic cells, including type, dimensions, materials, location, fixing, etc. shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policy 61).

26. No boiler flues, soil pipes, waste pipes or air extract trunking, etc. shall be installed until the means of providing egress for all such items from the new or altered bathrooms, kitchens and plant rooms has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Flues, pipes and trunking, etc. shall be installed thereafter only in accordance with the approved details.

    Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policy 61).

27. No external windows or doors shall be installed until drawings at a scale of 1:20 of details of sills, lintels, transoms, mullions and spandrel panels have been submitted and full details of all glass to be installed in doors/windows shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

    Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policy 61).

28. All new window frames shall be recessed at least 50 / 75mm back from the face of the wall / façade. The means of finishing of the 'reveal' is to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to installation. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

    Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policy 61).

29. Prior to commencement of development, full details of the secondary access to the site from Godesdone Road shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be constructed thereafter only in accordance with the approved details.

    Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policy 61).

30. Prior to first occupation of the development, hereby permitted, or commencement of the use, full details of facilities for the covered, secure parking of bicycles for use in connection with the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be constructed thereafter only in accordance with the approved details. The facilities shall be provided in accordance with the approved details before the development is occupied or the use commences and shall be retained in accordance with the approved details thereafter.

Reason: To ensure appropriate provision for the secure storage of bicycles and to avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 61 and 82)

31. Prior to the occupation of the development, hereby permitted, or the commencement of the use, a management plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The management plan shall include provisions relating to travel advice; check-in time slots in order to stage the impact of the check-in/out process; site security; crime reduction and reporting measures; the management of deliveries; and the external display of contact information for on-site management and emergencies. The scheme shall be managed in accordance with the approved details thereafter.

Reason: In order to ensure the occupation of the site is well managed and does not give rise to significant amenity issues for nearby residents (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 35 and 46).

32. Prior to the occupation of the development, hereby permitted, or the commencement of the use, full details of CCTV provision shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall identify the specific positions of where CCTV cameras will be located. The approved CCTV shall be provided prior to the commencement of the use hereby permitted and shall be retained thereafter for their intended use.

Reason - To provide a means of preventing and/or recording possible crime in the interests of users of the hotel facility and adjoining residential occupiers. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 57)

33. No development shall take place within the site until the applicant, or their agent or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that an appropriate archaeological investigation of the site has been implemented before development commences. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 61)

34. No development hereby permitted shall be commenced until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and in accordance with Cambridge City Council local plan policies, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is occupied.
The scheme shall include:
a) Details of the existing surface water drainage arrangements including runoff rates for the QBAR, 3.3% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) (1 in 30) and 1% AEP (1 in 100) storm events;
b) Full results of the proposed drainage system modelling in the above-referenced storm events (as well as 1% AEP plus climate change) , inclusive of all collection, conveyance, storage, flow control and disposal elements and including an allowance for urban creep, together with a schematic of how the system has been represented within the hydraulic model;
c) Detailed drawings of the entire proposed surface water drainage system, including levels, gradients, dimensions and pipe reference numbers, pump details and hydrodynamic separator details;
d) A plan of the drained site area and which part of the proposed drainage system these will drain to;
e) Full details of the proposed attenuation and flow control measures;

f) Details of overland flood flow routes in the event of system exceedance, with demonstration that such flows can be appropriately managed on site without increasing flood risk to occupants;
g) Full details of the maintenance/adoption of the surface water drainage system;
h) Measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface water
i) Formal agreement from a third party if discharging into their system is proposed, including confirmation (and evidence where appropriate) that sufficient capacity is available.
The drainage scheme must adhere to the hierarchy of drainage options as outlined in the NPPF PPG

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development can be adequately drained and to ensure that there is no increased flood risk on or off site resulting from the proposed development (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policies 31 and 32)

35. Details for the long term maintenance arrangements for the surface water drainage system (including the pumps, storage areas and proprietary features) to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of any of the buildings hereby permitted. This should build on the approved management and maintenance plan by MLM reference: 618971-MLM-ZZ-XX-RP-C-0002. The submitted details should identify runoff sub-catchments, control structures, pumps and access routes for the under building attenuation and pumps, flow routes and outfalls. In addition, the plan must clarify the access that is required to each surface water management component for maintenance purposes. The maintenance plan shall be carried out in full thereafter.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory maintenance of drainage systems that are not publicly adopted, in accordance with the requirements of Cambridge Local Plan policies 31 and 32, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

36. No development approved by this planning permission shall take place until a scheme that includes the following components to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site shall each be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the local planning authority: 1) Based on the reviews and results of the submitted MLM Contamination Assessment - JW/775621/MH, a quantitative risk assessment of the risk to controlled waters will be required and an acceptable remedial target will need to be determined for the soils remaining on site, which will be protective of controlled water. The conceptual model of the site should also be refined indicating absent/existing sources, pathways and receptors and potentially unacceptable risks arising from contamination at site.
2) A further site investigation scheme, based on (1) to provide information for a detailed assessment of the risk to controlled waters as we are not confident that the initial site investigation sampling and the results of the risk assessment provides sufficient evidence to prove that there is no risk to controlled waters on site.
3) The results of the site investigation and detailed quantitative risk assessment referred to in (2) and, based on these, an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken.
4) A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in the remediation strategy in (3) are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action. Any changes to these components require the express written consent of the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved. Reason. To protect and prevent the pollution of controlled waters from potential pollutants in line with NPPF paragraphs 109 and 121, and the Environment Agency Groundwater Protection Policy.
(National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 109 states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of water pollution. Government policy also states that planning policies and decisions should also ensure that adequate site investigation information, prepared by a competent person, is presented (NPPF, paragraph 121).

37. No development above ground level, other than demolition, shall commence (or in accordance with a timetable agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority), until a Public Art Delivery Plan (PADP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The PADP shall include the following:

a) Details of the public art and artist commission;
b) Details of how the public art will be delivered, including a timetable for delivery;
c) Details of the location of the proposed public art on the application site;
d) The proposed consultation to be undertaken;
e) Details of how the public art will be maintained;
f) How the public art would be decommissioned if not permanent;
g) How repairs would be carried out;
h) How the public art would be replaced in the event that it is destroyed;

The approved PADP shall be fully implemented in accordance with the approved details and timetabling. Once in place, the public art shall not be moved or removed otherwise than in accordance with the approved maintenance arrangements.

Reason: To accord with the provisions of Cambridge City Council Public Art SPD (2010) and policies 55 and 56 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

38. Prior to the commencement of construction or conversion of the proposed development full details of a mitigation scheme to address the impacts on air quality arising from the development shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Air Quality mitigation scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the first occupation of the development and shall thereafter be retained as such.

Reason: To protect human health in accordance with policy 36 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018)

39. Implementation of Renewable Energy Statement

The approved renewable energy technologies shall be fully installed and operational prior to the first occupation of the development and shall thereafter be retained and remain fully operational in accordance with a maintenance programme, which shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

No review of this requirement on the basis of grid capacity issues can take place unless written evidence from the District Network Operator confirming the detail of grid capacity and its implications has been submitted to, and accepted in writing by, the local planning authority. Any subsequent amendment to the level of renewable/low carbon technologies provided on the site shall be in accordance with a revised scheme submitted to and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions and to ensure that the development does not give rise to unacceptable pollution. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 29)

40. Water efficiency

Prior to occupation, a water efficiency specification shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This shall demonstrate that the proposed use is able to achieve at least a 25% improvement over baseline water consumption using the BREEAM Wat 01 water calculator and that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To ensure that the development makes efficient use of water and promotes the principles of sustainable construction (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 28 and 31 and Supplementary Planning Document 'Sustainable Design & Construction' 2007).

41. Prior to above ground works commencing, details shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority relating to the installation of integral bird boxes including the specification, number and location of swift boxes. Once agreed in writing the approved details shall be implemented prior to first use of the hotel hereby approved.

Reason: In the interests of ecology and in accordance with Policy 70 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

42. Prior to above ground works commencing, details for a biodiverse green roof shall be submitted in writing to the Local Planning Authority. Once approved, the details shall be implemented prior to the first use of the hotel hereby permitted. Should any of the green roof planting fail during the first 5 years after first planting, it shall be replaced.

    Reason: In the interests of biodiversity in accordance with Policy 70 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

43. No occupation of the building shall commence until a Travel Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Travel Plan shall specify the methods to be used to discourage the use of the private motor vehicle and the arrangements to encourage use of alternative sustainable travel arrangements such as public transport, car sharing, cycling and walking. The Travel Plan shall be implemented as approved upon the occupation of the development and monitored in accordance with details to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

    Reason: In the interests of encouraging sustainable travel to and from the site (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policies 80 and 81).

44. No demolition or construction works shall commence on site until a traffic management plan has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

    Reason: in the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 81)

45. To satisfy the noise insultation condition, the rating level (in accordance with BS4142:2014) from all plant, equipment and vents etc (collectively) associated with this application should be less than or equal to the existing background level (L90) at the boundary of the premises subject to this application and having regard to noise sensitive premises.

Tonal/impulsive noise frequencies should be eliminated or at least considered in any assessment and should carry an additional correction in accordance with BS4142:2014. This is to guard against any creeping background noise in the area and prevent unreasonable noise disturbance to other premises. This requirement applies both during the day (0700 to 2300 hrs over any one hour period) and night time (2300 to 0700 hrs over any one 15 minute period).

It is recommended that the agent/applicant submits a noise prediction survey/report in accordance with the principles of BS4142: 2014 "Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound" or similar, concerning the effects on amenity rather than likelihood for complaints. Noise levels shall be predicted at the boundary having regard to neighbouring premises.

It is important to note that a full BS4142:2014 assessment is not required, only certain aspects to be incorporated into a noise assessment as described within this informative.

Such a survey / report should include: a large scale plan of the site in relation to neighbouring premises; noise sources and measurement / prediction points marked on plan; a list of noise sources; details of proposed noise sources / type of plant such as: number, location, sound power levels, noise frequency spectrums, noise directionality of plant, noise levels from duct intake or discharge points; details of noise mitigation measures (attenuation details of any intended enclosures, silencers or barriers); description of full noise calculation procedures; noise levels at a representative sample of noise sensitive locations and hours of operation.

Any report shall include raw measurement data so that conclusions may be thoroughly evaluated and calculations checked.

46. Environment Agency - Other Environmental issues.
Surface Water Drainage:
All surface water from roofs shall be piped direct to an approved surface water system using sealed downpipes. Open gullies should not be used.

Surface Water Drainage and Infiltration Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). The water environment is potentially vulnerable and there is an increased potential for pollution from inappropriately located and/or designed infiltration (SuDS). We consider any infiltration (SuDS) greater than 2.0 m below ground level to be a deep system and are generally not acceptable. All infiltration SuDS require a minimum of 1.2 m clearance between the base of infiltration SuDS and peak seasonal groundwater levels. All need to meet the criteria in our Groundwater Protection: Principles and Practice (GP3) position statements G1 to G13 which can be found here:
https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/groundwater-protection. In addition, drainage systems must not be constructed in ground affected by contamination and if the use of deep bore soakaways is proposed, we would wish to be re-consulted. The proposals will need to comply with our Groundwater protection position statements G1 and G9 to G13.
Only clean, uncontaminated surface water should be discharged to any soakaway, watercourse or surface water sewer.
Foul Water Drainage:
An acceptable method of foul drainage disposal would be connection to the public foul sewer.
Anglian Water Services Ltd. should be consulted by the Local Planning Authority and be requested to demonstrate that the sewerage and sewage disposal systems serving the development have sufficient capacity to accommodate the additional flows, generated as a result of the development, without causing pollution or flooding. If there is not capacity in either of the sewers, the Agency must be reconsulted with alternative methods of disposal.
Pollution Prevention:
Surface water from roads and impermeable vehicle parking areas shall be discharged via trapped gullies.
Prior to being discharged into any watercourse, surface water sewer or soakaway system, all surface water drainage from lorry parks and/or parking areas for fifty car park spaces or more and hardstandings should be passed through an oil interceptor designed compatible with the site being drained. Roof water shall not pass through the interceptor.

Notwithstanding the provision of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 1995 (or any order revoking or re-enacting that Order), any oil storage tank shall be sited on an impervious base and surrounded by oil tight bunded walls with a capacity of 110% of the storage tank, to enclose all filling, drawing and overflow pipes. The installation must comply with Control of Pollution Regulations 2001, and Control of Pollution (Oil Storage) Regulations 2001.

Site operators should ensure that there is no possibility of contaminated water entering and polluting surface or underground waters.

INFORMATIVE: Dust condition informative

To satisfy the condition requiring the submission of a program of measures to control airborne dust above, the applicant should have regard to:

-Council's Supplementary Planning Document - "Sustainable Design and Construction 2007":
http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/docs/sustainable-design-and-construction-spd.pdf

-Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction
http://iaqm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/guidance/iaqm_guidance_report_draft1.4.pdf

- Air Quality Monitoring in the Vicinity of Demolition and Construction Sites 2012
http://www.iaqm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/guidance/monitoring_construction_sites_2012.pdf

-Control of dust and emissions during construction and demolition - supplementary planning guidance
https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Dust%20and%20Emissions%20SPG%208%20July%202014_0.pdf

INFORMATIVE: Anglian Water has assets close to or crossing this site or there are assets subject to an adoption agreement. Therefore the site layout should take this into account and accommodate those assets within either prospectively adoptable highways or public open space. If this
is not practicable then the sewers will need to be diverted at the developers cost under Section 185 of the Water Industry Act 1991. or, in the case of apparatus under an adoption agreement, liaise with the owners of the apparatus. It should be noted that the diversion works should normally be completed before development can commence.

INFORMATIVE: This planning permission should be read in conjunction with the associated deed of planning obligation prepared under s.106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) dated as this decision notice.

Notwithstanding any consent granted under the relevant planning act/s, the applicant is advised that before any works are carried out on any footway, carriageway, verge or other land forming part of the public highway the express consent of Cambridgeshire County Council as the Local Highway Authority will be required. All costs associated with any construction works will be borne by the developer. The developer will not be permitted to drain roof water over the public highway, nor across it in a surface channel, but must make arrangements to install a piped drainage connection. No window or door will be allowed to open over a highway and no foundation or footing for the structure will be allowed to encroach under the public highway.

Asbestos containing materials (cement sheeting) may be present at the site. The agent/applicant should ensure that these materials are dismantled and disposed of in the appropriate manner to a licensed disposal site. Further information regarding safety issues can be obtained from the H.S.E.

New development can sometimes cause inconvenience, disturbance and disruption to local residents, businesses and passers by. As a result the City Council runs a Considerate Contractor Scheme aimed at promoting high standards of care during construction. The City Council encourages the developer of the site, through its building contractor, to join the scheme and agree to comply with the model Code of Good Practice, in the interests of good neighbourliness. Information about the scheme can be obtained from The Considerate Contractor Project Officer in the Planning Department (Tel: 01223 457121).

In the event that the application is refused, and an Appeal is lodged against the decision to refuse this application, delegated authority is sought to allow officers to negotiate and complete the Planning Obligation required in connection with this development

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL FORUM 7 September 2018
10.00 am - 12.15 pm
Present
Planning Committee Members: Councillors Blencowe, Hipkin, Smart and Thornburrow
Ward Councillors:
Councillor Massey
Councillor Johnson
Officers:
Delivery Manager: Eileen Paterson (Chair)
Senior Planner: Charlotte Burton
Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

18/14/DCF Declarations of Interest
The Chair outlined the role and purpose of the Development Control Forum. She stated no decisions would be taken at the meeting.

18/15/DCF Application and Petition Details 18/1002/FUL - 211-213 Newmarket Road & 2 Godesdone Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB5 8HA
Application No: 18/1002/FUL
Site Address: 211-213 Newmarket Road & 2 Godesdone Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB5 8HA
Description: Demolition of existing buildings at 211-213 Newmarket Road and construction of a hotel (C1 use), with change of use and conversion of 2 Godesdone Road to C1 use, and provision of associated infrastructure.
Applicant: MPMerchant (NR) Ltd and easyHotel
Agent: Savills (UK) Ltd
Address: Unex House 132-134 Hills Road Cambridge CB2 8PA United Kingdom
Lead Petitioner: Resident of Riverside
Case Officer: Charlotte Burton

Text of Petition:
This site is not suitable for budget hotel use and in any case is not in accordance with the policy describing the need for hotel bedrooms. The application is overdevelopment of this small site on primarily residential Godesdone Road in the Riverside and Stourbridge Conservation Area. The overall quality of the design is not in keeping with such an important site. The building is at a gateway to the conservation area explicitly identified as critical in the Eastern Gateway Policy. There is no landscaping to soften the impact of the building.
The transport statement and hotel travel plan are completely inadequate to avoid negative impact on residential amenity over a wide area as it will jeopardise road safety; increase existing overnight parking stress; and generate many extra journeys in an area already experiencing severe congestion.
Approval of this application would add to anti-social behaviour issues including drug dealing associated with budget hotels. To address public safety there is a need for design changes to the entrance as well as additional street lighting to avoid street disturbance and noise. The application does not show how deliveries in the street rather than a courtyard and guests using taxis to arrive and waiting for departure would not increase air pollution to unsafe levels. The application does not address the loss of residential amenity from increased noise.

Do you think there are changes that could be made to overcome your concerns? Yes
The site could be suitable for a boutique hotel with a reasonable number of rooms, and internal courtyard for drop offs; provision for disabled parking; and the reception / delivery entrance, and a much better travel plan either with on-site parking / compulsory valet parking / or a commitment in perpetuity to fund the extra costs of the council rather than residents to enforce an extension to the restriction hours of the neighbouring CPZs.

Case by Applicant
A representative on behalf of the applicant made the following points:

i. Did not think that any new issues arose from the revised NPPF which had been issued that week.
ii. Images were inserted in the presentation to give context of the site.
iii. Commented that there had been a large number of third party representations, he went through the statutory consultation responses.

iv. The Planning Policy Team had considered the application and said it was acceptable.
v. The Urban Design and Conservation Team considered the scale and massing of the proposal was acceptable.
vi. Commented that there was no landscaping on site at the moment but the scheme incorporated external planters along Newmarket Road / Godesdone Road to enhance the public realm. There would be an internal courtyard area which would include planters.
vii. Amenity issues were addressed through a technical note. The Transport Assessment considered road safety as part of its scope. A travel plan had been submitted to address parking issues.
viii. The applicant had spoken with the Environmental Health Team regarding air quality.
ix. Easyhotel operated a zero tolerance policy in respect of anti-social behaviour.
x. Noted that the Petitioner's view was that the site was suitable for a boutique hotel however the proposal was for an Easyhotel with 90 rooms.
xi.There was an internal courtyard for drop offs and their proposal had been accepted by the Highways Department.
xii. There was a travel plan in place to manage guests.
xiii. Pre-application discussions directed the reception / delivery entrance towards the commercial frontage.
xiv. Design changes had been considered following the public exhibition and consultation with residents and further design ideas could be considered.

Case by Petitioners
A representative on behalf of the petitioners made the following points:
i. This was the third budget hotel on this small congested stretch of Newmarket Road.
ii. First major concern was overdevelopment, the site was not large enough to support budget hotel use.
iii. The development's Godesdone Road frontage would be 50% of the length of the Newmarket Road frontage.
iv. There was a blind junction from Newmarket Road into Godesdone Road so vehicles took a wide line when turning.
v. The 90 bedrooms proposed was more than all the bedrooms in the whole of Godesdone Road.
vi. The application proposes to step back the Godesdone Road frontage to accommodate a drop off bay.

vii. The site was smaller than the Travelodge or Premier Inn sites.
viii. There were already 340 budget hotel rooms on this junction.
ix. Easyhotel wants to locate 41% as many bedrooms as Travelodge onto a site that is only 17% of the Travelodge site area and 74% as many bedrooms as Premier Inn into a site that is only 31.5% of the Premier Inn's site.
x. If the same ratios were applied to site area as Travelodge and Premier Inn, the site would support 38 bedrooms.
xi. The reception area had no seating for guests to socialise.
xii. The pavement at entrances was narrow and it was also narrow around the drop off bay.
xiii. Budget hotel guest's behaviour can be disruptive for neighbours. This type of hotel usually operated a lean staff model but with large numbers of guests which could include stag / hen parties.
xiv. Fire alarms were set off in the Travelodge; guests were evacuated at 2am which was disruptive to Godesdone residents. One on-site staff member cannot deal with all behavioural issues.
xv. Coaches regularly parked on Newmarket Road despite travel plans providing for drop offs at the rear of premises.
xvi. The second concern expressed was that this was unsustainable development which provided no social or environmental benefit to the community.
xvii. This stretch of Newmarket Road was the resident's 'high street' and supported a rich mix of uses. Reference was made to the new local plan policy 22 which provided that development should reflect the predominantly residential nature of the area.
xviii. Commented that if the site was given to hotel use it would take the opportunity away for other local uses.
xix. The city had already satisfied its projected budget hotel need set until 2031, it was 11 rooms away from this projected need despite the growth period being 13 years away.
xx. The Local Plan Inspector had identified a need for quirky 5* hotels. The development did not meet the needs of residents or those in the local plan.
xxi. The third concern was traffic impact, questioned if the site was appropriate at all and commented on the impact on road safety and the local road network.
xxii. Questioned how taxi drop offs would be enforced, following the Travelodge development.
xxiii. The trip numbers on Godesdone Road will double.
xxiv. Resident's fourth concern was the overbearing effect of the proposed development on the Conservation Area.

Members Questions and Comments

Ward Councillor Massey made the following points:
i. Referred to anti-social behaviour associated with budget hotels and also TripAdvisor comments regarding drug dealing, prostitution and human trafficking.
ii. Police were notified of drug dealing, mugging and prostitution issues in the East Area and these issues were made a police priority at the last East Area Committee.
iii. Budget hotels cut costs to the bone, which limited resources to tackle anti-social behaviour, this was why budget hotels should not be located in residential areas.
iv. Budget hotels attracted stag / hen parties, the wheeling of suitcases late at night had an adverse effect on residents.
v. Referred to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions.
vi. Could not see any benefit of the proposed development to the ward, which was the most diverse ward in the city.

Ward Councillor Johnson made the following points:
i. Referred to policy 77 of the new local plan, more weight could be attached following the Planning Inspector's letter.
ii. Referred to paragraph 8.47 of the Local Plan, the Hotel Future Study influenced policy 77.
iii. 1500 bedrooms were identified in the Hotel Future Study (completed in 2012), the budget hotel room provision nearly exceeded the projected growth identified up to 2031.
iv. Referred to a shortfall in 3-5* hotel sector.
v. Easyhotel was a budget hotel brand, new hotels should be supported if they were at the upper end of hotel provision.

Case Officer comments
i. There were over 150 third party objections and some representations in support received for this application. The application would go to Planning Committee for determination.
ii. Following the publication of the Planning Inspector's report on Monday, the case officer would need to go through and address issues against the local plan policies.
iii. The Planning Policy Team had said that the proposal was compliant with the adopted and emerging policy 77 but further discussions were needed with the Planning Policy Team.
iv. In considering the impact on transport, an objection had been received from Highways particularly looking at Godesdone Road,

further information had been submitted by the Applicant and comments were waited from Highways.
v. It was difficult to make a clear link between anti-social behaviour and the budget hotel use proposed.
vi. Commented on the availability of spill out space and residential amenity.
vii. The Urban Design and Conservation team is supportive of the proposal in terms of scale and massing and the design of the frontage.
viii. Cycle parking was in the process of being assessed by the Landscape Officer.
ix. Environmental Health Team was satisfied with information submitted regarding air quality but other concerns remain outstanding.
x. The Council's Sustainable Drainage Engineer had raised issues which needed to be addressed by the Applicant.
xi. The Council's Access Officer had raised issues regarding the lack of accessible parking and the location of rooms within the hotel.

During the Case Officers comments the fire alarm sounded and the council building was evacuated, the meeting reconvened at 11.32am.

Planning Committee Members' questions and comments:
The Applicant responded to Members' questions as follows:
i. The Applicant was still in discussions with Highways but would keep Members' comments about traffic in mind.
ii. The site would have its own bicycles for guests to use so they should not need to use other bikes for example Ofo bikes.
iii. No food or beverages would be available on site.
iv. A single laundry van would be present daily and would have a stay of 20 minutes, the layby should be suitable to accommodate the laundry van.
v. It was proposed to have weekly refuse collections.
vi. Bird boxes and the technical aspects of a green roof were being explored.
vii. The applicant had had pre-application discussions with the Planning Officers and had considered SPD requirements. This was a considered application bearing in mind the Conservation Area.
viii. The design model of EasyHotel was to provide a place for guests to sleep, guests would go out to eat so would not be hanging around the hotel and would be enjoying the city.
ix. The ethos of the hotel was to accommodate people in small rooms it was not expected that people would stay for a long period of time.

There were some rooms without windows, this was common in London. Some people liked to take advantage of the discount price for a room without windows.
x. A typical room was 12-14sqm but disabled rooms were bigger.
xi. Members of the public who were registered disabled and had blue badges could park their cars in the local area. The information on the booking system would make it clear that this was a car free site.
xii. The site was in an urban area so the applicant would need to be mindful of construction timings and issues. Basement excavation would take one week.

Summing up by the Applicant's Agent:
i. Expressed thanks for holding the Development Control Forum.
ii. The application was a detailed application for demolition and construction of a hotel.
iii. The application contained a significant amount of information.
iv. Referred to the public exhibition which was well attended at the beginning of the year.
v. The statutory consultees either supported the proposal, had no objections or issues could be addressed through condition.
vi. There were comprehensive representations from third parties but they would have to agree to disagree on certain issues.
vii. Pre-application advice pre-dated the planning application.
viii. Referred to policy 20 in the SPD.
ix. Acknowledged the discussion regarding the Hotel Needs Assessment but commented that it was difficult to forecast hotels and market issues.
x. Commented that this was a real opportunity to bring forward redevelopment.

Summing up by the Petitioners:
i. Pre-application advice to the applicant about the intensity of use did not reassure the petitioners.
ii. The site was embedded in a residential street, if people stayed daily this was 77-80 people staying daily, questioned how this could be accommodated on a tiny street.
iii. Questioned if the drop-off bay was full what guests did.
iv. Questioned what disabled guests would do if the drop off bay was occupied.
v. Commented that there was not enough existing resident's parking.
vi. Questioned why Travelodge was used by the applicant in the travel plan if it was not a comparator.

vii. Amenity space was not addressed by Easyhotel.
viii. Conservation Area legislation was clear, development should preserve or enhance, there was no half way house compromise.
ix. This application would set a precedent for the rest of Newmarket Road.
x. Regeneration should support the residential area.

The applicant agreed to provide a construction plan for digging the basement and a table to show the sqm of rooms.

Final Comments of the Chair
The Chair observed the following:
i. Notes of the Development Control Forum would be made available to relevant parties.
ii. Application to be considered at a future Planning Committee.

The meeting ended at 12.15 pm
CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING COMMITTEE **4th September 2019**

Application Number	18/1058/FUL	**Agenda Item**	
Date Received	6th July 2018	**Officer**	Lewis Tomlinson
Target Date	31st August 2018		
Ward	Trumpington		
Site	60 Trumpington Road And 2 Nightingale Cottages Cambridge CB2 8EX		
Proposal	Demolition of the former Zahza Grill Restaurant and replacement with 4 terraced dwellings, along with access, parking and landscaping. First floor rear extension to No.2 Nightingale Cottages, with new front door and removal of existing lean-to element.		
Applicant	Mr Rupert Kirby c/o agent		

SUMMARY	The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons: - The design and scale of the proposed development would not have an adverse impact upon the character of the area; - The proposed development would not have any significant adverse impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring occupiers; The proposed development is unlikely to give rise to any significant adverse impact upon on street car parking capacity on the surrounding streets.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.1 The application site comprises a former restaurant/ takeaway and associated car parking on the east side of Trumpington Road, close to the vehicular junction between Trumpington Road and Long Road. Also included within the application site is the dwelling and its curtilage at No 2 Nightingale Cottages. The

existing vacant former public house building on the site is two-storeys in scale, rendered and has a hipped roof.

1.2 The surrounding area is residential in character. To the north there is a pair of semi-detached properties known as Nightingale Cottages. The southern dwelling of this pair is included within the application site. To the south of the site runs the private lane that connects North Cottages to Trumpington Road. No.1 North Cottages is positioned to the south-west of the site and has a small garden on its eastern side. Beyond this garden, also to the south is the row of terraced properties that form Nos. 2–4 North Cottages. These properties are configured so that the majority of habitable rooms are single aspect and are served only by north-facing windows. To the east of the site are the remaining properties that form Nos. 5–17 North Cottages.

1.3 There is an article 4 direction on the site (which is carried over from when the site was last used as the Volunteer Public House) which prohibits the demolition of the building without planning permission being obtained. Planning permission was however granted to demolish the building under planning application reference 17/0548/FUL.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

2.1 The proposal seeks planning permission for the demolition of the existing building and for the erection of 3 x 2.5 storey 4 bed dwellings and 1x 2.5 storey 3 bed dwelling The plans describe a development laid out in a single “terrace” of four properties, running approximately parallel to Trumpington Road with the “front” elevation orientated towards the west. The built form of the proposed terrace incorporates moderation between ground, first and the second floor levels with a consistent roof treatment with feature gables facing the street. The front elevations of the properties are staggered back into the site when moving from the southern section to the northern section of the site. Parking places are positioned to the front of the proposed dwellings. Individual combined bin and cycle stores also sit to the front of the proposed dwellings. To the rear of the dwellings are deep gardens with a garden studio at the very rear of each garden. An existing hedge is retained on the southern boundary opposite 1 North Cottages. The development would be accessed via a shared driveway from Trumpington Road.

2.2 The proposal also seeks planning permission for a first floor rear extension, new front door and removal of existing lean-to element to 2 Nightingale Cottages.

2.3 Following representations received and discussion with officers, the scheme has been amended since submission to:

- Reduce the massing of Unit 4 opposite rear amenity area of 1 North Cottage
- Reduce the overall width of the terrace to increase the distance between the proposed flank wall of unit 4 and the nearest property in North Cottages so as to increase the unobstructed width of the access way serving homes in North Cottages.

2.4 A previous scheme under planning application reference 17/0548/FUL for 2 x 3 bed dwellings, 1 x 2 bed dwelling, 1 x 2 bedroom flat and 2 x 1 bedroom flats was approved by planning committee 6th December 2017. This previous scheme had a built form along the southern boundary of the site, running parallel with North Cottages.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

3.1 The relevant site history comprises:

Reference	Description	Outcome
17/0548/FUL	Demolition of former restaurant, with redevelopment of the site for the erection of 2x3 bedroom and 1x2 bedroom detached linked dwellings; 1x2 bedroom apartment; 2x1 bedroom apartments; associated cycle and car parking provision and landscaping.	Approved

4.0 PUBLICITY

4.1

Advertisement:	Yes
Adjoining Owners:	Yes
Site Notice Displayed:	Yes

5.0 POLICY

5.1 See Appendix 1 for full details of Central Government Guidance, Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan 2018	1, 3, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 41, 50, 51, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 70, 71, 76, 80, 81, 82.

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework 2019 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014 Circular 11/95 (Annex A) Manual for Streets
Supplementary Planning Guidance	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012)
Material Considerations	City Wide Guidance Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010) Air Quality in Cambridge – Developers Guide (2008)

	Trumpington Road suburbs and approaches

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highway Authority)

6.1 No objection subject to the imposition of a traffic management plan condition.

Environmental Health

6.2 No objection. Recommends conditions regarding construction hours, collection during construction, construction/demolition noise/ vibration & piling, dust, contamination, ventilation scheme, low NOx boilers and EV charging points.

Nature Conservation Projects Officer

6.3 Content with the updated ecological survey. The report proposed the integration of hedgehog gaps in all boundary features and 6 swift nesting bricks. A condition is recommended requesting further details of the specification and location of bird and bat boxes, hedgehog access features and native planting.

Sustainable Drainage Engineer

6.4 No objection subject to the imposition of a surface water drainage condition and all new or altered external surfaces should be of permeable construction.

Tree Officer

6.5 No objection. The recommended landscape condition should cover details of tree removals and replacement.

Urban Design and Conservation Team

6.6 Support. Recommends a materials sample condition.

Landscape Officer

6.7 Support. Recommends landscaping and boundary treatment conditions.

Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service

6.8 Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service (CFRS) would like to pass the following observations: -

- Fire Service vehicle access should be provided in accordance with Table 8 of Approved Document B Volume 1 for the proposed new dwellings.
- There should be vehicle access for a pump appliance to within 45m of all points within the proposed new dwelling-houses.
- It's noted that the access road to existing North Cottages is proposed to be widened in areas and removes the existing pinch point.
- CFRS is of the opinion that access to North Cottages is not affected by the proposed development and our operational response can still be met as existing.

Planning Policy Team

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

6.9 The NPPF seeks to support sustainable communities. In this context, public houses may be valued for their role in supporting local economies, including those in outlying areas; in providing a local facility for social interaction; and in retaining an intrinsic part of the settlement's cultural and historic heritage. The NPPF states that local authorities should plan positively for the provision of community facilities such as public houses, guard against their unnecessary loss, and ensure that policies are flexible enough to allow such facilities to modernise and be retained for the benefit of the community (paragraphs 91 & 92).

The Cambridge Local Plan 2018

6.10 The Cambridge Local Plan 2018 adopted 18 October 2018 includes Policy 76 'Protection of public houses'. The former Volunteers public house at 60, Trumpington Road is listed on the list of safeguarded public house sites. The policy requires proposals involving the loss of a public house site to first demonstrate: the site has been marketed, diversification options including the retention of the public house use have been considered but are not feasible; and that the community no longer need the public house.

Trumpington

6.11 Trumpington is attached to the urban periphery of Cambridge, it is still considered as a separate village with its own centre and accompanying local facilities. Trumpington's population is set to increase from 9,000 in 2013 to 17,800 by 2021, nearly doubling in size. Commensurate capacity for social infrastructure is also planned to support this quantum of growth, although no specific proposals for new public houses have been proposed. As such the number of public house sites (open and closed) currently remains at four (The Green Man, Lord Byron Inn, Hudson's Ale House and at 60, Trumpington Road site).

Planning application 17/0548/FUL – Marketing & Local Consultation

6.12 As part of the planning process for the planning application 17/0548/FUL (60 Trumpington Road), the site was the subject of a pre-application marketing exercise the details of which were submitted as part of the planning application. From the evidence provided during the planning application public consultation, the site's viability relied on the site's ancillary takeaway business. This demonstrated that it had to diversify to retain any form of A4 use. Other diversification schemes including its use as a micro-brewery were also considered but found to be unsuitable. The limited number of objections to the loss of the public house site at the time during both the local consultation undertaken by the applicant and the application's public consultation indicated the community no longer needed by the community. No proposal to buy or take over the public house by the community was put forward at the time.

6.13 Further marketing of the site was considered but it would require a public house operator that included a significant takeaway food business which would permit the site to diversify to retain the public house use. No suitable public house operator was identified as fitting this model. No alternative proposals to take on the public house use by the community were received during this planning application.

6.14 It is the Council's strategy to safeguard public houses from development by ensuring they are no longer viable or able to diversify before they are lost to an alternative proposal. This approach reflects the Council's recognition that some public

house sites may no longer serve their local community and, or be economically viable to operate. No operator showed any interest in the site, it would therefore be unreasonable to require the applicant to undertaken another marketing exercise. Unless an alternative proposal was forthcoming e.g. from the local community it is very difficult to conclude the public house site is viable for A4 use.

Planning application 18/1058/FUL

6.15 Since the previous planning application (17/0548/FUL), there has been no material change in circumstances, in terms of options presented by public house operators or the local community to retain the public house use. It is therefore considered unreasonable to require a further round of marketing of the public house for a similar use. However, if a credible proposal was submitted which involved the retention of the public house use, this would indicate the public house use was viable and should be retained.

Summary

6.16 Given the lack of interest from existing public house operators and any other alternative proposals to retain the public house use, it is reasonable to conclude that the development site is no longer viable for public house use. In the absence of any credible proposals which would retain the public house use, it is considered unreasonable to ask the applicant to market the site any further.

6.17 The above responses are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the consultation responses can be inspected on the application file.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

7.1 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations:

- North Cottages (Residents submitted an 'Impact and Issues Statement')
- 1 North Cottages
- 2 North Cottages
- 3 North Cottages (Owner lives at 96 North End Meldreth)

- 4 North Cottages
- 5 North Cottages
- 6 North Cottages
- 8 North Cottages
- 12 North Cottages
- 13 North Cottages
- 14 North Cottages
- 15 North Cottages
- 16 North Cottages
- 1 Nightingale Cottages
- 21 Barrow Road
- 29 Barrow Road
- 30 Barrow Road
- 6 Eltisley Avenue
- 1 Brookside
- 13 Porson Road
- 16 Porson Road
- 36 Porson Road
- 53 Shelford Road
- 180 Shelford Road
- Landseer House, Trumpington Road
- Camcycle

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- There will be a loss of light, loss of outlook and overshadowing of North Cottages dwellings by the proposed development
- There is potential for overlooking by adjacent buildings onto the proposed development
- The proposed development would result in an intensification of use on North Cottages by foot and or vehicle unless the entirety of the development is solidly fenced off and self-contained within its TITLE boundary
- The proposed development is now 500mm closer laterally than the approved plan making it too close
- The proposed development is now 140mm taller than the approved plan making it too tall
- The proposed development is now 5500mm in front of 1 North Cottages making it over bearing on No1 North Cottages

- The window assessment is worse in the proposed development than the approved plan
- The overriding evidence is that the total effect of diminishing light into the North Cottages by this proposal 18/1058/FUL is far more detrimental compared to the approved plan 17/0548/FUL
- The existing right of way over 60 Trumpington for 2 Nightingale Cottages will be enforceable in the case of either proposal; then there will be no rear access in case of emergency for either property
- The Independent Complaints Investigator is reporting on four complainant cases regarding issues in 17/0548/FUL. Several of these issues are being repeated in 18/1058/FUL
- The daylight and sunlight reports are missing information and not complete. There is no assessment for the gardens of North Cottages
- There is a 50% decrease in the 'green space' when viewing from Trumpington Road; the 'hedge' is being reduced by 40% in length which is not consistent with 17/0548/FUL
- The initial 'setting back' of the building line in 18/1058/FUL compared to 17/0548/FUL has been lost by the December 2018 revision to bring the building, and 1st floor of unit 4 further forward again
- There are errors in the drawings and plans
- The overbearing nature of the development in scale compared to neighbouring houses
- Unit 4 does not conform to the other units design; unit 4 has parts that stick out, squash in, and not consistent with the rest of the development, it is out of character to neighbourhood
- The bin collection point needs revising as the new development would alter the existing arrangement and not meet the Recap standard
- The North Cottages lane is reduced by 1.2m, as a result of the usurping of land by the developer, at the entrance onto the Public Highway, therefore it will not meet Highway Standards
- The recent demolition work on site did not include Health and Safety requirements for safeguarding against Asbestos, there are concerns about the future demolition on site

- Archaeology report needs updating
- Wildlife report needs updating
- Breach of Policy 59, no boundary treatment has been agreed for 18/1058/FUL, and the boundary treatment agreed for 17/0548/FUL has been ignored in 18/1058/FUL
- Fails policy 27, the development causes an increase in carbon consumption for neighbouring houses due to dramatic loss of light
- Policy 76 needs to be addressed by a feasibility study being completed
- The residential amenity of the neighbourhood has dramatically decreased as a result of the developer acting in anti-social behaviour
- There are errors in the application form
- No certificate D has been produced for the land that the developer does not own
- The development is already having a negative effect on the health and wellbeing of the neighbourhood
- There are issues regarding the continual attempt by the developer to access North Cottages private lane for his development through placing walkways and gates on the boundary and disregarding North Cottages residents existing easements and Rights of Way over the whole lane.
- The scale and massing of the new dwellings are inappropriate
- First floor extension to 2 Nightingale Cottage will overshadow the rear garden and rooflights on ground floor of 1 Nightingale Cottage. Large windows will overlook the rear garden.
- Fire access is through the car park at 60 Trumpington Road, this will be lost. The pinch point would still not be wide enough to accommodate a fire engine.
- The studios will encroach onto 5 North Cottages property.
- The gate from unit 4 onto North cottages should be removed as no rights of access onto north cottages.
- cycles leaning against each other not compliant with cycle parking guide for new residential developments
- First floor windows and Juliet balconies of unit 1 will overlook 5 North Cottages garden.
- Loss of daylight to 2 North Cottages due to height of development.

- New dwellings are higher than surrounding buildings and existing building.
- Studios should not be used for habitation.
- 1 car parking space per dwelling and one visitor car parking space in total. Lack of parking will increase parking on nearby streets.
- Health issues with exhaust fumes entering 1 North Cottages ground floor windows from cars parking opposite
- Overdevelopment of the site.
- Balconies of all 4 new dwellings will overlook 2 - 5 North Cottages.
- Studios will create a loss of light for 3 - 5 North Cottages
- The size of the houses mean they will most likely have more than one vehicle and will contribute to the gridlocked traffic on Trumpington Road. The infrastructure cannot support this development.
- The proposed garden studios would be less than 6ft away from an existing Victorian clay sewer that runs below the footpath.
- The footpath alongside No.5 North Cottage must remain accessible at all times.
- The east most windows of 4 North Cottages are missing from the daylight and sunlight assessment.
- The daylight and sunlight assessment fails to address the 1st floor windows of No1 Nightingale Cottage. There will be significant impact upon these due to the increase in the first floor extension.
- Loss of character to both Nightingale Cottages due to the proposed extension.
- Vertical Sky Component should be recalculated now the dry storage shed has been removed. Height of property remains overbearing. Probable impacts on privacy.
- Skylights were not assessed on No.3 North Cottages.
- 2 Windows missing from No.4 North Cottages on the VSC and APSH assessments. No assessment has been done to the balcony window of No 4 North Cottages.
- Out of keeping. Will not enhance the city approach as set out in the Trumpington Road Suburbs and Approach Study. Overbearing and dominant in height compared to adjacent buildings affecting their light and privacy.
- 3.7m access width should be kerb to kerb not wall to wall.

7.3 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. Residential amenity
4. Refuse arrangements
5. Highway safety
6. Car and cycle parking
7. Drainage
8. Ecology
9. Fire Safety
10. Land Ownership
11. Third party representations

Principle of Development

8.2 The existing building at 60 Trumpington Road is the former Volunteers public house. The building is listed on the list of safeguarded public house sites within policy 76 'Protection of public houses' of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018. The policy requires proposals involving the loss of a public house site to first demonstrate: the site has been marketed, diversification options including the retention of the public house use have been considered but are not feasible; and that the community no longer need the public house. Under planning application 17/0548/FUL and following consultation with the Council's Planning Policy Team, planning permission was granted to demolish the existing building. Since the previous planning application (17/0548/FUL), there has been no material change in circumstances, in terms of options presented by public house operators or the local community to retain the public house use. It is therefore considered unreasonable to require a further round of marketing of the public house for a similar use. Therefore, I consider the principle of the development is acceptable in this case subject to the material considerations discussed below.

Context of site, design and external spaces

8.3 The proposed dwellings would be 2.5 storeys with a height of 8.1m, with a 2nd floor level accommodated in the pitched roof space. The proposed development would be slightly taller than the surrounding existing dwellings to the north, south and east of the site. The applicants Design and Access statement argues that the pitched roof gable forms would provide a contemporary design which would be sympathetic to the street scene. The rear of the properties step down from the third floor level with a 2 storey flat roof element which would reflect the eaves height of the adjacent North Cottages terraced properties. The proposed development embodies a contemporary architectural style which replaces the more conventionally styled detached 2 storey building and will result in a distinct and clearly visible stepped terrace facing Trumpington Road.

8.4 The site will continue to be accessed from Trumpington Road and the proposed dwellings would use a short shared, centrally located entrance driveway. Each dwelling will have off-street car parking space plus an individual cycle and bin store located to the front of the property. The proposal includes private amenity areas to the rear of the proposed dwellings which are considered to be of an appropriate size for the amount of bedrooms proposed. The proposal proposes to replace the predominantly tarmac surfaced car park in front of the existing building with new car parking and access surfaces supplemented by soft landscaping and trees to the front of the site. An existing hedge alongside North Cottages and located in front of the existing building would be partly retained – the stepped terrace being set further forward in the site than the existing building.

8.5 Whilst the Urban Design Team and Landscape Officer are supportive of the scheme subject to the inclusion of the above conditions, representations received from neighbours have raised concerns about the style, form and treatment of the building. These are considered further below. In addition, neighbours have expressed concern that the proposed changes to 2 Nightingale Cottage would also result in a loss of character to Nightingale Cottages. The majority of the changes are to the rear of the property and accordingly would not be visible from within the street.

8.6 Having regard to the sites location on a main roadway into the City, where a range of contemporary and traditional building forms, differing building heights, boundary treatments and building lines can be observed, it is my opinion that the form, height and layout of the proposed development represents an acceptable response to the character of the area and the sites context and would not accordingly have an adverse impact upon the character of the area. Whilst the replacement of the existing detached building with a terrace of four homes represents an increase in the intensity of use of the site, along Trumpington Road there are a similar range of densities which reflect the significance of the route as a key route into the City. Whilst noting the representations made on this issue, it is not considered that the proposals constitute an overdevelopment of the site and accordingly, the proposal is considered to accord with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 52, 55, 56 & 57.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

8.7 This is the second application for residential development on this site. The detailed design and orientation of the development and its “amenity spaces” has changed from the earlier permission and the application is accordingly also accompanied by new assessments of sunlight and daylight reflecting that the impacts upon neighbouring properties will also have changed. The majority of the surrounding neighbouring properties have objected to the proposal on grounds of overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing nature. I have assessed the impact upon each property.

1 North Cottages

8.8 1 North Cottage is a detached dwelling located to the south west of site and is the first property at the entrance to North Cottages. The cottage is principally orientated to face towards the site onto North Cottages. Planning permission exists for an extension to the property which extends the main 2 storey form of the property eastwards from the existing main 2 storey element of the house. The extension includes additional first floor windows facing towards the site and eastwards towards the garden area. The occupier of North Cottages has objected to the proposal on the grounds of loss of light/ overshadowing,

overlooking and visual enclosure, in addition to supporting wider concerns that are considered elsewhere in this report.

Private amenity space

8.9 The existing building varies in height along the boundary abutting the lane at North Cottages. Drawing no.SK19.04.10-01revA shows sections through the private amenity area, the lane and the nearest part of the proposed development - unit 4. Sections B and C indicate that unit 4 would be of similar height to the existing building on the site, where it falls immediately opposite the private amenity area of No.1. The height of unit 4 does nevertheless step up at the point opposite the single storey element. A revised Daylight and Sunlight Assessment has assessed the impact of the scheme upon No.1 North Cottage's private amenity area. 1 North Cottages lies south of the proposed development. Given the path of the sun through the day, the sunlight assessment indicates that the proposal would not result in overshadowing of the private amenity area of 1 North Cottages. The development would, depending upon the boundary treatment deployed by the owner of No 1 North Cottages, nevertheless be clearly visible from the garden area – and the views out from the garden would change materially as a result. Given the orientation, the change in the outlook would not be so significant as to erode the qualities of or prevent the use of the amenity space. For the above reasons, it is my view that the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact upon the rear amenity area of 1 North Cottages.

Windows

8.10 Working from east to west along the northern facing elevation of No.1, there are windows serving:

- A snug (this room is also served by glazed French doors facing the private amenity area)
- A kitchen
- A dining room
- A lounge

8.11 The application is accompanied by a Daylight and Sunlight assessment which has been undertaken in accordance with BRE guidance. This indicates that all of the ground floor windows retain over 80% of current daylight levels, which

accords with an acceptable impact when considered against the BRE guidance.

8.12 The proposal was amended during the process to address concerns regarding the impact upon No.1's garden. This resulted in the built form of Unit 4 moving westwards towards Trumpington Road. This does mean that Unit 4 would be three storeys in height opposite the window serving the ground floor snug. This room is also served by glazed French doors in the east elevation (facing over the garden) and accordingly, it is considered that the impact of the proposal would not result in so significant a sense of enclosure within this room as to render the relationship unacceptable in policy terms. The built form at the front of Unit 4 would be 5.5m from the kitchen window at No.1. The first floor would be staggered back from the ground floor, and the second floor would also be staggered back from the first floor and ground floor. While the proposed Unit 4 would have an impact upon the outlook of the kitchen window due to the proximity and siting of Unit 4, having viewed the development from within the kitchen, it my view that the kitchen window would retain a reasonable level of outlook due to the continued views/outlook to the north west (in front of the building).The outlook of the windows serving the dining room and lounge would change as a result of the development but would not be significantly affected due to the distance away from the built form of Unit 4 and the oblique angle from these windows. Unit 4 is not directly opposite these windows.

8.13 There is a bedroom window on the first floor approximately above the location of the ground floor kitchen window. Similar to the kitchen window, there would be a degree of impact upon this window. It is my view that the bedroom window would retain views/outlook to the north west especially due to its elevation above the ground. There would be no direct overlooking from the Juliet balconies on the proposed dwellings due to the oblique angle.

8.14 The planning permission for No 1 North Cottages provides for additional first floor windows facing northwards, and an application for a non-material amendment to no 1, also indicates proposals for roof lights to be inserted in the roof to serve these upper floor rooms. The Daylight and Sunlight assessment also takes into account the approved extension scheme at 1 North Cottages. Officers have considered the

impact of the proposals on these new first floor windows but having regard to the conclusions of the sunlight and daylight assessment on the ground floor windows below and the orientation of the new space created, which includes a window facing eastwards creating a dual aspect room, the impact of the proposal on this extension is also considered to be acceptable.

2 North Cottages

8.15 2 North Cottages is the first property in the line of terraced properties that make up 2 - 4 North Cottages. Drawing no.SK19.04.10-01revA demonstrates that the massing of the single storey and two storey elements of Unit 4 are comparable to the massing of the existing building on the site. The proposal would pull the ground floor element away from 2 North Cottages by 0.6m in comparison to the ground floor element of the existing building. The nearest element of the first floor element of Unit 4 would be circa 4.7m away from the ground floor and first floor windows at 2 North Cottages. The first floor element of unit 3 would be circa 8.1m away from the windows on No.2 North Cottage. Given the relationship between the existing building on the application site and properties in North Cottages, whilst the view out from these properties would change I do not consider that the change amounts to a significant overbearing impact upon 2 North Cottage. In regards to loss of light to the windows at No.2, the Daylight and Sunlight Assessment demonstrates that all the ground floor windows retain over 80% of current levels, therefore complying with the BRE guidance. The oblique outlook from the proposed Juliet balconies means that levels of overlooking between the proposed development and this property would not, in my view, be material.

8.16 It is noted that the Inspector's decision on the retrospective application for the now removed storage building (15/0152/FUL) stated that the storage building which measured approximately 2.6m to the ridge and 7m wide, had an overbearing impact on the windows of nos. 2–4 North Cottages. The proposed development would not have any built form in the same position as the now removed storage building. Notwithstanding this, I have assessed any potential overbearing impacts for 2 – 4 North Cottages above and below.

3 North Cottages

8.17 3 North Cottage is the second property in the line of terraced properties that make up 2-4 North Cottages. 3 North Cottage is set further to the east than No.2, and it is my view that given this separation and the relative orientation of the buildings, the impact of the built form of the proposed dwellings and the arrangement and relationship of windows in the existing and proposed dwellings, (and the proposed Juliet balconies) would not have a significant adverse impact upon the residential amenity of No.3 so as to render the proposal unacceptable. .

4 North Cottages

8.18 4 North Cottages is sited south east of the proposed dwellings. There are ground floor windows that are north facing. The nearest element of the development to 4 North Cottages is the proposed garden studio on Unit 4. Representations received have expressed concern about the impact and relationship of these buildings and their use. The pitched roof garden studios would have a ridge height of 3.85m and an eaves height of 2.3m. The Daylight and Sunlight Assessment and Addendum demonstrates that the 3 north facing ground floor windows and the east facing ground floor window on 4 North Cottages would all retain over 90% of the former daylight value which accords with the recommended levels of BRE guidance. The applicant was asked to consider an alternative flat roof design to the proposed ridged roof but advises that such an approach would result in a greater apparent eaves height which would increase their apparent scale when viewed from the street and surrounding properties. Officers are satisfied with this explanation. As the studios would be off set towards the east from these windows, and given the pitched roofs, I do not consider that the proposed studio at Unit 4 would have a significant overbearing impact upon any of the ground floor windows on 4 North Cottages. Due to the siting of the proposed dwellings, the first-floor terrace of no.4 would be unaffected in its outlook to the east or north. There would be no direct overlooking from the Juliet balconies on the proposed dwellings to No.4 due to the oblique angle.

5 North Cottage

8.19 The first floor windows on the rear elevation of Unit 1 and of the extended 2 Nightingale Cottage would be circa 14.5m away from the boundary of No.5 North Cottages and therefore would not significantly overlook the garden of No.5. The proposed sheds to the rear of 2 Nightingale Cottage and the proposed dwellings are separated by a private track from the boundary of No.5 North Cottage. A revised Daylight & Sunlight Assessment has assessed the impact of the proposed scheme upon the garden of No.5 North Cottage. The garden will retain 98% of current sunlight levels on March 21st which would comply with BRE guidance.

1 Nightingale Cottage

8.20 The proposed first floor element of the extension to 2 Nightingale Cottage would project 2.4m further than the existing rear elevation but would not project past the existing ground floor extension at 1 Nightingale Cottage. The first floor element would be set 0.6m off the boundary with 1 Nightingale Cottage. There is a first floor window on 1 Nightingale Cottage but this is set in from the boundary. The proposed extension would not protrude into the 45 degree rule of thumb when measured from the centre of this first floor window. The proposed extension to 2 Nightingale Cottage would result in a loss of light but given the orientation of the properties and as this rear elevation is east facing, I do not consider this to be a significant loss. No daylight/sunlight assessment was requested for 1 Nightingale Cottage for this reason. The proposed first floor window would be larger and set higher than the existing first floor window, and it would look towards the rear of the garden of 1 Nightingale Cottage. Therefore, it would not result in a significant adverse impact having regards to loss of light or loss of privacy to 1 Nightingale Cottage.

- Wider area

8.21 The properties further to the east along North Cottages have responded to the consultation with a range of comments, these include a concern about the impact of the proposals upon their amenity during the development phase and concerns associated with access (particularly emergency access) and refuse services which are considered further below. The

Environmental Health team has recommended conditions to mitigate the impact of construction on nearby residential properties. Noise and disturbance during the construction phase is recognised as an inevitable consequence of development and cannot on its own justify preventing development taking place. Rather the matter is appropriately addressed where relevant by the use of planning conditions. I accept the advice of consultees that the impact on the wider residential area is acceptable subject to the mitigation measures to be secured through the recommended conditions.

8.22 Based upon the material submitted by the applicants and officers assessment of the changes to and impact of the development upon the amenities of surrounding residential properties, in my opinion the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and I consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 57 and 35.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

8.23 Policy 50 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) sets out internal residential space standards. The proposed units would comply with and exceed the standards. In this regard, the units would provide appropriate quality internal living environment for the future occupants of the development. 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	4	6	3	112	160	+48
2	4	6	3	112	164	+52
3	4	6	3	112	167	+55
4	3	6	3	108	169	+61

8.24 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. All of the units would have large private rear east facing gardens. To ensure that adequate private amenity space is retained for the proposed dwelling, and the residential amenity of neighbouring properties along North

Cottages is protected I recommend that permitted developments rights are removed for extensions and outbuildings for Unit 4. I also recommend that permitted development rights for extensions on Units 1 – 3 are also removed.

8.25 In my opinion the proposal provides a high-quality living environment and an appropriate standard of residential amenity for future occupiers, and I consider that in this respect it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 50.

Accessible homes

8.26 The development has been assessed for compliance with Policy 51 and complies with the requirements of Part M4 (2) of the Building Regulations. I have recommended a condition to secure this requirement.

Refuse Arrangements

8.27 The proposal provides bin storage in front of the buildings within a designed enclosure. Officers consider that the bin stores would be in a convenient location for the residents with easy access to Trumpington Road for collection. During the application phase, residents of properties on North Cottages raised concerns about the combined effect of bins from properties on North Cottages and the application site impeding the safe flow of pedestrians along the footway to Trumpington Road or compromising visibility splays at each access. Officers have engaged with the Shared Waste team to determine the parameters and practice surrounding refuse collection and the placement and management of bins by refuse personnel on collection days. The surfaced footway along the site frontage and to the south, in front of 1 North Cottages is significantly in excess of a standard footway width. This arises because it appears that the grass verge along much of this side of Trumpington Road has been tarmac'd. On collection days, the space along the footway occupied by existing bins from properties on North Cottages will be increased as a result of the additional four properties proposed. Officers are nevertheless satisfied that the substantial width of the footway along the site frontage and the access arrangements mean that these additional collections will not adversely impact upon footway space so as to displace pedestrians passing the site into the

main carriageway. Equally, subject to the considerate placement of bins by all residents, officers are satisfied that acceptable visibility can be maintained at all private and shared access on collection days so as not to create an additional unacceptable hazard. In my opinion the proposal is therefore compliant with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 57 in this regard.

Highway Safety

8.28 The proposal would alter the existing access to the site. The Highway Authority has been consulted as part of the application and is satisfied that there would not be any adverse impact upon the highway. The Highway Authority recommends the inclusion of a traffic management plan condition for both the demolition and construction stage. I agree with this advice. I am accordingly satisfied that the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 81.

Car and Cycle Parking

- *Car parking*

8.29 The proposal would include:

- 2 car parking spaces for 2 Nightingale Cottage
- 1 Car parking space for Unit 1
- 1 Car parking space for Unit 2
- 1 Car parking space for Unit 3
- 2 Car parking spaces for Unit 4
- 1 Visitor car parking

8.30 Neighbours have raised concerns that the proposed level of car parking for the development would not be adequate. However, this level of car parking is compliant with the Council's adopted maximum car parking standards which aim to promote reduced car travel and sustainable transport modes. The site lies on Trumpington Road in an area with on street parking controls and is also adjacent to a private road, North Cottages. The site is also located within a very sustainable location with good links to the city centre and train station. Given the proposed level of car parking provision and nearby parking controls, it is my view that the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 82.

- *Cycle parking*

8.31 The proposal includes a cycle store at the front of each of the dwellings including 2 Nightingale Cottage. The cycle storage would mean that cycles would be stored side by side in a leaning style. During the consultation phase, some neighbouring properties have expressed a concern about the cycle parking arrangements and, in particular, the height of the stores and potential intrusion on North Cottages. In this particular case, the proposals are considered acceptable in order to moderate the size of the stores. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 57 and 82.

Drainage

8.32 The Drainage Officer has not raised any objections subject to a surface water drainage condition. In my opinion, the condition would secure an adequate surface water drainage scheme for the proposed dwellings. Subject to this condition, the proposal is compliant with the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) and policy 31 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

Ecology

8.33 The Ecology Officer has been consulted as part of the application and is content with the updated ecological survey. The report proposed the integration of hedgehog gaps in all boundary features and 6 swift nesting bricks. Therefore, a condition is recommended requesting further details of the specification and location of these features. Subject to this condition, the proposal would therefore be in accordance with Policy 70 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

Fire Safety

8.34 Several neighbours have raised concerns about fire safety due to the removal of the existing car park and the access it provides the Fire Service to the properties further down North Cottages. North Cottages is an unadopted unsealed single carriageway road which narrows from its entrance onto Trumpington Road to a pinch point formed by the existing extension to the existing property at No 60 and No 2 North

Cottages. The previous planning permission provided for a slight increase in the clear width (between buildings) at the pinch point but the matter remained one of concern to residents.

8.35 Cambridge Fire Service have bene consulted on the proposals and their comments have been summarised above. In particular, they have advised that in the event of Fire in North Cottages, they would not expect to drive down North Cottages but would expect to fight the fire from tenders in Trumpington Road. The Governments Publication "The Manual For Streets" provides guidance on access for emergency vehicles within new development. The document advises upon the need to consult with Local Fire Officers but states*: "The Association of Chief Fire Officers has expanded upon and clarified these requirements as follows:*

• a 3.7 m carriageway (kerb to kerb) is required for operating space at the scene of a fire. Simply to reach a fire, the access route could be reduced to 2.75 m over short distances, provided the pump appliance can get to within 45 m of dwelling entrances;

• if an authority or developer wishes to reduce the running carriageway width to below 3.7 m, they should consult the local Fire Safety Officer;"

8.36 In this case, following concern of residents, the Planning Service commissioned a survey of North Cottages to determine its actual width at present. This survey demonstrated that there is an existing pinch point between the existing building at 60 Trumpington Road and 2 North Cottages. This pinch point measures 3m from the wall at 60 Trumpington Road to the wall at 2 North Cottages and 2.62m from the wall at 60 Trumpington Road to the flower bed at 2 North Cottages. The application proposes the demolition of the existing building and extensions on the site and the construction of a new building on a new footprint. The amendments to the current application following residents concerns have increased the width between buildings on North Cottages at its narrowest point from 3m to 3.7m. Whilst residents remain concerned that the camber and surface mean that the actual width may be less than 3.7m, the proposals therefore offer a material improvement to the "clear" width of North Cottages. Notwithstanding the views of the Fire Authority regarding fire fighting, this improved width will potentially allow for other delivery and emergency vehicles to access North Cottages beyond the existing pinch point at No 4

and amounts to an improvement in access. Residents have also suggested that the development of the application site removes the ability of the Fire Service to fight a fire in North Cottages from within the curtilage of No 60. The existing property and car park area are locked and enclosed and remain private land – and not part of the public highway. They cannot therefore be relied upon for access in an emergency.

8.37 Residents have sought further clarity on the length of fire hoses held by the Fire Service on its vehicles – so as to be reassured that fire hoses would reach all properties at North Cottages. Confirmation on this information is awaited from the fire Authority. Residents have also sought to highlight the greater enclosure of a length of North Cottages by the new building. The existing building however intrudes forward into North Cottages beyond the proposed side wall of the proposed development for a length of some 6m – and accordingly is considered to amount to a greater barrier to access than the proposed building which maintains a minimum distance significantly greater than the 2.75m referred to in the manual for streets advice above.

8.38 Whilst therefore information on hose capacity is awaited, the clear view of the Fire Authority and the positive impact of the proposals on the width of North Cottages mean that officers in the Planning and Building Control team are satisfied with the Fire Service response that the development would not have an adverse impact upon the ability of the emergency services to respond to a Fire in North Cottages.

Land Ownership

8.39 Neighbours have raised an issue that the certificate D has not been signed in the application form. The applicant submitted a completed certificate B of ownership with the application. The council must accept the submission of a signed certificate unless there is clear evidence that an incorrect certificate has been supplied. Whilst neighbouring parties have disputed the validity of the certificate, no clear evidence has been provided to the Council and therefore the Council must accept the certificate on face value.

Third Party Representations

8.40 I have addressed the third party representations as follows:

Comments	Response
There will be a loss of light, loss of outlook and overshadowing of properties in North Cottages by the proposed development	I have addressed this in paragraphs 8.7-8.22
There is potential for overlooking by adjacent buildings onto the proposed development	I have addressed this in paragraphs 8.7-8.22
The proposed development would result in an intensification of use on North Cottages by foot and or vehicle unless the entirety of the development is solidly fenced off and self-contained within its TITLE boundary	Original submission included a gate from North Cottages to Unit 4, this has since been removed within amendments. The proposed development would be accessed only from Trumpington Road.
The proposed development is now 500mm closer laterally than the approved plan making it too close	I have addressed this in paragraphs 8.7-8.22
The proposed development is now 140mm taller than the approved plan making it too tall	I have addressed this in paragraphs 8.7-8.22
The proposed development is now 5500mm in front of 1 North Cottages making it over bearing on No1 North Cottages	I have addressed this in paragraphs 8.7-8.22
The window assessment is worse in proposed development than approved plan	I have addressed this in paragraphs 8.7-8.22
The overriding evidence is that the total effect of diminishing light into the North Cottages by this proposal 18/1058/FUL is far more detrimental compared to the approved plan 17/0548/FUL	I have addressed this in paragraphs 8.7-8.22. The application has been assessed on its own merits.
The existing right of way over 60 Trumpington for 2 Nightingale Cottages will be enforceable in the case of either proposal; then there will be no rear access in case of emergency for either property	2 Nightingale Cottages is under ownership by the applicant and is part of the site edged red.

The Independent Complaints Investigator is reporting on four complainant cases regarding issues in 17/0548/FUL. Several of these issues are being repeated in 18/1058/FUL The daylight and sunlight reports are missing information and not complete. There is no assessment for the gardens of North Cottages	This is separate from the planning application process. Officers have considered the recommendations of the ICI in preparing this report. The Daylight and Sunlight Assessment has been revised to address the missing information including an assessment for the gardens of 1 and 5 North Cottages.
There is a 50% decrease in the 'green space' when viewing from Trumpington Road; the 'hedge' is being reduced by 40% in length which is not consistent with 17/0548/FUL	I have addressed this in paragraphs 8.3-8.6. The hedge is being retained as part of the development. The proposal would increase the green space by reducing the amount of car parking and hard landscaping that currently dominates the site.
The initial 'setting back' of the building line in 18/1058/FUL compared to 17/0548/FUL has been lost by the December 2018 revision to bring the building, and 1st floor of unit 4 further forward again	I have addressed this in paragraphs 8.7-8.22
There are errors in the drawings and plans	The applicant claims that the inconsistencies in the drawings have been addressed through amendments.
The overbearing nature of the development in scale compared to neighbouring houses	I have addressed this in paragraphs 8.7-8.22
Unit 4 does not conform to the other units design; unit 4 has parts that stick out, squash in, and not consistent with the rest of the development, it is out of character to neighbourhood	Amendments have been made to Unit 4 to address residential amenity impacts upon 1 North Cottage. The report above considers the relationship of Unit 4 to neighbouring homes and the impact of the design upon the character of the area.

The bin collection point needs revising as the new development would alter the existing arrangement and not meet the Recap standard	This is a matter separate to the planning application due to an informal arrangement of storing bins upon private land. Officers have nevertheless liaised with the Waste Service to understand the process for assisted collections and the potential consequences of the development on the continuation of this service where provided.
The North Cottages lane is reduced by 1.2m, as a result of the usurping of land by the developer, at the entrance onto the Public Highway, therefore it will not meet Highway Standards	The Council has accepted the statements made concerning the application site ownership, in the absence of any evidence to the contrary. The land in question relates to a stretch of North Cottages which is not currently enclosed or defined on the ground by significant structures so as to impede movement along North Cottages. In the absence of any definitive evidence to contradict the applicant's declaration in the application, the LPA has accepted the application as valid. The Highway Authority has not raised any concerns with the application in regards to the proposed development or its impact upon the wider area.
The recent demolition work on site did not include Health and Safety requirements for safeguarding against Asbestos, there are concerns about the future demolition on site	Any demolition on the site that forms part of the application will need to be in accordance with approved details in a discharge of condition application and will also need to follow Health and Safety requirements.
Archaeology report needs updating	This information was sought by condition on 17/0548/FUL and it would be unreasonable not to apply this approach again.

Wildlife report needs updating	A revised ecology report has been submitted with the application. Please see paragraph 8.33
Breach of Policy P59, no boundary treatment has been agreed for 18/1058/FUL, and the boundary treatment agreed for 17/0548/FUL has been ignored in 18/1058/FUL	It is common practice to condition further details of boundary treatment as long as there is an indication of siting and type.
Fails policy 27, the development causes an increase in carbon consumption for neighbouring houses due to dramatic loss of light	In the draft local plan, Policy 28 (Carbon reduction, community energy networks, sustainable design and construction, and water use) was previously policy 27. This policy relates to the construction methods and specifications of new developments and not the impact upon neighbouring properties. The impact upon residential amenity of neighbouring properties have been addressed in paragraphs 8.7-8.22
Policy 76 needs to be addressed by a feasibility study being completed	This has been addressed in paragraph 8.2
The residential amenity of the neighbourhood has dramatically decreased as a result of the developer acting in anti-social behaviour	This is not a planning issue.
There are errors in the application form	Officers are satisfied that the application submitted is valid and that the application can lawfully be determined.
No certificate D has been produced for the land that the developer does not own	The council must accept the submission of a signed certificate unless there is clear evidence that the incorrect certificate has been supplied. Whilst neighbouring parties have disputed the validity of the certificate, no evidence to disprove or respond to the applicants solicitors request for evidence has been forthcoming.

The development is already having a negative effect on the health and wellbeing of the neighbourhood	Potential proposed changes in a locality and the impact upon the health of individuals participating in or commenting upon planning applications is not a matter that the LPA can have regard to in determining the “planning merits” of a planning application. .
There are issues regarding the continual attempt by the developer to access North Cottages private lane for his development through placing walkways and gates on the boundary and disregarding North Cottages residents existing easements and Rights of Way over the whole lane.	Original submission included a gate from North Cottages to Unit 4, this has since been removed from amendments. The proposed development would be accessed from Trumpington Road.
The scale and massing of the new dwellings are inappropriate	I have addressed this in paragraphs 8.3-8.6
First floor extension to 2 Nightingale Cottage will overshadow the rear garden and rooflights on ground floor. Large windows will overlook the rear garden.	I have addressed this in paragraphs 8.7-8.22
Fire access is through the car park at 60 Trumpington Road, this will be lost. The pinch point would still not be wide enough to accommodate a fire engine. 3.7m should be kerb to kerb not wall to wall.	I have addressed this in paragraphs above
The studios will encroach onto 5 North Cottages property.	This is a legal issue between land owners.
Cycles leaning against each other not compliant with cycle parking guide for new residential developments	I have addressed this in paragraphs 8.28-8.31
First floor windows and Juliet balconies of unit 1 will overlook 5 north cottages garden.	I have addressed this in paragraphs 8.7-8.22
Loss of daylight to 2 north cottages due to height of development.	I have addressed this in paragraphs 8.7-8.22
New dwellings are higher than surrounding buildings and existing building.	I have addressed this in paragraphs 8.7-8.22

Studios should not be used for habitation.	A condition shall be recommended to ensure that the studios are not used for sleeping or let out as separate units.
1 car parking space per dwelling and one visitor car parking space in total. Lack of parking will increase parking on nearby streets.	I have addressed this in paragraphs 8.28-8.31.
Health issues with exhaust fumes entering 1 north cottages ground floor windows from cars parking opposite	Currently, there is a car park area in this area which served the former public house. The proposal would reduce the amount of space for car parking/cars parked in immediate proximity to no 1 North Cottages.
Overdevelopment of the site.	In consideration of the assessment within the main body of the report, it is my view that the proposal does not constitute an overdevelopment of the site.
Balconies of all 4 new dwellings will overlook 2 - 5 north cottages.	I have addressed this in paragraphs 8.7-8.22
Studios will create a loss of light for 3 - 5 north cottages	I have addressed this in paragraphs 8.7-8.22
The size of the houses mean they will most likely have more than one vehicle and will contribute to the gridlocked traffic on Trumpington Road. The infrastructure cannot support this development.	I have addressed this in paragraphs 8.28-8.31. The Highway Authority has not raised any concerns about the impact of the additional traffic that would be a result of the scheme.
The proposed garden studios would be less than 6ft away from an existing Victorian clay sewer that runs below the footpath.	This is a matter that relates to the construction phase of the development and will need to be addressed by the applicant
The footpath alongside No.5 North Cottages must remain accessible at all times.	This is a civil matter between the applicant and owner of No 5 North Cottages .
The east most windows of 4 North cottages are missing from the daylight and sunlight assessment.	The Daylight and Sunlight Addendum has assessed these windows.

The daylight and sunlight assessment fails to address the 1st floor windows of No1 Nightingale cottage. There will be significant impact upon these due to the increase in the first floor extension.	No Daylight and Sunlight assessment was considered necessary for 1 Nightingale Cottage. I have addressed this in paragraphs 8.7-8.22
Loss of character to both Nightingale Cottages due to the proposed extension.	I have addressed this in paragraphs 8.3-8.6
Vertical Sky Component should be recalculated now the dry storage shed has been removed.	Paragraph 1.7 of the Daylight and Sunlight Addendum explained that the dry storage shed was not included in the analysis as the applicant had instructed the consultants to assume the building had been demolished as it was subject to an enforcement notice.
Skylights were not assessed on No.3 North Cottages.	The Daylight and Sunlight Addendum has assessed these windows.
2 Windows missing from No.4 North Cottages on the VSC and APSH assessments. No assessment has been done to the balcony window of No 4 North Cottages.	The Daylight and Sunlight Addendum has assessed these windows.
Will not enhance the city approach as set out in the Trumpington Road Suburbs and Approach Study.	I have addressed this in paragraphs 8.3-8.6

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 This application seeks to re-develop an existing commercial property to provide for 4 new homes and to alter an existing residential property. The proposed dwellings, for the reasons set out above, are considered to be acceptable having regard to the development Plan and all material planning considerations. The application has prompted a wide range of comment from immediate neighbours and residents nearby concerning the physical impact of the development and its implications for safety and the amenity of adjoining properties, and upon the character and appearance of the area. The principle of development and redevelopment has been established by the earlier permission. Having regard to the balance of all the relevant planning considerations, for the reasons that are set

out in the report above, and subject to conditions, I have concluded that the proposals are acceptable and can be recommended for approval.

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. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as listed on this decision notice.

   Reason: In the interests of good planning, for the avoidance of doubt and to facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

3. Submission of Preliminary Contamination Assessment:

   Prior to the commencement of the development (or phase of) or investigations required to assess the contamination of the site, the following information shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

   (a) Desk study to include:
   -Detailed history of the site uses and surrounding area (including any use of radioactive materials)
   -General environmental setting.
   -Site investigation strategy based on the information identified in the desk study.
   (b) A report setting set out what works/clearance of the site (if any) is required in order to effectively carry out site investigations.

   Reason: To adequately categorise the site prior to the design of an appropriate investigation strategy in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

4. Submission of site investigation report and remediation strategy:

Prior to the commencement of the development (or phase of) with the exception of works agreed under condition 3 and in accordance with the approved investigation strategy agreed under clause (b) of condition 3, the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:
(a) A site investigation report detailing all works that have been undertaken to determine the nature and extent of any contamination, including the results of the soil, gas and/or water analysis and subsequent risk assessment to any receptors
(b) A proposed remediation strategy detailing the works required in order to render harmless the identified contamination given the proposed end use of the site and surrounding environment including any controlled waters. The strategy shall include a schedule of the proposed remedial works setting out a timetable for all remedial measures that will be implemented.

Reason: To ensure that any contamination of the site is identified and appropriate remediation measures agreed in the interest of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

5. Implementation of remediation.

Prior to the first occupation of the development (or each phase of the development where phased) the remediation strategy approved under clause (b) to condition 4 shall be fully implemented on site following the agreed schedule of works.

Reason: To ensure full mitigation through the agreed remediation measures in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

6. Completion report:

Prior to the first occupation of the development (or phase of) hereby approved the following shall be submitted to, and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

(a) A completion report demonstrating that the approved remediation scheme as required by condition 4 and implemented under condition 5 has been undertaken and that the land has been remediated to a standard appropriate for the end use.
(b) Details of any post-remedial sampling and analysis (as defined in the approved material management plan) shall be included in the completion report along with all information concerning materials brought onto, used, and removed from the development. The information provided must demonstrate that the site has met the required clean-up criteria.

Thereafter, no works shall take place within the site such as to prejudice the effectiveness of the approved scheme of remediation.

Reason: To demonstrate that the site is suitable for approved use in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

7. Material Management Plan:

Prior to importation or reuse of material for the development (or phase of) a Materials Management Plan (MMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The MMP shall:
a) Include details of the volumes and types of material proposed to be imported or reused on site
b) Include details of the proposed source(s) of the imported or reused material
c) Include details of the chemical testing for ALL material to be undertaken before placement onto the site.
d) Include the results of the chemical testing which must show the material is suitable for use on the development
e) Include confirmation of the chain of evidence to be kept during the materials movement, including material importation, reuse placement and removal from and to the development.

All works will be undertaken in accordance with the approved document.

Reason: To ensure that no unsuitable material is brought onto the site in the interest of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

8. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, with the exception of below ground works, full details including samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of buildings, which includes external features such as entrance doors, porch and canopies, projecting windows, roof cladding, external metal work, rain water goods and coping shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

   Brick sample panels of the facing materials to be used shall be erected on site and shall be 1m x 1m to establish the detailing of bonding, coursing, colour and type of jointing shall be agreed in writing with 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. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 52, 55, and 57)

9. Unexpected Contamination:

   If unexpected contamination is encountered whilst undertaking the development which has not previously been identified, works shall immediately cease on site until the Local Planning Authority has been notified and the additional contamination has been fully assessed and remediation approved following steps (a) and (b) of condition 4 above. The approved remediation shall then be fully implemented under condition 5.

   Reason: To ensure that any unexpected contamination is rendered harmless in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

10. Prior to the commencement of development/construction, details of a ventilation scheme as an alternative to open windows for the terraced accommodation units 1 to 4 and No.2 Nightingale Cottages on the Trumpington Road façade shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The ventilation scheme shall achieve at least 2 air changes per hour.
    The scheme shall be installed before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall not be altered.

Reason: To protect the amenity of future occupants of this property from the high ambient noise levels in the area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35)

11. No construction work or demolition work shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours and1300 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 2018 policy 35)

12. Except with the prior agreement of the local planning authority in writing, there should be no collection or deliveries to the site during the demolition and construction stages outside the hours of 0700 hrs and 1900 hrs on Monday Saturday and there should be no collections or deliveries on Sundays or Bank and public holidays.

    Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35)

13. In the event of the foundations for the proposed development requiring piling, no such piling shall take place until a report / method statement detailing the type of piling and mitigation measures to be taken to protect local residents noise and or vibration has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. Potential noise and vibration levels at the nearest noise sensitive locations shall be predicted in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228-1&2:2009 Code of Practice for noise
    and vibration control on construction and open sites. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Due to the proximity of this site to existing residential premises and other noise sensitive premises, impact pile driving is not recommended.

    Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35)

14. No development shall commence until a programme of measures to minimise the spread of airborne dust from the site during the demolition / construction period has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme.

    Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 36)

15. For Units 1 - 4, notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Classes A, B E of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification): the enlargement, improvement or other alteration of the dwellinghouses, including insertion of new windows; loft conversion including rear dormers; and the provision within the curtilage of the dwellinghouses of any building or enclosure, swimming or other pool, shall not be allowed without the granting of specific planning permission.

    Reason: To ensure sufficient amenity space is retained for future occupiers of the dwelling, to protect the character of the area and to protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 52 and 57)

16. Notwithstanding the approved plans, the dwellings, hereby permitted, shall be constructed to meet the requirements of Part M4(2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings' of the Building Regulations 2010 (as amended 2016).

    Reason: To secure the provision of accessible housing (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 51)

17. No development above ground level, other than demolition, shall commence until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include proposed finished levels or contours; means of enclosure; car parking layouts, other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials; minor artefacts and structures (eg furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting); retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant. This should also include a scheme of lighting for the public areas within the site. Soft Landscape works shall include planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate and an implementation programme.

    All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The maintenance shall be carried out in accordance with the approved schedule. Any trees or plants that, within a period of five years after planting, are removed, die or become in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced as soon as is reasonably practicable with others of species, size and number as originally approved, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

    Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that suitable hard and soft landscape is provided as part of the development. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 57 and 59)

18. No development above ground level, other than demolition, shall commence until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatments to be erected. The boundary treatment shall be completed in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation or the bringing into use of the development (or other timetable agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority) and retained as approved thereafter.

This should include:
- Retention of the hedge opposite 1 North Cottages as shown P04revG
- Boundary treatment details of the fence for Unit 4 opposite the garden of 1 North Cottages and also the fence opposite 2 - 4 North Cottages
- Boundary treatment for dwelling units 1 - 4

Reason: To ensure an appropriate boundary treatment is implemented in the interests of visual amenity and privacy (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 57 and 59)

19. No development hereby permitted shall be commenced until surface water drainage details have been submitted to the local planning authority. Before these details are submitted, an assessment shall be carried out of the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system in accordance with the principles set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and associated Guidance, and the results of the assessment provided to the local planning authority. The system should be designed such that there is no surcharging for a 1 in 30 year event and no internal property flooding for a 1 in 100 year event + 40% an allowance for climate change. The submitted details shall:
a) provide information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters; and
b) provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.

c) The surface water drainage scheme shall be managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the agreed details and management and maintenance plan.

The approved details shall be fully implemented on site prior to the first use/occupation and shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure appropriate surface water drainage. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 31 and 32)

20. No development shall commence until a plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Authority detailing the proposed specification, number and locations of internal and / or external bird and bat boxes on the new buildings, hedgehog access features and proposed native planting. The installation shall be carried out and subsequently maintained in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason: To protect local wildlife (Policy 70 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

21. No demolition or construction works shall commence on site until a traffic management plan has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: in the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 81)

22. No development above ground level, other than demolition, shall commence until full details of green roofs have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. The details shall include details of build-ups, make up of substrates, planting plans for biodiverse roofs, methodologies for translocation strategy and drainage details where applicable. The green roofs once installed shall be maintained in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interests of responding suitably to climate change and water management (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 31)

23. Prior to the occupation of the development, hereby permitted, the curtilages of units 1 - 4 shall be fully laid out and finished in accordance with the approved plans. The curtilages shall remain as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure an appropriate level of amenity for future occupiers and to avoid the property being built and occupied without its garden land (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 50, 52, 55 and 56)

24. The garden studios hereby permitted shall be used only for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse. They shall at no time be used as sleeping accommodation, nor shall they be separately occupied or let, used to accommodate bed-and-breakfast guests or other short-term visitors paying rent or fees.

Reason: To avoid harm to the character of the area, to protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and because if the outbuilding were to be slept in or used as a separate unit of accommodation it would provide a poor level of amenity for its intended occupiers (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policies 35, 50, 55, 52, and 57 and to ensure consistency with the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development Order 2015).

25. The dwellings hereby approved shall not be occupied until the cycle and bin storage has been provided in accordance with the details within drawing No. P20. The cycle and bin storage shall be retained in accordance with these details thereafter.

Reason: To ensure appropriate provision for the secure storage of bicycles and bins. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 56, and 82)

26. No development shall take place within the area indicated until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To secure the preservation of the archaeological interest of the area either by record or in situ as appropriate. (Local Plan 2018 policy 61)

27. The development hereby approved shall utilise low NOx boilers, i.e., boilers that meet a dry NOx emission rating of 40mg/kWh, to minimise emissions from the development that may impact on air quality. Details of the boilers shall be submitted to the local planning authority for approval prior to installation.

    The details shall include a manufacturers NOx emission test certificate or other evidence to demonstrate that every installed boiler meets the approved emissions standard shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. The details shall demonstrate compliance with the agreed emissions limits. The scheme as approved shall be fully carried out in accordance with the approved details before first occupation and shall be thereafter retained.

    Reason: To protect local air quality and human health by ensuring that the production of air pollutants such as nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter are kept to a minimum during the lifetime of the development, to contribute toward National Air Quality Objectives and accords with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), policy 36 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 and in accordance with Cambridge City Councils adopted Air Quality Action Plan (2018)

28. Prior to occupation of the proposed development, a scheme for the installation of electric vehicle charging points within the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

    Reason: In the interests of encouraging more sustainable forms of travel/transport and to reduce the impact of development on local air quality, in accordance with Policies 36 & 82 Cambridge Local Plan (2018); and in accordance with Cambridge City Councils adopted Air Quality Action Plan (2018)

29. For Unit 4, notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 2, Classes A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification): the erection of fence forward of the principal elevation , shall not be allowed without the granting of specific planning permission.

Reason: To protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 52 and 57)

30. Notwithstanding the approved plans, the first floor window on the south facing elevation of Unit 4 shall be fitted with obscured glazing (meeting as a minimum Pilkington Standard level 3 in obscurity) and shall be non-opening unless the part of the window, door or opening is more than 1.7m above the finished floor level of the room in which it is installed. The development shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity and for the amenity of future occupiers (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55 and 58)

INFORMATIVE: Dust condition informative

To satisfy the condition requiring the submission of a program of measures to control airborne dust above, the applicant should have regard to:

-Council's Supplementary Planning Document - "Sustainable Design and Construction 2007":
http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/docs/sustainable-design-and-construction-spd.pdf

-Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction
http://iaqm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/guidance/iaqm_guidance_report_draft1.4.pdf

- Air Quality Monitoring in the Vicinity of Demolition and Construction Sites 2012
http://www.iaqm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/guidance/monitoring_construction_sites_2012.pdf

-Control of dust and emissions during construction and demolition - supplementary planning guidance
https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Dust%20and%20Emissions%20SPG%208%20July%202014_0.pdf

INFORMATIVE:

This development involves work to the public highway that will require the approval of the County Council as Highway Authority. It is an OFFENCE to carry out any works within the public highway, which includes a public right of way, without the permission of the Highway Authority. Please note that it is the applicant's responsibility to ensure that, in addition to planning permission, any necessary consents or approvals under the Highways Act 1980 and the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 are also obtained from the County Council.
No part of any structure may overhang or encroach under or upon the public highway unless licensed by the Highway Authority and no gate / door / ground floor window shall open outwards over the public highway.

Public Utility apparatus may be affected by this proposal. Contact the appropriate utility service to reach agreement on any necessary alterations, the cost of which must be borne by the applicant.

INFORMATIVE:

Informative on wildlife access gaps within garden boundary treatments

The applicant is reminded that the National Planning Policy Framework (2018) seeks all developments to 'minimise impacts on and provide net gains for biodiversity, including establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures'. Residential gardens are increasingly important refuges for declining species such as hedgehogs and local enhancement can be achieved through provision of access gaps (minimum 130mm x 130mm) within boundary features to connect these habitats.

INFORMATIVE: Cambridge City Council recommends the use of low NOx boilers i.e. appliances that meet a dry NOx emission rating of 40mg/kWh, to minimise emissions from the development that may impact on air quality.

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING COMMITTEE **4th September 2019**

Application Number	19/0183/FUL	**Agenda Item**	
Date Received	11th February 2019	**Officer**	Mary Collins
Target Date	8th April 2019		
Ward	Trumpington		
Site	3 Saxon Street Cambridge CB2 1HN		
Proposal	Single storey rear extension and rear roof extension.		
Applicant	Mr & Mrs T. Stainsby 3, Saxon Street Cambridge CB2 1HN UK		

SUMMARY	The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons: - The proposed development would respect the character and appearance of the conservation area. - The proposed development would not have any significant adverse impact on the amenity of surrounding occupiers. - The proposed development would provide accessible living accommodation and a good level of indoor and outdoor amenity for future occupiers.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

1.1 3 Saxon Street is situated on the southern side of the street and is situated in a terrace of 11 two storey dwellings. The property along with its adjoining neighbours has been extended at two storey level and roof level.

1.2 To the rear boundary is the end gable wall of Panton Hall which is constructed on the rear boundary of the application site and the adjoining property at 2 Saxon Street.

1.3 Saxon Street is a cobbled road and is situated within the New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

2.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey rear extension and rear roof extension.

2.2 The ground floor single storey extension projects 3m from the rear of the existing house with a maximum height of 3.1m. The roof extension replaces the existing dormer with a continuation of No.4's mansard type roof profile. The height does not exceed the line of the roof line of No4. The rear extension will be built in matching Cambridge cream coloured brickwork and natural slate roof to match the existing house materials.

2.3 Revisions were made to the original submission with the rear extension being reduced at eaves level to 2.1m, the width has been reduced to allow for gutters each side. A two storey element was originally proposed but has since been removed from the proposal.

2.4 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:

1. Design Statement
2. Drawings
3. Shadow Study

2.5 This application was originally scheduled to be heard at the August committee meeting but was withdrawn to enable neighbours to view the shadow study that was submitted just before that Committee.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
C/81/0758	Alterations and additions to existing dwelling houses (2,3 & 4 Saxon Street)	Approved 14.12.1981

4.0 PUBLICITY

4.1 Advertisement: Yes
Adjoining Owners: Yes
Site Notice Displayed: Yes

5.0 POLICY

5.1 See Appendix 1 for full details of Central Government Guidance, Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan 2018	1 35 55 56 58 61

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

	National Planning Policy Framework 2019 National Planning Practice Guidance 2014 Circular 11/95 – The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions (Annex A) Cambridge City Council (May 2007) – Sustainable Design and Construction Biodiversity Checklist for Land Use Planners in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (March 2001). Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan (2011)

	New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area Appraisal (2012)

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Control)

6.1 No comment on the behalf of the Highway Authority.

Conservation team

6.2 This house is one of a small terrace of early 19th century houses within the New Town and Glisson Road conservation area.
Numbers 2, 3 and 4 all had their roofs changed in the early 80s with the raising of the ridge and rear elevations of the houses. Numbers 2 and 3 have a matching style of part inset dormer in the roof with a small extension to the rear. Number 4 has a higher ridge height and has a sloping form similar to that proposed in this application.
This proposal is to alter the roof line to remove the existing inset dormer and take the roof slope down at a gradual pitch to meet a new small two storey extension. There are no objections to the small two storey and single storey extensions.
Whilst it is acknowledged that the existing rear roof does not enhance the character of the conservation area it does currently match that of No 2. This proposal is not an improvement to the existing situation in conservation terms.

Revised drawings

This amendment has reduced the scale and altered the form of the rear extension which is an improvement on the previous proposal, however it retains the changes to the roof slope to remove the existing inset dormer and take the roof slope down to meet the eaves of the original roof and match the roof slope of No 4.
Whilst it is acknowledged that the existing rear elevation does not enhance the character of the conservation area it does currently match that of No 2. This proposal would increase the bulk of the rear roof and would fail to preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area.

6.3 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 Councillor Robertson has commented on this application.

A rear extension to Nos. 2, 3 and 4 Saxon Street has been added in a sympathetic way.

The rear extension would adversely impact on the setting, character and appearance of the conservation area in contravention of Policies 58 and 61. As there is already a back extension to the original building, any new back addition should not add to this so that the combination of existing and new extension exceeds 3m.

The applicant has failed to provide plans which show the proposed work in the context of the full row of houses. Nor has any assessment on the loss of light to adjoining houses been provided.

7.2 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations:

Object

- 26 Brookside
- 33 Brookside
- Coronation Place
- 45 Lensfield Road
- 10 Panton Street
- 12 Panton Street
- Pemberton Terrace
- Pemberton Terrace
- St Eliglius Street
- 1 Saxon Street
- 2 Saxon Street
- 7A Saxon Street
- Bell Hill, Histon (owners of no.4 Saxon Street)

- Support

- Saxon Street
- 24 Russell Court
- 85 Tavistock Road

7.3 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Overshadows, overlooks and visually dominates. The extension takes up a considerable part of the garden and it does not enhance or contribute to the local conservation area.

The proposal seems to be disproportionately large for such a small property and breaks the property line in the middle of this row creating an inappropriate change for a Conservation Area.

Permission to extend the terraced houses of 2/3/4 Saxon Street was granted in the mid to late C20 following the guidelines of the Local Planning Authority. The properties were extended by 2.5 metres, allowing a single storey building, not overshadowing neighbouring properties and complying with local planning rules. What consideration is there of the earlier extension as this and the new proposed extension, a combined length of 6.150 metres at ground floor level, cover a greater area than the original footprint of the house

These terraced properties have narrow gardens with limited access. The height of the proposed extension would dominate and overbear the properties on either side. Panton Hall abuts the southern wall of No 2 Saxon Street, limiting light into these small gardens. The height of the proposed extension would create further shadow, restricting sunlight not only in the garden but to the only window and main living area of the adjoining terraced houses. Light would also be restricted on the first floor.

Letters of support state the proposal would help maximise the ground floor living area and make it easier and more accessible to move around. This seems to be a well conceived sympathetic extension in keeping with the area that will add space with minimal to no impact on neighbouring properties including no disruption of natural light

7.3 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

Context of site, design and external spaces Impact on the Conservation Area

8.1 There are no public views of the rear of this terrace from within the wider conservation area and from Panton Street with the only view available from the parking area to the east of the application site. There are views from the rear of the properties in Brookside to the west and Panton Street to the east

8.2 I agree with the view of the Conservation Officer that the existing rear roof does not enhance the character of the conservation area with its part inset dormer in the roof. I am of the opinion however that given a similar Mansard style roof has been constructed on the adjoining property at 4 Saxon Street and given the limited wider views of the rear of this terrace from within the conservation area, that in this instance the proposal to match the design of no. 4 would not have a detrimental impact on this terrace and that the proposal would therefore preserve the appearance of the conservation area.

8.3 The proposed extension along with the previous extension to the property would not in my opinion detrimentally impact on the amount of useable garden space or the pattern of surrounding development and would not infill or urbanise the rear of this terrace. The depth of the remaining rear garden would be 8 metres and the proposal plus previous additions would not extend over more than half the existing garden area.

8.4 The single storey rear extension projecting a further 3 metres from the rear building line of this terrace would not in my opinion be detrimental to the appearance of the dwelling, the terrace or the wider conservation area. It is a subservient extension with a pitched roof and is an appropriately sized and designed extension to this dwelling.

8.5 In my opinion the proposal is compliant in design terms with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 55, 56, 58 and 61.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

2 Saxon Street

8.6 This property is situated to the east of the application site and has a large rear facing window and a glazed door at ground floor level. I am of the opinion that owing to the limited depth of the proposed ground floor extension with a low eaves level that the proposal would not result in a detrimental loss of light and would not result in undue enclosure of this property.

8.7 The adjoining properties in this terrace have been extended at the same time to the same depth to the rear. I am of the opinion that given that the rear walls of the properties are currently in line, that the permitted development fall back position of a single storey rear extension could be argued in this case. As such, BRE guidelines consider an extension of this depth would not be detrimental to the amenities of adjoining properties by way of loss of light. This is confirmed as the proposed extension does not fail the 45 degree test when measured on the vertical plane in relation to this window.

8.8 The Shadow Study submitted made assessments at 9.00am, 12.00pm and 15.00pm respectively on the Winter Solstice, Spring Equinox and Summer Solstice. The results of this study indicate that there would be some overshadowing in the summer evenings but this would not have a detrimental impact to this property.

8.9 With respect to the extension to the roof, given there are three windows serving the bedroom in the loft and the windows are set in from the edge of the roof, I am of the opinion that a detrimental loss of light would not occur.

4 Saxon Street

8.10 This property adjoins to the west and has a very short rear garden which is bound by a high garden wall alongside the application site. The rear courtyard of this dwelling already has an enclosed feel and I am of the opinion that the proposed extension would not cause any significant additional harm

through enclosure and would not result in a detrimental loss of light to this property.

8.11 This property is situated to the west of the application site and it is only would overshadow this property early in the summer mornings but this would not have a detrimental impact to this property.

8.12 In my opinion the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and in this respect, I consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 56 and 58.

Third Party Representations

9.0 The cobbled road is outside the application site and is therefore outside the scope of this application. For a minor development of this scale, I am of the opinion that the council wouldn't normally seek to control construction traffic management by condition.

10.0 CONCLUSION

10.1 In my opinion, the proposed development would not have an adverse impact upon the conservation area or neighbouring properties.

11.0 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 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as listed on this decision notice.

Reason: In the interests of good planning, for the avoidance of doubt and to facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

3. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the extension(s) hereby permitted shall be constructed in external materials to match the existing building in type, colour and texture.

Reason: To ensure that the extension(s) is(are) in keeping with the existing building. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 58 and 61)

PLANNING COMMITTEE **4th September 2019**

Application Number	19/0046/FUL	**Agenda Item**	
Date Received	17th January 2019	**Officer**	Mary Collins
Target Date	14th March 2019		
Ward	West Chesterton		
Site	The Tivoli 16 Chesterton Road Cambridge CB4 3AX		
Proposal	Alterations and repairs to building including reinstatement of frontages and side walls, bricking up of some openings, replacement windows and fire escape. Creation of second floor element and enclosed roof terraces to first and second floor. Part change of use of the existing building to recreational uses.		
Applicant	City Pub Group		

SUMMARY	The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons: It accords with policy 61 as it preserves the character and appearance of the Castle and Victoria Conservation area. It accords with policy 72, as it includes compatible uses at all floors within a District Centre. It accords with policy 73, as it provides new sports and leisure facilities which are open to the wider community and enhance both accessibility and the range of facilities available. It accords with policy 76 as the Safeguarded Public House would be protected The proposal would not give rise to a detrimental effect, individually or

	cumulatively, on the character or amenity of the area through smell, litter, noise or traffic problems. The proposal would not be detrimental to the amenities of neighbouring properties.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVE

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

1.1 The Tivoli, 16 Chesterton Road, is a former cinema that has been used most recently as a public house before the site suffered a fire in 2015. It has since been boarded up but not rebuilt. The Tivoli is identified as a protected public house and is on the list of protected public houses sites in Appendix C of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

1.2 The building is currently empty and the flat roof of the rear element of the building has been completely removed following the fire. The art-deco frontage of the building remains largely in place. The site is a rectangular plot which extends from the south side of Chesterton Road down to the bank of the River Cam. The south-side of this section of Chesterton Road is formed of predominantly two-storey buildings with a range of commercial uses. To the north of the site are a number of commercial units including Staples and Evans Cycles. The surrounding area is formed of a mixture of commercial buildings which frequently include residential accommodation above.

1.3 The site falls within the Castle and Victoria Road Conservation Area, Flood Zones 2 and 3, an Air Quality Management Area and Controlled Parking Zone. The site also lies within the Mitcham's Corner Development Framework SPD (2017) area and Mitcham's Corner District Centre. The River Cam to the south is designated as a County Wildlife Site. Jesus Green to the south of the site is identified as Protected Open Space.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

2.1 Planning permission is sought for alterations and repairs to the building including reinstatement of frontages and side walls,

bricking up of some openings, replacement windows and fire escape.

A second floor element is proposed with an open roof terrace. The proposal includes a part change of use of the existing building to recreational uses.

The building would have an extended lift shaft and stairwell with some rooftop plant.

The building is proposed to be used as follows:

- Basement at riverside level level – Shuffleboards and associated bar area
- Ground floor – bar servery and food concession
- First floor – 2 no. 9 hole (crazy) golf courses with the floor space extending into the existing balcony area facing the river with a cinema bar at the Chesterton Road end.
- Second floor external terrace to the river end with a screening room and events space within the building to the Chesterton Road end.
- VIP open roof terrace and Yoga Studio to Chesterton Road end.

2.2 The application is accompanied by the following information:

1. Drawings
2. Design and Access Statement
3. Noise Impact Assessment
4. Preliminary Ecological Appraisal & Bat Report.
5. Heritage Statement
6. Odour Control Assessment

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
05/1126/S73	Section 73A application to vary condition 05 of planning permission C/0138/95 in order to extend opening hours to 0800 to 0030 hours Mondays to Saturdays and Sundays.	Granted 12.1.2006

10/1025/FUL	Erection of retractable canopy forming smoking shelter to front elevation.	Refused 27.01.2011
12/1250/FUL	Opening up of existing basement and garden to form additional dining area, including reinstatement of original fire escape stair.	Granted 7.12.2012
17/1771/FUL	Demolition of existing structure, retention of original facade and returns. Construction of seven 1-bed apartments and nine 2-bed apartments and creation of self contained unit on ground floor for A1, A2, A3 or A4 use (in the alternative).	Refused 13.03.2018

4.0 PUBLICITY

4.1

Advertisement:	Yes
Adjoining Owners:	Yes
Site Notice Displayed:	Yes

5.0 POLICY

5.1 See Appendix 1 for full details of Central Government Guidance, Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan 2018	1, 6, 22, 28, 31, 32 35, 36 55 56 58 61 69, 70, 72, 73, 76, 79 82

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

	National Planning Policy Framework 2019 National Planning Practice Guidance 2014 Circular 11/95 – The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions (Annex A) Cambridge City Council (May 2007) – Sustainable Design and Construction Biodiversity Checklist for Land Use Planners in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (March 2001). Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan (2011)

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Control)

6.1 Following the submission of the revised Construction and Traffic Management Plan on 28th January 2019, the amended information is sufficient to overcome the Highway Authority's original request that the application be refused. Therefore, as long as the amended Construction and Traffic Management Plan is one of the documents approved by the Planning Authority if it is minded to grant planning permission the request that the application be refused is withdrawn.

Conservation team

6.2 The development proposed is acceptable subject to the imposition of the conditions requiring the details outlined below.

- Joinery
- Windows
- All glass to be installed in doors / windows / screens, etc

The proposals for this building are supported in Conservation terms. The frontage of the building is to be refurbished which will enhance the character of the building and therefore that of the

streetscape in the conservation area. The new arched window is acceptable in that it is a reinstatement of what was originally built. Details of it and the other new windows on the north elevation should be submitted for written approval to ensure that they are appropriately detailed and glazed for this prominent building.

The windows and doors to the rear are also supported as being appropriate to the design of the building and views of it from Jesus Green.

The additions at roof level are not considered to have any undue impact on either the building or the Protected Open Space opposite, Jesus Green.

One concern is that there does not appear to be a designated external area for smokers. Will this be provided? If customers have to stand at the front of the building, suitable receptacles will be needed to ensure that cigarette ends and packaging are not randomly dropped in the street which would have an effect on the character of the local area.

Disability Consultative Panel

6.3 Level access. As the building has been gutted by fire, there is a ready opportunity to make the building more readily accessible by relocating the lift. There is no reflection of this is the submitted plans, and there would be no wheelchair access to areas of all of the upper floors, including none at all to the roof terrace, as the design stands. This is not acceptable.

Access Officer

6.4 Platform lifts are only a remedial measure. They often cannot be independently used. The proposed lift because of the design would mean basically no wheelchair or scooter user could use it as it would be impossible to manoeuvre out once you had reached the lower ground floor.

- No step free access to cinema bar
- Golf course must be wheelchair accessible
- On 2nd floor route between lift and screening room should be sheltered
- Lift must serve roof terrace and all of roof terrace must be accessible.

Drainage

6.5 The proposals are for a refurbishment of an existing building and the footprint if the building is not changing. A small green roof is proposed to provide a small degree of betterment. Part of the building is also affected by flooding from the River Cam. Flood resilient construction is required for this part of the building. The proposals are acceptable subject to condition requiring the submission and approval of a scheme for flood resilient /resistant construction and details of the green roof.

Environmental Health

6.6 No objection following submission of a revised noise impact assessment report RSK (297344-04(01)) dated June 2019, subject to the following conditions:

- Construction hours
- Collection during construction
- Hours of use
- The use hereby approved shall not operate outside the hours of 07:00 – 00:00 Monday to Saturday, 07:00 – 23:00 on Sundays.
- External terrace hours of use
- External music
- Doors and windows closed
- Noise insulation condition
- Noise Insulation Scheme Post Construction Completion, Commissioning and Testing Report
- Collections & deliveries
- Plant noise condition
- Odour filtration / extraction

Nature Conservation Projects Officer

6.7 Basically content that the ability to survey the structure is compromised by the fire damaged condition. Supports the ecology report recommendations and request that there is no external lighting of the river Cam County Wildlife Site and that the building incorporates an integral bat roosting tube close to the river frontage aspect.

6.8 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 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations:

Object:

- 1 Riverside Court
- Ashton Legal, On Behalf Of 1-8 Riverside Court And 24 And 24 A-H Chesterton Road

Support:

- 82 Chesterton Road
- 15 Corona Road
- 32 Greens Road
- 8 Pretoria Road
- Friends of Mitcham's Corner

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Object

- There is a history of attempts to obtain permission for windows to be opened overlooking the river and fortunately the Council has always resisted on the grounds that the noise disturbances and opportunities to allow overlooking would cause significant harm to the residential amenity of No 1 Riverside Court
- Opportunities for overlooking and noise nuisance.
- Noise nuisance from open terrace on the second floor.

Support

- There is considerable relief that is will retain its former use as a pub and eating place and that façade can be restored.
- The features would contribute to the local business and local community views available across the river.

- This looks to be a development that is keeping with the environment and enhances the character of Mitcham's Corner.
- The alterations and repairs to the Tivoli seem positive.
- Please can you include the engagement of local organisations who represent people with disabilities, such as wheelchair users, those with hearing and sight impairment, and/or sensory sensitivities re: ease of access; type of lighting; how sound reverberates etc. This would help the Tivoli to be a place that is inclusive and welcoming to all within the community.

Camcycle

The proposed employee cycle parking area is far too small to contain two Sheffield stands as drawn. The area currently labelled as 'cycle parking for staff' only has room for a single Sheffield stand. The applicant should either try to enlarge this space or look elsewhere in the building for employee cycle parking space.

Regarding the visitor cycle parking at the front of the building, the installation of 'two tier' cycle stands is unacceptable under the Local Plan Policy 82 Appendix L and impractical as a matter of course for pub cycle parking. Consider 'high-low' stands to be a pragmatic alternative here provided that they meet the specifications laid out in paragraph L.20 of the Local Plan Appendix L.

Strongly recommend that the applicant work together with the city to install additional cycle parking stands along the street, such as by replacing some existing pay-and-display spaces with cycle stands. Note that the Greater Cambridge Partnership is already in the process of installing some additional street cycle parking around the city centre and could potentially be a partner in a subsequent phase of cycle parking installation

Accordingly, request that the City Council seek the agreement of the applicant for a commuted sum to fund the shortage in cycle parking provision that would ordinarily be required under the Local Plan

7.3 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

Principle of development

8.1 Policy 76 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 relates to the 'Protection of public houses' and includes a list of protected public houses sites in Appendix C. The property is the Tivoli and is included on the list of protected sites.

8.2 Policy 76 states that the loss of any part of a public house, or its curtilage will be permitted if it can be demonstrated that:

- the viability of the public house use will not be adversely affected, sufficient cellarage, beer garden, parking and dining/kitchen areas will remain to retain a viable public house operation; and
- the loss including associated development will not detract from the prevailing character and appearance of the area, including where the building is of merit or has any distinctive architectural features.

8.3 In my opinion the existing premises have A4 use. Notwithstanding the introduction of recreational uses such as a screening room, golf course and bowling alley activities, the main use will be as a drinking establishment and would be licensed as such. The primary source of income is from sale of alcoholic and non-alcoholic drink.

8.4 Given that the building is over four floors with the main use as a drinking establishment, I am of the opinion the proposal does not result in the loss of a public house. Notwithstanding this, I consider that there would be sufficient dining and kitchen areas and potentially basement areas for cellarage to retain a viable public house operation in the future.

8.5 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 76.

8.6 Policy 72 states that within the boundary of district centres, proposals for other centre uses other than A1 use will be permitted provided:

a. they complement the retail function and maintain or add to the vitality, viability and diversity of the centre;

b. provision is made for an active frontage, such as a window display, which is in keeping with the character of the shopping area; and
c. they would not give rise to a detrimental effect, individually or cumulatively, on the character or amenity of the area through smell, litter, noise or traffic problems.

8.7 The application site is within the Mitcham's Corner District Shopping Centre. Drinking establishments (A4 uses) and Assembly and leisure (D2 uses) are other uses which are considered suitable on all floors in district centres and in accordance with this policy. The property has an active frontage with Chesterton Road and is in keeping with character of the shopping area.

8.8 Policy 73 states that new or enhanced community or leisure facilities will be permitted if:

a. the range, quality and accessibility of facilities are improved;
b. there is a local need for the facilities; and
c. the facility is in close proximity to the people it serves.

8.9 The proposal would be in close proximity to local residents and visitors to Cambridge and would provide a range of leisure activities such as shutffleboard, golf and bowling as well as a screening area. These facilities would be open to the wider community and enhance both accessibility and the range of facilities available.

8.10 I am of the opinion that in respect to policies 72 and 73 the proposal would add to the vitality and viability of the district centre, including its evening economy; the facilities would be open to the wider community and would enhance both accessibility and the range of facilities available. The proposal is in a sustainable location with good public transport accessibility

8.11 With respect to whether the proposal would give rise to a detrimental effect, individually or cumulatively, on the character or amenity of the area through smell, litter, noise or traffic problems, I am of the opinion that this would not be detrimental and can be controlled by conditions. I will assess this later in this report under neighbour amenity from paragraphs 8.16 onwards.

8.12 Policy 79 states that proposals for new visitor attractions within the city centre will be supported where they:

a. complement the existing cultural heritage of the city;
b. are limited in scale; and
c. assist the diversification of the attractions on offer, especially to better support the needs of families.

8.13 The application site is with the Mitcham's Corner District Centre with the City Centre to the south and on the opposite side of the river. As such I do not consider this policy relevant however the application site would have easy links to the city centre.

Context of site, design and external spaces Impact on the Conservation Area

8.14 The building is a prominent building within the conservation area and the local centre and has been empty and is in a state of disrepair. The external changes are minimal with the introduction of the rooftop terrace. The rooftop terrace is set back from the front elevation of the building and there would be minimal views of it from street level. The proposed external changes to the building would enhance the appearance of the conservation area by bringing this building back into use. As set out in paragraph 6.2 of this report, the Conservation Team supports the proposal.

8.15 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 55, 56, 58 and 61.

Residential Amenity

<u>Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers</u>

8.16 The application site adjoins a residential property at 1 Riverside Court which is situated to the east and the garden of which wraps directly between part of the rear elevation of The Tivoli and the river. This property also has windows which face towards the side elevation of The Tivoli.

8.17 This garden at 1 Riverside Court is already highly visible from the public realm, from the river and Jesus Green opposite and as a result of its riverside location does not afford any private outdoor space for this resident. To the east of the application

site is 18 Chesterton Road which is currently the subject of an application for planning permission for the erection of a mixed use scheme comprising 11 flats and 2 retail units following demolition of existing buildings at 18, 18a, 18b and 18c-d Chesterton Road. This scheme proposes a balcony to the western side facing The Tivoli.

8.18 The roof top VIP terraced area would be enclosed with high 1.7 metre high glazed screening to the perimeter which would restrict the ability to look over towards adjoining residential properties with views directed rearwards towards the river and the other proposed terrace to the rear section of the building. The existing side walls would be built up to a height of 2 metres above roof level to screen the lower terrace from view from both the east and the west. The glazed screen to the river end would be set back behind the side walls by 1.25 metres which would reduce the ability to look sideways and downwards into the adjoining garden.

8.19 I am of the opinion that the glazed screens to the eastern side of the rooftop terrace would prevent loss of privacy to the existing residential properties and the proposed flats to the east through overlooking. The screens however must be positioned so that there are minimal gaps between panels to avoid views though these gaps and must be constructed in an obscure material.

8.20 To the east facing side elevation of The Tivoli, existing openings are to be blocked with only fire doors and fire escape stairs serving the development and therefore there would be in my opinion no detrimental loss of privacy through overlooking.

8.21 To the rear elevation of The Tivoli, the existing windows are to be fitted with new glazing. These openings currently overlook a small section of the garden belonging to 1 Riverside Court which wraps directly between part of the rear elevation of The Tivoli and the river.

8.22 At the lowest (basement) level, (which is effectively riverside level to the rear), the window would serve the room accommodating the shuffleboard tables with its associated bar area.

8.23 To the ground floor (effectively the first floor to the rear and river end) the window would serve the seating area with 143 covers at first floor level. The windows would be fixed and would be set back behind the behind a reveal of approximately 0.60 metres.

8.24 To the first floor (effectively the second floor to the rear and river end) the windows would serve the indoor 9 hole golf course and the glazed balcony area would be incorporated into this indoor space and accommodate this use. This window would be fixed and non openable. The east facing side of the first floor glazed balcony is proposed to be fitted with obscure glazing and be to a height of at least 1.7 metres high and would restrict sideways views eastwards towards 1 Riverside Court.

8.25 There would be no views from the second floor terrace to either the east or west as this is contained within a high perimeter wall with views directed rearwards towards the river. The glazed screen to the rear would be set back from the rear by approximately 1.2 metres behind the reveal created by the side wall. This would reduce the ability to look sideways from the point.

8.26 There is unlikely to be overlooking from the basement level due to the position of the window. I appreciate that the use of the lower section of the building would have a leisure use introduced but I am of the opinion that this does not differ substantially from the recreational use as a public house. However a condition could be attached to ensure that the part of the window that directly overlooks the adjoining garden is obscurely glazed.

Noise

8.27 The adjacent neighbour at 1 Riverside Court has expressed concern regarding loss of amenity through noise from the use of the proposed open terraces. Following concerns raised by Environmental Health Officers, the applicants have submitted a revised “noise impact assessment report” (297344-04(01)) dated June 2019.

8.28 Environmental Health have assessed the revised noise impact assessment and are satisfied that the hours of operation are reasonable including the assurance that external areas and

terraces will close at 22:00hrs and be empty of customers and staff and this will be required by condition.

8.29 The applicant has stated that no external amplified music will be provided to/on the terraced areas and this would reduce noise impact from the use of these outdoor areas. With respect to noise breakout from other doors and windows, during internal amplified events, external doors will remain closed and access to the second floor terrace would be from the first floor staircase and therefore Environmental Health Officers are satisfied that sound breakout from the opening of doors for ingress/egress from the second floor internal space into the second floor terrace would be minimal.

8.30 A proposed acoustic lobby to be installed on the eastern façade to serve the second floor internal space would minimise noise breakout from the second floor access, if used as a secondary access point.

8.31 Further mitigation measures are proposed to minimise noise spillage from the use of the outdoor terraces. This includes the provision of a 2.5m high brick wall around the second floor terrace perimeter (North, East & West elevations) with a 1.8m glazed barrier overlooking the river (South elevation). The revised impact assessment predicts minimal noise impact with the implemented mitigation measures. Environmental Health Officers consider this prediction is reasonable but request a condition is attached regarding noise insulation and the final acoustic design for all aspects of the development prior to commencement of works to ensure that this is acceptable.

8.32 With respect to plant noise, the noise predictions are acceptable however to demonstrate that the proposed rating level is not exceeded, Environmental Health recommend a plant condition to provide full details of the plant prior to installation with. with calculations to demonstrate that the proposed rating level is not exceeded.

8.33 Environmental Health Officers are satisfied that subject to the recommended conditions which are detailed at paragraph 6.6 of this report and future submission of details and compliance with these conditions that the use of the building and the outdoor terraces and associated plant would not have a detrimental impact on surrounding residential properties through noise.

8.34 In my opinion the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and I consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 58 and 35.

Inclusive access

8.35 The applicant has been advised of the comments from the Access Officer regarding inclusive access to all areas of the building. The applicant has commented that the renovations will result in considerable improvements to accessibility within the building. The building has been fire damaged however the lower floors are structurally sound so are able to be re-used with refurbishment and repair and without unnecessary substantial rebuilding work.
The introduction of the new lift shaft provides wheelchair access to the main roof terrace and all areas, apart from the upper roof terrace and cinema bar. Care has been taken to balance accessibility with impact on heritage assets. The rooftop is the most visible element of the building and works at this level have therefore been kept to a minimum. Access to the upper terrace would require additional height to incorporate the lift shaft and housing of effectively another storey which would be particularly prominent in views of the building.

8.36 I am of the opinion that the proposal would provide increased accessibility to this existing building and is in accordance with policy 56. The detailed matters of accessibility would be dealt with under a Building Regulations application.

Highway Safety

8.37 Following the submission of an amended Construction and Traffic Management Plan, the Highways Authority is satisfied that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on highway safety.

8.38 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 80 and 81.

Car and Cycle Parking

8.39 I will recommend that a condition is attached to secure 'high-low' stands to the front of the building and for staff cycle parking areas to be provided to meet the specifications laid out in paragraph L.20 of the Local Plan Appendix L. The Tivoli currently has no cycle parking so there would be a benefit.

8.40 With regard to the request by CamCycle for the applicant to pay a commuted sum to fund the shortage in cycle parking provision, I do not consider this request to be proportionate in this case however the applicant's attention will be drawn to the need to make some contribution to cycle parking provision.

8.41 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 82.

Flood risk

8.42 A small green roof is proposed to provide a small degree of betterment. Part of the building is also affected by flooding from the River Cam. I will recommend that a condition is attached requiring the submission and approval of a scheme for flood resilient /resistant construction and details of the green roof as requested by the Sustainable Drainage Engineer.

8.43 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 32.

Ecology

8.44 The application site is next to the river Cam County Wildlife Site. The application has been accompanied by a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal & Bat Report.

8.45 I will recommend that conditions recommended by the Nature Conservation Projects Officer are attached to ensure that the building incorporates an integral bat roosting tube close to the river frontage aspect, that there is no external lighting of the river Cam County Wildlife Site and the recommendation of the ecology report are adhered to.

8.46 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 69 and 70.

9.0 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 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as listed on this decision notice.

   Reason: In the interests of good planning, for the avoidance of doubt and to facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

3. No construction work or demolition work shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours and 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 2018 policy 35)

4. There shall be no collections from or deliveries to the site during the demolition and construction stages outside the hours of 0800 hours and 1800 hours on 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 2018 policy 35)

5. The use hereby approved shall not operate outside the hours of 07:00 - 00:00 Monday to Saturday, 07:00 - 23:00 on Sundays.

   Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35)

6. The external terraces including rooftop terraces shall only be used by patrons and staff between the hours of 07:00 - 22:00hrs Monday to Sunday and shall be clear of patrons and staff outside these hours. Any waste / glass removal required and the cleaning of these areas including the clearance and the movement of any tables and seating / chairs shall only be undertaken during these times only.

   Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35)

7. Acoustic / unamplified music and the playing of amplified music / voice within the external terraces including the roof top yoga studio is prohibited subject to the submission of an acceptable noise impact assessment and insulation scheme for approval by the local planning authority.

   The scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall be retained thereafter.

   Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35)

8. Apart from the external doors to the main ground floor entrance lobby onto Chesterton Road all external doors and windows serving the premises as approved shall be kept closed at all times during the playing of internal unamplified and amplified music / voice.

   Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35)

9. Prior to the commencement of works associated with the development hereby approved, a noise insulation / mitigation scheme or details of other relevant noise control measures as appropriate, in order to minimise the level of noise emanating from the premises, including noise from activities and uses within the internal and external spaces, shall be submitted in writing for approval by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme / details shall have regard (but not be limited to) the following:

- Level and type of music / voice - acoustic / unamplified and amplified
- Sound system setup with in-house fixed sound system incorporating noise limiting control / device set to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority;
- Music noise cut-off devices to any external doors;
- Noise egress, airborne, structural and flanking sound via building structural elements;
- Building fabric, glazing, openings and ventilation systems acoustic performance including detailed composite acoustic performance calculations of external facades and noise prediction to nearby noise sensitive receptors with special consideration of low frequency noise characteristics / components of music;
- External terrace screening / balustrade / barrier acoustic performance and use of acoustically absorbent finishes to external hard reflective surfaces
- Adequate alternative ventilation should be provided to ensure external doors and windows remain closed;
- Premises entrances / exits (including details of acoustic lobbies) and any associated external spaces and patron noise;
- Noise management plan for external patron noise to include a complaints management and handling procedure;
- All other noise insulation / mitigation proposals not detailed above (such as perimeter walls / barriers / screens)

The noise insulation / mitigation scheme as approved shall be fully constructed and implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall be fully retained thereafter.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35)

10. Before the use hereby permitted is commenced a post construction completion, commissioning and testing report for the noise insulation scheme, to include the acoustic performance testing /monitoring, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

The post construction completion, commissioning and testing report shall demonstrate compliance with the Noise Insulation Scheme (as approved / required by condition 9 respectively) and shall include; airborne and structural acoustic / sound insulation and attenuation performance certification / reports for the various elements of the scheme, the consideration and inspection of the standards of workmanship (including quality control) and detailing of the sound insulation scheme and any other noise control measures as approved. Details of the full noise insulation scheme sound performance testing and monitoring including, noise limiting control / limiter device level setting and certification to the satisfaction of the LPA will be required.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35)

11. All service collections / dispatches from and deliveries to the approved development including refuse / recycling collections during the operational phase shall only be permitted between the hours of 07:00 to 22:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00 to 13:00 on Saturdays. Service collections / dispatches and deliveries are not permitted at any time on Sundays or Public Holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35)

12. Prior to the installation of plant, a scheme for the insulation of the plant in order to minimise the level of noise emanating from the said plant shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall be retained thereafter.

The combined rating level of sound emitted from all fixed plant and/or machinery associated with the development and the use hereby approved shall not exceed the rating level limits specified within the submitted RSK noise impact assessment report dated 20th June 2019 (297344-04(01)).

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35)

13. Prior to the installation of plant, details of equipment for the purpose of extraction abatement and filtration of odours shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved extraction/abatement/filtration scheme shall be installed before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall thereafter be retained as such. The scheme shall have regard to design recommendations within EMAQ's "Control of Odour and Noise from Commercial Kitchen Exhaust Systems (update to the 2004 report prepared by NETCEN for DEFRA)" dated September 2018.

    Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35)

14. No development shall commence until a scheme for flood resilient /resistant construction has been submitted to and approved in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Development shall take place in accordance with the approved details.

    Reason: To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 32)

15. No development shall commence until details of the green roof construction has been submitted to and approved in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Development shall take place in accordance with the approved details.

    Reason: To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 31 and 32)

16. All new joinery [window frames, etc.] shall be recessed at least 50 / 75mm back from the face of the wall / façade. The means of finishing of the 'reveal' is to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to installation of new joinery. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

    Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policy 61)

17. No new windows shall be constructed in the existing building, nor existing windows altered until drawings at a scale of 1:10 of details of new or altered sills, lintels, jambs, transoms, and mullions have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

    Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policy 61)

18. Prior to the commencement of installation of glass/glazing, full details of all glass to be installed in doors / windows / screens, etc., shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Mirrored, reflective, metallic coated or other non-transparent glass are unlikely to be approved. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

    Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policy 61)

19. Prior to first occupation of the development, hereby permitted, or commencement of the use, full details of facilities for the covered, secure parking of bicycles for use in connection with the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The facilities shall be provided in accordance with the approved details before the development is occupied or the use commences and shall be retained in accordance with the approved details thereafter.

    Reason: To ensure appropriate provision for the secure storage of bicycles. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 82)

20. Prior to first occupation or the bringing into use of the development, the 1.7 metre high terrace screens, the flank windows to the second floor balcony and all windows shown to be obscurely glazed shall be fitted with obscure glazing to a minimum level of obscurity to conform to Pilkington Glass level 3 or equivalent and shall thereafter be retained in accordance with the approved details.

    Prior to first occupation or the bringing into use of the development, all windows shown to be blocked shall be bricked up. No further openings shall be made.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55 and 57).

21. No development shall commence until a plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Authority detailing the proposed integration of a bat roosting tube close to the river frontage aspect. The installation shall be carried out and subsequently maintained in accordance with the approved plans.

    Reason: To provide ecological enhancements for protected species on the site (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 70).

22. There shall be no external lighting of the river Cam County Wildlife Site.

    Reason: To protect sites of biodiversity and priority species and habitats (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 69 and 70)

23. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted Construction and Traffic Management Plan.

    Reason: In the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 81)

PLANNING COMMITTEE **4th September 2019**

Application Number	19/0400/FUL	**Agenda Item**	
Date Received	29th March 2019	**Officer**	Emily Burton
Target Date	24th May 2019		
Ward	Kings Hedges		
Site	348 Milton Road Cambridge CB4 1LW		
Proposal	Erection of a single storey dwelling to the rear of 348 Milton Road.		
Applicant	Mr D Crockwell 348, Milton Road Cambridge CB4 1LW		

SUMMARY	The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons: - The design and scale of the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on the character of the surrounding area; - The proposed development would not have any significant adverse impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring occupiers; - The proposed development would provide a high quality living environment for the future occupiers;
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

1.1 The application site is located at the rear of 348 Milton Road which is comprised of a two storey semi-detached dwelling and a long vacant garden to the rear. The site is in proximity to the

Kendal Way Allotments. The site is not located within a Controlled Parking Zone. There are no site constraints.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

2.1 The proposal seeks planning permission for the erection of a single storey, 3 bedroom dwelling. Vehicle and cycle access to the site would be via an existing private driveway to the rear of No.348 via Kendal Way, and a new 1m wide pedestrian access way is proposed from Milton Road along the eastern boundary of No.348.

2.2 Pre-application was submitted for a two storey, 3 bedroom dwelling with similar proposed access arrangements (18/5224/PREAPP). Pre-application advice did not support the two-storey proposal as the scale and mass was not in keeping with the surrounding locality.

2.3 2 car parking spaces and a bike area is provided to the rear of the site off the private drive. Bin access would be provided via the 1m wide pedestrian access way to Milton Road.

2.4 This scheme does not include any alterations to the existing dwelling or existing trees and seeks planning permission solely for the erection of a single storey dwelling to the rear of 348 Milton Road.

2.5 Amended plans have been provided (Drawing nos. L(PL)MR_03 A, L(PL)MR_01 A) for the inclusion of a rooflight to Bedroom 3.

2.6 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:

1. Design and Access Statement
2. Drawings

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
12/0531/FUL	Single storey front, part two storey rear extension	PERM 22.06.2012

18/1809/FUL	Erection of a single storey dwelling to the rear of 348 Milton Road.	Application returned

4.0 PUBLICITY

4.1

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

5.0 POLICY

5.1 See Appendix 1 for full details of Central Government Guidance, Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 **Cambridge Local Plan 2018**

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan 2018	1, 3 31, 32, 33, 35, 36 50, 51, 52, 55, 56, 57, 59 70, 71 80, 81, 82

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework February 2019 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014 Circular 11/95 (Annex A)
Supplementary Planning	Sustainable Design and Construction (May

Guidance	2007)

5.4 **City Wide Guidance**

Cambridge City Council (May 2007) – Sustainable Design and Construction:
Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Control)

6.1 No significant adverse effect upon the Public Highway should result from this proposal, should it gain benefit of Planning Permission.

Drainage Team

6.2 The development proposed is acceptable subject to the imposition of two conditions for a surface water drainage scheme and details for the long term maintenance arrangements for the surface water drainage system.

6.3 The Drainage Team advise that the proposal has not indicated a surface water drainage strategy however, as this is a minor development and there are no surface water flood risk issues, it would be acceptable to obtain this information by way of a condition.

Environmental Health

6.4 The development proposed is acceptable subject to the imposition of two conditions for construction/demolition hours and piling in the event the ground works require piling.

6.5 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 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made objections:

- 309 Milton Road
- 362 Milton Road
- 364 Milton Road
- 384 Milton Road

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Utility service arrangements
- Space is not suitable for a 3 bedroom dwelling and will not achieve visual amenity for the occupiers
- Maintenance costs and responsibility of private drive
- Private drive is not suitable for heavy vehicles and increased traffic
- Dwelling not in keeping with locality
- Precedent for overdevelopment
- Noise amenity impacts resulting from construction and increased vehicle traffic along private drive
- Loss of green space
- Proposed conflict of interest as owner of 348 trades as a scaffolding company
- Existing trees for retention are in poor condition and dangerous
- Disruption to adjacent gardening allotments during construction
- Pathway is too narrow for cycle and wheelchair access

7.3 The owner/occupier of the following address has made representations neither in support nor objection to the proposal:

- 100 Kendal Way

7.4 The representation can be summarised as follows:

- Seeking further information on the proposed utility servicing and ongoing responsibility of the private drive.

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. Residential amenity
4. Highway Safety
5. Car and cycle parking
6. Refuse arrangements
7. Surface water drainage
8. Third party representations

Principle of Development

8.2 Policy 3 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) states that the majority of new development should be focused in and around the existing urban area, making the most effective use of previously developed land, and enabling the maximum number of people to access services and facilities locally.

Policy 52 Protecting garden land and the subdivision of existing dwelling plots

8.3 As the proposal is for the subdivision of an existing residential plot, policy 52 of Cambridge Local Plan (2018) is relevant in assessing the acceptability of the proposal.

8.4 Policy 52 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) states that: 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 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.

8.5 I consider that the proposal complies with the above five criteria and the reasons for this are set out in the relevant sections of this report.

Context of site, design and external spaces

8.6 The site is located within an area that is characterised by two storey housing with long rear garden allotments. Milton Road is located to the front of the site and a private drive is located to the rear. The private drive is unsealed and is wide enough for one-way traffic only. Adjoining the private drive to the south is an area of private protected open space allotments. While there is a strong linear pattern of development along Milton Road, there is also a strong character of single storey outbuildings and double garage backland development directly to the north east of the site which.

8.7 The proposed dwelling would be of a scale and mass that would be in keeping with the character of the area. The dwelling would not be dissimilar to the height and appearance of existing garages located along the private drive. I am of the opinion that the proposal would be in keeping with this pattern of development. A materials condition is recommended to ensure the proposal would be of a high quality finish. It is my opinion the form, height and layout of the proposed development is appropriate to the surrounding pattern of development and the character of the area and would not constitute as overdevelopment.

8.8 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 52, 55, 56, 57, 59.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

8.9 The eastern facing elevation would be 1m away from the rear garden boundary of No.350, and the majority of the western

facing elevation would be located against the garage elevation of No.346. The proposed dwelling would not lead to a loss of light at either neighbouring property. At 3.4m in height, with a pitched roof that slopes down to 2.6m in height as it falls towards the neighbouring boundaries, I do not consider this mass would lead to harmful loss of light. Any loss of light would be minor and limited to the latter parts of neighbouring gardens in the late afternoon or early morning respectively.

8.10 The proposed bungalow would be set approximately 900mm away from the eastern adjoining boundary, and against the western adjoining boundary. I am of the opinion that given the single-storey scale proposed with a low eaves height, the proposed dwelling would not appear visually overbearing from neighbouring gardens. It would be sited a considerable distance from the main windows of neighbours.

8.11 In my opinion the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and I consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 55 (58) and 35.

Amenity of future occupiers

8.12 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	1	86	86	0

8.13 Third party representations raised concern over the poor outlook from the internal bedrooms due to the small setbacks from adjoining neighbour boundaries. Bedroom 3 is setback only 1m from the western boundary 2.1m high fence however amended plans have been submitted proposing installation of a rooflight. As such Bedroom 3 will have access to adequate light. Bedrooms 2 and 3 have windows facing the south of the property and considered to provide appropriate light amenity for future occupiers.

Size of external amenity space:

8.14 Policy 50 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) states that all new residential units will be expected to have direct access to an area of private amenity space. The proposed dwelling would have a north facing garden of an appropriate size for a 3 bed dwelling, being 8.5m in width and 5.5m in length. A condition is recommended to remove permitted development rights to not only protect neighbouring properties, but also to protect the character of the area and the external amenity space provided for the dwelling.

Accessible homes

8.15 The development has been assessed for compliance with Policy 51 and complies with the requirements of Part M4 (2) of the Building Regulations. I have recommended a condition to secure this requirement.

Wider area

8.16 The Environmental Health Team has recommended various construction related conditions in order to protect the residential amenity of occupiers of properties in the wider area during construction. I accept this advice and have recommended the conditions accordingly. Additionally a condition to control hours for collections or deliveries to the site is also considered appropriate to protect the amenity of the adjoining properties.

8.17 In my opinion the proposal provides an adequate level of residential amenity for future occupiers and I consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 50, 51 and 56.

Highway Safety

8.18 Third party representations have raised concern over the impact of the development on the existing private drive and ongoing maintenance responsibility. However, as the maintenance of the private drive is not a planning concern, and the Highways Authority have raised no objection to the proposal, it is considered that the proposal will not result in adverse access impacts.

8.19 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 80 and 81.

Car and Cycle Parking

Car parking

8.20 Car parking allocations established under policy 82 of the Local Plan (2018) require the provision of no less than 0.5 spaces per dwelling, up to 2 spaces per dwelling. The application satisfies this requirement with two car parking spaces accessible via the private drive provided at the rear of the property.

Cycle parking

8.21 Cycles can gain access to the site via the private drive, and sufficient space is provided at the rear of the proposed dwelling for secure bike storage. As such, a condition is recommended requesting further details of this store.

8.22 The site is in a sustainable location with good cycle and public transport links to the wider area and there are local shops and services along Barnwell Road and the adjacent retail parks within walking distance.

8.23 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 82.

Refuse Arrangements

8.24 The 1m wide access path from the site to Milton Road will provide appropriate access for waste disposal and there is appropriate space for bin storage. In my opinion the proposal is compliant in this respect with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 57.

Surface water drainage

8.25 The proposal has not provided details on surface water drainage, and as such the Drainage Team has requested the submission of a surface water drainage strategy and ongoing maintenance details to be submitted prior to determination. It is

considered that it is reasonable to request this information prior to development.

Third Party Representations

8.26 Some of the third party representations have been addressed in the main body of this report. Those outstanding have been addressed below:

Comment	Response
Utility service arrangements	Utility service arrangements are not a planning matter.
Increase in traffic pressures to the area.	The Highway Authority has raised no objection to the proposed development in terms of increased vehicle movements. The proposal is for one dwelling and I do not consider this increase would have a drastic impact on the existing transport network.
Disturbance caused by construction and ongoing responsibility of private drive	This is a civil/ legal matter between the owners of the private drive as this does not form part of the adopted public highway.
Loss of green space	The site is not a protected public open space and is currently unused vacant land. The proposal is not considered to adversely affect the biodiversity value of the locality.
This would set a precedent for future development.	In terms of precedent, each planning application is considered on its own merits. The proposal is considered to be compliant with policies which relates to the development of dwellings within existing residential plots.
Existing trees are in poor condition and dangerous	This is a civil/ legal matter between the owners of the property and neighbours. The trees are not protected and

	could be removed without planning approval.
Proposed conflict of interest as owner of 348 trades as a scaffolding company	This is not a planning matter.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 In my opinion, the proposed development would not amount to overdevelopment of the site nor would it have an adverse impact upon the area, the neighbouring properties or the future occupants of the development.

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 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as listed on this decision notice.

   Reason: In the interests of good planning, for the avoidance of doubt and to facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

3. No construction work or demolition work shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours and 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 2018 policy 35)

4. In the event of the foundations for the proposed development requiring piling, prior to the development taking place, other than demolition, the applicant shall provide the local authority with a report / method statement for approval detailing the type of piling and mitigation measures to be taken to protect local residents from noise and/or vibration. Potential noise and vibration levels at the nearest noise sensitive locations shall be predicted in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228-1&2:2009 Code of Practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

   Due to the proximity of this site to existing residential premises and other noise sensitive premises, impact pile driving is not recommended.

   Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35)

5. No development hereby permitted shall be commenced until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and in accordance with Cambridge City Council local plan policies, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is occupied.
   The scheme shall include:
   a) Details of the existing surface water drainage arrangements including runoff rates for the QBAR, 3.3% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) (1 in 30) and 1% AEP (1 in 100) storm events;
   b) Full results of the proposed drainage system modelling in the above-referenced storm events (as well as 1% AEP plus climate change) , inclusive of all collection, conveyance, storage, flow control and disposal elements and including an allowance for urban creep, together with a schematic of how the system has been represented within the hydraulic model;
   c) Detailed drawings of the entire proposed surface water drainage system, including levels, gradients, dimensions and pipe reference numbers, details of the proposed attenuation;
   d) A plan of the drained site area and which part of the proposed drainage system these will drain to;
   e) Full details of the proposed attenuation and flow control measures;
   f) Site Investigation and test results to confirm infiltration rates;

g) Full details of the maintenance/adoption of the surface water drainage system;
h) Measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface water
The drainage scheme must adhere to the hierarchy of drainage options as outlined in the NPPF PPG

Reason: To ensure appropriate surface water drainage. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 31 and 32)

6. Details for the long term maintenance arrangements for the surface water drainage system (including all SuDS features) to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of any of the buildings hereby permitted. The submitted details should identify runoff sub-catchments, SuDS components, control structures, flow routes and outfalls. In addition, the plan must clarify the access that is required to each surface water management component for maintenance purposes. The maintenance plan shall be carried out in full thereafter.

Reason: To ensure appropriate surface water drainage. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 31 and 32)

7. Notwithstanding the approved plans, the building, hereby permitted, shall be constructed to meet the requirements of Part M4(2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings' of the Building Regulations 2010 (as amended 2016).

Reason: To secure the provision of accessible housing (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 51)

8. For the hereby approved dwelling, notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Classes A, B and E of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification): the enlargement, improvement or other alteration of the dwellinghouses, including insertion of new windows; loft conversion including rear dormers; and the provision within the curtilage of the dwellinghouses of any building or enclosure, swimming or other pool, shall not be allowed without the granting of specific planning permission.

Reason: To ensure sufficient amenity space is retained for future occupiers of the dwelling, to protect the character of the area and to protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 52 and 57)

9. No development shall take place above ground level, other than demolition, until details of the external materials to be used in the construction of the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

   Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the development does not detract from the character and appearance of the area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 57 (for new buildings) and/or 58 (for extensions))

10. Prior to the occupation of the development, hereby permitted, the curtilage(s) of the approved dwelling(s) shall be fully laid out and finished in accordance with the approved plans. The curtilage(s) shall remain as such thereafter.

    Reason: To ensure an appropriate level of amenity for future occupiers and to avoid the property being built and occupied without its garden land (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 50, 52, 55 and 56)

11. The dwelling hereby approved shall not be occupied until details of facilities for the covered, secured parking of bicycles and the storage of bins for use in connection with the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The approved facilities shall be provided in accordance with the approved details before dwellings are occupied.

    Reason: To ensure appropriate provision for the secure storage of bicycles. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 56, and 82)

12. There shall be no collections from or deliveries to the site during the demolition and construction stages outside the hours of 0800 hours and 1800 hours on 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 2018 policy 35)

INFORMATIVE:

This development involves work to the public highway that will require the approval of the County Council as Highway Authority. It is an OFFENCE to carry out any works within the public highway, which includes a public right of way, without the permission of the Highway Authority. Please note that it is the applicant's responsibility to ensure that, in addition to planning permission, any necessary consents or approvals under the Highways Act 1980 and the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 are also obtained from the County Council.
No part of any structure may overhang or encroach under or upon the public highway unless licensed by the Highway Authority and no gate / door / ground floor window shall open outwards over the public highway.

Public Utility apparatus may be affected by this proposal. Contact the appropriate utility service to reach agreement on any necessary alterations, the cost of which must be borne by the applicant.

PLANNING COMMITTEE **4th September 2019**

Application Number	19/0707/FUL	**Agenda Item**	
Date Received	22nd May 2019	**Officer**	Mairead O'Sullivan
Target Date	17th July 2019		
Ward	Market		
Site	62-64 King Street Cambridge CB1 1LN		
Proposal	Retrospective change of use from A1 to A1 with an associated A3 or A4 use in the alternative.		
Applicant	Mr Sam Owens C/O Agent		

SUMMARY	The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons: - The proposed flexible use is considered to be appropriate for the city centre location - The proposal is not considered to give rise to any adverse impacts on residential amenity
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

1.1 The application site lies on the southern side of King Street. This is a predominantly commercial area and lies within the designated City Centre. The site lies within a Primary Shopping Area. The site is a pair of two storey buildings which are lower than the adjoining buildings at either side. There is a shop front which spans both properties.

1.2 The site was previously in solely A1 retail use. The proposed change of use is retrospective and the site is currently operating as A1 with ancillary A3 (café) use.

1.3 The site lies within the central Conservation Area and is a Grade II Listed Building. The site lies within the Controlled Parking Zone.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

2.0 The application seeks full planning permission for a change of use from A1 (retail) use to A1 (retail) use with an associated A3 (café) or A4 (wine bar) use in the alternative. The application is retrospective as Thirsty currently occupy the site. The current use is A1 with ancillary A3 (Café use). For flexibility the applicant wants an A4 (Wine Bar) use in the alternative.

2.1 There are no physical works proposed to the building. Any new signage would need to be considered under an application for advert consent.

2.2 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:

1. Planning Statement
2. Plans

3.0 SITE HISTORY

3.1 There is no site history.

4.0 PUBLICITY

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

5.0 POLICY

5.1 See Appendix 1 for full details of Central Government Guidance, Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan 2018	1 10 11 35 36 55 56 61 81 82

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework 2019 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance from 3 March 2014 onwards Circular 11/95 (Annex A)
Previous Supplementary Planning Documents	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007)
	Area Guidelines Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal (2015)

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Control)

6.1 No objection: There would be no significant adverse impact on the public highway should the development gain planning permission.

Urban Design and Conservation team

6.2 There are no material conservation issues with the proposal.

Environmental Health

6.3 No objection: The permitted opening hours of the application site via the premises licence (Licensing Act 2003) are restricted to 08:00 – 23:00 hours Monday to Sunday. These hours are reasonable and are recommended to be conditioned. The kitchen size is very limited and the current menu is unlikely to produce excessive odours to impact upon the locality. Any future A3 uses are unlikely to be able to extend the kitchen due to the site constraints and therefore future odour generation is likely to be minimal.

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 The owners/occupiers of 56 Manor Place, King Street has made a representation. The representations can be summarised as follows:

- There are increasing issues with anti-social behaviour in the city centre, often alcohol related.
- The site is at a pinch point in the street and in close proximity to residential windows
- Concerned that the pathway will be blocked by patrons which could impact on Highway safety. There is no space for a smoking area to the rear so patrons are likely to congregate on the street

- Concerned that there would be food vans as there are regularly outside the High Street Chesterton branch
- There are already numerous businesses which serve alcohol on the street and the proposal will add to anti-social behaviour and noise nuisance.

7.2 Councillor O'Reilly has commented on this application. She has requested that the application be determined at planning committee. Her comments can be summarised as follows:

- Concerned about licensing implications as within the cumulative impact zone
- Residents have raised concerns about increase noise
- The site is on a narrow residential street and concerned about potential use as a pub
- Concerned the proposal is contrary to policy 11 which states that change of use will only be permitted if it would not give rise to a detrimental effect on the character or amenity of the area through smell, litter, noise or traffic

7.3 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 and impact on heritage assets
3. Residential amenity
4. Highway safety
5. Car and cycle parking
6. Third party representations

Principle of development

8.2 The site lies within a Primary Shopping Area (PSA) within the designated City Centre so policy 11 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) is relevant. Policy 11 states that development within the PSA should a) complement the retail function and make a

positive contribution to vitality, viability and diversity in the city centre, b) make provision for an active frontage and c) not give rise to a detrimental impact on the character of the area, either alone or cumulatively, through smell, litter, noise or traffic problems. The site falls within a Secondary Frontage and criterion e) states that A1 (retail) use should remain the predominant use on frontages (above 50%) unless it can be demonstrated that the change would be beneficial to the vitality and viability of the frontage.

8.3 The proposed change of use retains the A1 use as the predominant use on site and proposes to introduce A3 (café) or A4 (wine bar) uses as associated uses in the alternative. The change of use is retrospective and the site is currently being used as A1 with ancillary A3 use. The ancillary A3 or A4 uses are considered acceptable as ground floor uses within the PSA and I am satisfied that the proposal would comply with criterion a of policy 11. The proposal would provide an active shop front with no physical changes being proposed as part of the application and would therefore be in compliance with criterion b. I will address criterion c under the residential amenity heading below. The application proposes to retain the A1 use on site and there would be no change to the number of A1 frontages on the street as a result of the proposal. The applicant has confirmed that 58% of the commercial units are in A1 use on King Street.

Context of site, design and external spaces and impact on heritage assets

8.4 The application does not propose any physical changes to the building. The Conservation Officer has confirmed there are no material conservation issues. The change of use proposed retains the A1 use and includes either A3 or A4 uses in the alternative. These uses are considered to be in keeping with the surrounding character.

8.5 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 55, 56 and 61.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

8.6 The application does not propose any physical changes to the building. The Environmental Health Officer has reviewed the application and has no objection to the proposal. I recommend a condition to restrict the operation hours in line with the premises license to 08:00 – 23:00 hours Monday to Sunday. He notes that due to the small size of the kitchen it would not be possible to undertake any significantly odorous cooking. I have recommended a condition to ensure that if more intensive cooking were to occur on site details would need to be provided to the Local Planning Authority for approval.

8.7 The proposed use would remain primarily A1 but with ancillary A3 or A4 uses. The representation raises concerns that the proposal will give rise to further issues with anti-social behaviour on the street. The site lies within the city centre and residents would typical expect a greater level of noise and activity than residents of suburban areas. There has only been one objection to the application and no evidence of any significant issues with anti-social behaviour on the street has been demonstrated. The hours of operation are recommended to be conditioned and are similar to other neighbouring commercial uses on the street. In my view the proposed use is unlikely to result in a significant increase to noise and disturbance to nearby occupiers given the nature of the use (primarily an A1 use), restricted hours of operation and the presence of existing commercial uses on the street.

8.8 In my opinion the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and I consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 11c), 56, 35 and 36.

Highway Safety

8.9 The Highway Authority is satisfied that the proposal would not have any significant adverse impact on highway safety. I share this view.

8.10 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 81.

Car and Cycle Parking

8.11 The A1 use is existing and there is no space on site to provide any additional parking. The site lies within the CPZ with metered car parking outside of the premises. There are some public Sheffield stands available on King Street. Given the existing use, the central location of the site and the site constraints I am satisfied that in this instance the lack of secure and dedicated cycle parking is acceptable.

8.12 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 82.

Third Party Representations

8.13 I have addressed the majority of the points raised by the representation within the body of my report but will cover any outstanding matters in the below table.

Representation	**Response**
There are increasing issues with anti-social behaviour in the city centre, often alcohol related.	See paragraph 8.7
The site is at a pinch point in the street and in close proximity to residential windows	See paragraph 8.7
Concerned that the pathway will be blocked by patrons which could impact on Highway safety. There is no space for a smoking area to the rear so patrons are likely to congregate on the street	This is not a planning matter.
Concerned that there would be food vans as there are regularly outside the High Street Chesterton branch	The Chesterton Road branch does not have a kitchen so provides food through food van. The application site has a kitchen.
There are already numerous businesses which serve alcohol on the street and the proposal will add to anti-social behaviour and noise nuisance.	There is no evidence to suggest there are issues with anti-social behavior that would be compounded by the introduction of ancillary A3 or A4 uses to the site.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 The introduction of A3 or A4 uses on site are considered acceptable for the city centre location. The proposed use is not considered to give rise to any significant adverse impact to residential amenity. There are no physical changes proposed to the building and as a result there would be no impact on the Conservation Area or the special interest of the Listed Building.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as listed on this decision notice.

   Reason: In the interests of good planning, for the avoidance of doubt and to facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. The use hereby permitted shall not be open to customers outside the hours of 08:00hrs-23:00hrs daily (including Bank and Public Holidays).

   Reason: To protect the amenity of adjoining and adjacent residential premises (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policies 35, 55 and 56)

3. Should the owner/tenant of the premises wish to prepare hot food in the future, details of the extraction/ventilation system to effectively control the emission of cooking smells and fumes shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (so as to prevent the transmission of odour); the extraction/ventilation system shall be installed and fully operational before the preparing of hot food commences and shall be retained thereafter.

   Reason: to protect the amenity of nearby occupiers (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 11 and 36)

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING COMMITTEE **4th September 2019**

Application Number	19/0252/FUL	**Agenda Item**	
Date Received	25th February 2019	**Officer**	Aaron Coe
Target Date	22nd April 2019		
Ward	Romsey		
Site	342 Mill Road Cambridge CB1 3NN		
Proposal	Replacement of existing outbuilding to two storey Annex to the rear of the garden.		
Applicant	Mrs Lucy Ingham 2 Beaumont Road Cambridge CB1 8PY		

SUMMARY	The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons: • The proposal is well integrated with the character and appearance of the surrounding area. • The proposal would not harm the amenities of neighbouring properties.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

1.1 The application site is located on the southern part of Mill Road within a terrace of two storey properties built in brick and slate. The whole terrace lies within the Mill Road area of the Central Cambridge Conservation Area. The property is unlisted but has been identified as a positive unlisted building in the Conservation Area.

1.2 The site falls outside of the controlled parking zone and there are no protected trees within the application site.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

2.1 The application seeks full planning permission to demolish the existing timber outbuilding and construct a two storey annex at the rear of the garden.

2.2 The existing timber outbuilding is located at the rear of the garden. The structure has a width of 5.2m, a depth of 4m, with an eaves height of 3.3m and ridge height of 4.1m. Rear access to the property is via the outbuilding.

2.3 The proposed new two storey annex measures 5.2 metres in width and 6 metres in depth. The north elevation is proposed to have an eaves height of 2.52 metres with a steeper roof pitch and a ridge height of 4.8 metres. The eave height on the south elevation is proposed to remain the same as the existing outbuilding at 3.5 metres.

2.4 The proposal involves two velux windows, one on the front elevation and one on the rear.

2.5 There is an existing access from the alleyway on the south side of the development, this is proposed to be improved and used as part of the proposed development for bicycle access.

2.6 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:

1. Design Statement
2. Drawings

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
18/0920/FUL	Roof extension incorporating raising ridge height and rear box dormer with Juliet balcony. Single storey rear extension.	Refused (Appeal-part allowed/part dismissed)

4.0 PUBLICITY

4.1

Advertisement:	Yes
Adjoining Owners:	Yes
Site Notice Displayed:	Yes

5.0 POLICY

5.1 Central Government Advice

National Planning Policy Framework 2019
Planning Practice Guidance 2014
Circular 11/95 – The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions (Annex A)

5.2 Cambridge Local Plan 2018

Policy 1:The presumption in favour of sustainable development
Policy 55: Responding to context
Policy 56: Creating successful places
Policy 57: Designing new buildings
Policy 61: Conservation and enhancement of Cambridge's historic environment
Policy 82: Parking management

5.3 Area Guidelines

Mill Road Area Conservation Area Appraisal (2011)

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Control)

6.1 No objection to the proposal and recommend no conditions. The following advice is provided:

6.2 No additional off-street parking provision is made for the additional residential accommodation, the layout of which would allow it to be occupied as a household independent of the main dwelling.

6.3 The streets in the vicinity provide uncontrolled parking, and as there is no effective means to prevent residents from owning a car and seeking to keep it on the local streets this demand is likely to appear on-street in competition with existing residential uses.

6.4 The development may therefore impose additional parking demands upon the on-street parking on the surrounding

streets and, whilst this is unlikely to result in any significant adverse impact upon highway safety, there is potentially an impact upon residential amenity which the Planning Authority may wish to consider when assessing this application.

Urban Design and Conservation team

6.5 The development is acceptable subject to imposition of a standard condition requiring the submission of material details prior to installation of the materials. This is to avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area.

6.6 It is considered that the proposed design would have no greater impact on the character or appearance of the conservation area than the existing outbuilding. There is concern over the use of a man-made material for the cladding. Wood effect cement weatherboard can have a very plastic character that would not be appropriate to this location. The applicant should consider a natural material instead, for example a timber cladding to achieve appropriate character for the outbuilding.

6.7 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 Councillor Smith (Romsey Ward Councillor) requested to call in this application in officers were minded to approve for the following reasons:

- Over development and increasing housing density in the area.

8.0 ASSESSMENT

Context of site, design and external spaces

8.1 No. 342 is listed as a ‘Positive Unlisted Building’ in the Mill Road Conservation Area Appraisal. Positive Buildings are good examples or relatively unaltered buildings where their style, detailing and building materials provides the streetscape with interest and variety. They make a positive contribution to the special interest of the Conservation Area.

8.2 The proposed annex replaces an existing two storey outbuilding, with a proposed increase in depth by 2 metres along with the introduction of a steeper roof pitch and ridge height. The proposal would not be visible from Mill Road but would be partly visible from Madras Road to the west of the application site.

8.3 The existing outbuilding is a dilapidated timber outbuilding which is out of character with the surrounding character. The proposed replacement building will provide a more contemporary design with higher quality materials. The design and appearance would not have an adverse impact on the character or appearance of the conservation area.

8.4 There is an extant permission for a single storey extension to the dwelling No. 342 Mill Road, this will add an additional depth of 3metres to No.342 Mill Road and once implemented would retain an external amenity space of 4.4 metres deep and approximately 5 metres in width. It is acknowledged that the approval of the proposed development would result in a further reduction in the amount of garden space for existing and future occupiers, however, it is considered the amount of amenity space proposed to be retained is sufficient and would not warrant a refusal of the application.

8.5 In my opinion the proposal is compliant in design terms with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 55, 56, 57, 59.

Impact on the Conservation Area/Listed Building/BLI

8.6 The City Council conservation officer is concerned over the use of a man made material for cladding and considers the proposed wood effect cement to be inappropriate for this location. A condition will be imposed to ensure a sample of the proposed cladding is submitted for approval prior to commencement of development. However, overall the proposal is considered to be acceptable and the design of the annex would not impact the character of the conservation area.

8.7 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 61.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers:

8.8 It is considered that the proposal would not be unduly overbearing to the properties either side, 340 or 344 Mill Road. The proposals would not impact detrimentally on the gardens of these properties and there are no overlooking or overshadowing impacts associated with the proposed development. Given the separation of the building from the rear of adjoining properties, the proposed building would not have a detrimental impact through loss of light, privacy or enclosure.

8.9 The proposed annex would be situated within close proximity to No.1 Madras Road, however, given the presence of the existing outbuilding and the eaves height being proposed to remain the same it is considered that there would not be any additional impacts on this property.

8.10 The proposal would not result in any overlooking of habitable rooms of neighbouring properties.

8.11 In my opinion the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and in this respect, I consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 55 and 57.

Highway Safety, Car and Cycle Parking

8.12 The proposal does not offer any additional parking provision for the proposed additional residential accommodation. The streets in the vicinity provide uncontrolled parking, and there is no effective means to prevent residents from owning a car. However, given that the proposed development is for an annex rather than an independent dwelling, the proposal is unlikely to result in additional on street car parking demand.

8.13 Additional bicycle storage is also proposed to be provided on the western boundary which will be accessible from the rear alleyway. This is an appropriate space for cycle movement and parking, as per the Cambridge Cycle Parking Guide.

8.14 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 82.

Other Matters

8.15 I have recommended an ancillary annex condition to ensure the unit is not independently occupied. This would require separate assessment against a different suite of policies and such a proposal would be unlikely to succeed in gaining planning permission.

9.0 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 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as listed on this decision notice.

   Reason: In the interests of good planning, for the avoidance of doubt and to facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

3. No construction work or demolition work shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours and 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 2018 policy 35)

4. The annex hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwellinghouse and it shall at no time be independently occupied or let, used to accommodate bed-and-breakfast guests or other short-term visitors paying rent or fees.

   Reason: To avoid harm to the character of the area, to protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and to avoid the creation of a separate planning unit (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policies 35, 55, 52, and 57).

5. Prior to the installation of any non-masonry walling systems, cladding panels or other external screens full details including structural members, infill panels, edge, junction and coping details, colours, surface finishes/textures and relationships to glazing and roofing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This may consist of large-scale drawings and/or samples. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

   Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policy 61)

PLANNING COMMITTEE **4th September 2019**

Application Number	18/1319/FUL	**Agenda Item**	
Date Received	28th August 2018	**Officer**	Lewis Tomlinson
Target Date	23rd October 2018		
Ward	Abbey		
Site	24 Elfleda Road Cambridge CB5 8LZ		
Proposal	Proposed two bed dwelling		
Applicant	Mr And Mrs Nigel Russell 24 Elfleda Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB5 8LZ		

SUMMARY	The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons: - The design and scale of the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on the character of the surrounding area; - The proposed development would not have any significant adverse impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring occupiers; - The proposed development would provide a high quality living environment for the future occupiers;
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

1.1 The application site consists of a detached two storey property on the south side of Elfleda Road. To the south (rear) of the property are Elfleda Road Allotments. There are no site constraints.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

2.1 The proposal seeks planning permission for the erection of a 2 bedroom bungalow in the rear garden of 24 Elfleda Road. It would be accessed via a private road that serves the existing garage. It would have two off street car parking spaces, and would also provide cycle and bin storage within the boundary of the proposed dwelling.

2.2 The scheme has been amended since submission to:

- Reduce the dwelling from two storey to one storey with a reduction from 4 to 2 bedrooms

3.0 SITE HISTORY

3.1 16/1351/FUL– Alterations to existing garage/store to form additional living space ancillary to the main dwelling (approved)

.

4.0 PUBLICITY

4.1

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

5.0 POLICY

5.1 See Appendix 1 for full details of Central Government Guidance, Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan 2018	1, 3 31, 32, 35 50, 51, 52, 55, 56, 57, 59 81, 82

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework February 2019 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014 Circular 11/95 (Annex A)
Supplementary Planning Guidance	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007)

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

6.1 No objection. The Highway Authority does not consider that this application will have any significant adverse impact upon the operation of the highway network.

Drainage Officer

6.2 No objection. The proposals have not indicated a surface water drainage strategy however, as this is a minor development and there are no surface water flood risk issues, it would be acceptable to obtain this information by way of a condition.

Environmental Health

6.3 No objection subject to the inclusion of conditions regarding construction hours and piling.

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 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made objections:

- 25 Elfleda Road
- Camcycle

7.2 The objections can be summarised as follows:

- Lack of cycle parking
- Potential for flooding of No.25 Elfleda Road due the site being higher than No.25's land
- Loss of privacy to the timber framed and clad garden studio in the garden of No.25.
- Loss of light and overshadowing to the garden of 25 Elfleda Road
- Car parking adjacent the boundary with No.25 would result in noise nuisance.
- Conditions should be included to remove permitted development rights, secure materials, bins and drainage.

7.3 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations in support:

- 23A Elfleda Road

7.4 The letters of support can be summarised as follows:

- There are no windows overlooking No.23A so happy to support.

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. Residential amenity
4. Surface water drainage and flood risk
5. Refuse arrangements
6. Highway safety
7. Car and cycle parking

Principle of Development

8.2 Policy 3 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) states that the majority of new development should be focused in and around the existing urban area, making the most effective use of previously developed land, and enabling the maximum number of people to access services and facilities locally.

Policy 52 Protecting garden land and the subdivision of existing dwelling plots

8.3 As the proposal is for the subdivision of an existing residential plot, policy 52 of Cambridge Local Plan (2018) is relevant in assessing the acceptability of the proposal.

8.4 Policy 52 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) states that: 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 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.

8.5 I consider that the proposal complies with the above five criteria and the reasons for this are set out in the relevant sections of this report.

Context of site, design and external spaces

8.6 The site is located within an area that is characterised by large two storey housing. Elfleda Road is located to the front of the site and Elfleda Road Allotments are located to the rear of the site. There is a large 1.5 storey backland dwelling to the immediate west of the site at 23a Elfleda Road. There is an existing single storey double garage on the site. The proposed dwelling would be situated to the south of this and would be of a single storey scale. As there is a backland dwelling immediately to the west of the proposal, the proposed development would not harm the character of the area. I have recommended a materials condition to ensure the proposed bungalow would be of an acceptable appearance. The proposal would also include a reasonable sized amenity area and gaps around the proposed dwelling for additional soft landscaped areas.

8.7 It is my opinion the form, height and layout of the proposed development is appropriate to the surrounding pattern of development and the character of the area and would not constitute an overdevelopment of the site.

8.8 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 52, 55, 56 & 57.

Residential Amenity

<u>Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers</u>

8.9 The built form of the proposed dwelling would be sited circa 8m away from the boundary of No.24 Elfleda Road and circa 16m from the rear elevation of No.24 Elfleda Road. It would also be circa 14m away from the rear elevation of No.25 Elfleda Road. No.25 Elfeda Road has an outbuilding that is used as an office along the western boundary. The occupiers of No.25 Elfleda Road have raised concerns about the loss of privacy to this outbuilding. However, given the single storey scale of the dwelling, there would be no first floor windows that would overlook this outbuilding. The owners have also raised concerns about the loss of afternoon light to the garden of

No.25 Elfleda Road. However, given the siting of the proposed dwelling and the fact it would only be 5m in height at the ridge declining to 2.2m at the eaves, it would not have a significant impact in regards to the loss of light upon the main rear amenity area of No.25 Elfleda Road.

8.10 As the proposed dwelling would be of a single storey scale, and would be sited a reasonable distance away from all neighbouring properties, the proposed dwelling would not overlook, overshadow or be overbearing to any of the neighbouring properties. I am satisfied that the proposed dwelling due to its orientation, layout and distance from existing dwellings and boundaries, would not have a significant adverse impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring occupiers such that it would warrant refusal.

8.11 The occupiers of No.25 have raised concerns about the potential disturbance from the parking of cars for the proposed dwelling. Cars for the proposed dwelling would park in the same location as the existing garage on the site. I acknowledge that the existing situation means the noise is contained within a garage. The parking area would be separated from the main rear amenity area of No.25 by the proposed bike store and the existing outbuilding at No.25. The parking area would also have a block paving finish minimising the noise made by manouvering vehicles. For these reasons, I do not consider that the proposed parking arrangements for the dwelling would result in a significant amount of disturbance or nuisance upon No.25.

Wider area

8.12 The Environmental Health Team has recommended various construction related conditions in order to protect the residential amenity of occupiers of properties in the wider area during construction. I accept this advice and have recommended the conditions accordingly.

8.13 In my opinion the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and I consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 35, 52, 55 and 56.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

8.14 Policy 50 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) sets out internal residential space standards. The proposed unit would comply and significantly exceed the standards. In this regard, the unit would provide a high quality internal living environment for the future occupants in my opinion. The gross internal floor space measurements for the dwelling in this application is 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	2	4	1	70	91	+21

8.15 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. The proposed dwelling would have a south facing garden of an appropriate size for a 2 bed dwelling. The proposed garden for the existing dwelling would not change from the existing situation due to the existing garage and separation from the land to the rear where the proposed dwelling would lie. Therefore, I accept the proposed garden size for the existing dwelling. To ensure that adequate private amenity space is retained for the proposed dwelling, I recommended that permitted developments rights are removed for extensions and outbuildings.

8.16 In my opinion the proposal provides a high-quality living environment and an appropriate standard of residential amenity for future occupiers, and I consider that in this respect it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 50.

Accessible homes

8.17 The development has been assessed for compliance with Policy 51 and complies with the requirements of Part M4 (2) of the Building Regulations. I have recommended a condition to secure this requirement.

Surface water drainage and flood risk

8.18 A neighbour has raised concerns about the potential for flooding due to the site being on higher ground than No.25. The Drainage Officer has not raised any objections subject to a surface water drainage condition. In my opinion, the condition would secure an adequate surface water drainage scheme for the proposed dwelling. Subject to this condition, the proposal is compliant with the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) and policy 31 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

Refuse Arrangements

8.19 There is adequate space within the site to store bins. In my opinion the proposal is compliant in this respect with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 57.

Highway Safety

8.20 The Highway Authority is satisfied there would not be any adverse impact upon highway safety. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 81.

Car and Cycle Parking

Car Parking

8.21 The proposal includes 2 car parking spaces for the proposed dwelling where the existing garage is sited and the existing dwelling also has space for at least 2 car parking spaces at the front of the existing dwelling. This complies with the maximum standards in the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) which seek 1 car parking space for dwellings with up to 2 bedrooms and 2 car parking spaces for dwellings with 3 or more bedrooms. There is a private track leading to the proposed dwelling which is shared with the Allotments and also the existing backland dwelling at 23A Elfleda Road. Therefore the proposed car parking arrangements for the proposed dwelling and additional noise would not have a significant impact upon the neighbouring residential properties due to the existing situation.

Cycle Parking

8.22 The proposal includes secure and covered cycle parking within the site. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 82.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 In my opinion, the proposed development would not amount to overdevelopment of the site nor would it have an adverse impact upon the area, the neighbouring properties or the future occupants of the development.

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 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as listed on this decision notice.

   Reason: In the interests of good planning, for the avoidance of doubt and to facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

3. No construction work or demolition work shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours and 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 2018 policy 35)

4. In the event of the foundations for the proposed development requiring piling, prior to the development taking place, other than demolition, the applicant shall provide the local authority with a report / method statement for approval detailing the type of piling and mitigation measures to be taken to protect local residents from noise and/or vibration. Potential noise and vibration levels at the nearest noise sensitive locations shall be predicted in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228-1&2:2009 Code of Practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

   Due to the proximity of this site to existing residential premises and other noise sensitive premises, impact pile driving is not recommended.

   Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35)

5. No development hereby permitted shall be commenced until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and in accordance with Cambridge City Council local plan policies, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is occupied.
   The scheme shall include:
   a) Details of the existing surface water drainage arrangements including runoff rates for the QBAR, 3.3% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) (1 in 30) and 1% AEP (1 in 100) storm events;
   b) Full results of the proposed drainage system modelling in the above-referenced storm events (as well as 1% AEP plus climate change) , inclusive of all collection, conveyance, storage, flow control and disposal elements and including an allowance for urban creep, together with a schematic of how the system has been represented within the hydraulic model;
   c) Detailed drawings of the entire proposed surface water drainage system, including levels, gradients, dimensions and pipe reference numbers, details of the proposed attenuation;
   d) A plan of the drained site area and which part of the proposed drainage system these will drain to;
   e) Full details of the proposed attenuation and flow control measures;
   f) Site Investigation and test results to confirm infiltration rates;

g) Full details of the maintenance/adoption of the surface water drainage system;
h) Measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface water
The drainage scheme must adhere to the hierarchy of drainage options as outlined in the NPPF PPG

Reason: To ensure appropriate surface water drainage. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 31 and 32)

6. Details for the long term maintenance arrangements for the surface water drainage system (including all SuDS features) to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of any of the buildings hereby permitted. The submitted details should identify runoff sub-catchments, SuDS components, control structures, flow routes and outfalls. In addition, the plan must clarify the access that is required to each surface water management component for maintenance purposes. The maintenance plan shall be carried out in full thereafter.

Reason: To ensure appropriate surface water drainage. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 31 and 32)

7. Notwithstanding the approved plans, the building, hereby permitted, shall be constructed to meet the requirements of Part M4(2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings' of the Building Regulations 2010 (as amended 2016).

Reason: To secure the provision of accessible housing (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 51)

8. For the hereby approved dwelling, notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Classes A, B and E of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification): the enlargement, improvement or other alteration of the dwellinghouses, including insertion of new windows; loft conversion including rear dormers; and the provision within the curtilage of the dwellinghouses of any building or enclosure, swimming or other pool, shall not be allowed without the granting of specific planning permission.

Reason: To ensure sufficient amenity space is retained for future occupiers of the dwelling, to protect the character of the area and to protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 52 and 57)

9. No development shall take place above ground level, other than demolition, until details of the external materials to be used in the construction of the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

   Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the development does not detract from the character and appearance of the area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 57 (for new buildings) and/or 58 (for extensions))

10. Prior to the occupation of the development, hereby permitted, the curtilage(s) of the approved dwelling(s) shall be fully laid out and finished in accordance with the approved plans. The curtilage(s) shall remain as such thereafter.

    Reason: To ensure an appropriate level of amenity for future occupiers and to avoid the property being built and occupied without its garden land (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 50, 52, 55 and 56)

11. The dwelling hereby approved shall not be occupied until cycle storage has been provided in accordance with the details within drawing No. 05/RUSS/18. The cycle storage shall be retained in accordance with these details thereafter.

    Reason: To ensure appropriate provision for the secure storage of bicycles. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 56, and 82)

INFORMATIVE: This development involves work to the public highway that will require the approval of the County Council as Highway Authority. It is an OFFENCE to carry out any works within the public highway, which includes a public right of way, without the permission of the Highway Authority. Please note that it is the applicant's responsibility to ensure that, in addition to planning permission, any necessary consents or approvals under the Highways Act 1980 and the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 are also obtained from the County Council.
No part of any structure may overhang or encroach under or upon the public highway unless licensed by the Highway Authority and no gate / door / ground floor window shall open outwards over the public highway.

Public Utility apparatus may be affected by this proposal. Contact the appropriate utility service to reach agreement on any necessary alterations, the cost of which must be borne by the applicant.

PLANNING COMMITTEE **4th September 2019**

Application Number	19/0555/FUL	**Agenda Item**	
Date Received	23rd April 2019	**Officer**	Mairead O'Sullivan
Target Date	18th June 2019		
Ward	Abbey		
Site	84 Ditton Lane Cambridge CB5 8SR		
Proposal	Sub-divide existing site to build new one and a half storey 2-bed detached dwelling to the rear, and bike store.		
Applicant	Mr & Mrs M Lawton 97 High Street Girton CB3 0QQ		

SUMMARY	The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons: - The proposal would not adversely impact on the residential amenity of surrounding occupiers - The proposed building is acceptable in design terms - The proposal would provide a high-quality living environment for future occupiers.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

1.1 The application site is a two storey semi-detached brick dwelling with front and rear garden on the northern side of Ditton Lane. The site sits on the corner with Dunsmore Close. There are a number of garages to the rear of the site. A footpath runs along the eastern side of the site. The area has a mixed character; with a range of semi-detached and terraced properties on Ditton Lane and rows of terraced brick and timber clad buildings to the rear on Dunsmore Close.

1.2 The site lies outside of the Controlled Parking Zone. To the front of the site is a small area of protected open space. The site does not fall within a Conservation Area.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

2.1 The application seeks full planning permission to subdivide the existing plot and build one new 1.5 storey 2 bedroom detached dwelling with associated landscaping and bike storage within a garden shed. The dwelling would be accessed from the footpath which runs along the side of the site. Some planting is proposed in front of the ground floor windows to provide defensible space. An off-street car parking space would be provided for the new dwelling.

2.2 The proposed building would be finished in brick. It would be 1.5 storeys in scale with the upper floor accommodation being accommodated in the roof. A dormer is proposed on the front elevation to provide headroom and outlook to the first floor bedrooms. The only first floor windows in the rear elevation are rooflights or high-level bathroom windows. A garden is proposed to be provided to the rear. Bins would be stored in a fenced and gated area to the rear of the property between the rear wall and the adjacent garage.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

3.1 There is no planning history.

4.0 PUBLICITY

4.1

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

5.0 POLICY

5.1 See Appendix 1 for full details of Central Government Guidance, Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan 2018	1 3 28 31 32 35 50 51 52 55 56 57 59 81 82

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework July 2019 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance from 3 March 2014 onwards Circular 11/95 (Annex A)
Previous Supplementary Planning Documents	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007)
Material Considerations	<u>City Wide Guidance</u> Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan (2011) Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (November 2010) Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

6.1 No objection: Please add a condition to any permission requiring that the proposed driveway be constructed so that its falls and levels are such that no private water from the site drains across or onto the adopted public highway.

Environmental Health

6.2 No objection: Three conditions are recommended which relate to construction hours, collections during construction and piling. An informative about Low NOx boilers is requested.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Officer)

6.3 No objection: The proposals have not indicated a surface water drainage strategy however, as this is a minor development and there are no surface water flood risk issues, it would be acceptable to obtain this information by way of a condition.

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 The owners/occupiers of 1 Dunsmore Close have made a representation in objection to the application.

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Concerned about pedestrian and cyclist safety as this corner is blind and there is a footpath, which is well used, on one side of the road only. Concerned that construction vehicles will impact on safety
- Concerned about height and appearance of the building. Other new builds in the area have been single storey and the adjacent garages are also single storey.

7.3 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. Water management and flood risk
4. Noise and vibration
5. Inclusive access
6. Residential amenity
7. Refuse arrangements
8. Highway safety
9. Car and cycle parking
10. Third party representations

Principle of Development

8.2 The application proposes to subdivide the existing plot and therefore policy 52 is relevant. This policy states that subdivision of an existing residential plot will only be permitted where a) the form, height and layout is appropriate to the surrounding character, b) there is sufficient garden space for the proposed and retained dwellings and any important trees are retained, c) the privacy of the new and neighbouring dwellings are respected, d) adequate amenity space, vehicular access and parking arrangements are available for the new and retained dwellings and e) there is no detrimental effect on the potential comprehensive development of the wider area. I will cover criteria a – d under the relevant headings below. Criterion e is not considered relevant.

Context of site, design and external spaces

8.3 The proposed dwelling is 1.5 storeys in scale with the upper floor accommodation being provided in the roof. The scale of the dwelling would clearly read as subservient to the host property on Ditton Lane. I note that the third party representation considers that the dwelling should only be single

storey and cites other examples in the area. In my view the 1.5 storey scale would be acceptable as it would remain subservient to the host dwelling and is of a scale which transitions from the full two storeys on Ditton Lane to the 1 storey scale of the garages to the rear.

8.4 The new building is proposed to be finished in brick with a natural slate roof. This is considered to be acceptable in principle, but details of materials are recommended to be provided by condition. There is currently a hedge and a number of trees which run along the side of the site behind the fence adjacent to the footpath; none of these are protected trees and they are small garden trees rather than large mature trees which are of any real amenity value. These would be removed to make way for the new dwelling. The applicant proposes some low level planting to the front of the site which in my view would be adequate to retain the sense of some greenery around the site.

8.5 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 52, 55, 56, 57 and 59.

Integrated water management and flood risk

8.6 The Drainage Officer is satisfied that the proposal is acceptable subject to a condition requiring details of the drainage system.

8.7 In my opinion the applicants have suitably addressed the issues of water management and flood risk, and the proposal is in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 31 and 32.

Noise and vibration

8.8 The Environmental Health Officer has no objection to the proposal subject to conditions relating to piling and to limit hours of construction and collections/deliveries to the site. I share his view and have recommended the suggested conditions.

8.9 In my opinion, subject to the conditions I have recommended, the applicants have suitably addressed the issues of noise and vibration and the proposal is in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 35.

Inclusive access

8.10 The applicant has confirmed that the dwelling would be capable of meeting with part M4(2) of Building Regulations. I have recommended a condition to require this to ensure compliance with policy 51.

8.11 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 51

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

8.12 The proposed new building would be 10.6m from the rear of the retained house at 84 Ditton Lane. The proposed building would result in some enclosure to the rear garden of 84 but I am satisfied that the majority of the garden would retain a good level of outlook and that the level of enclosure would not be significantly harmful to warrant refusal. I am satisfied that due to the low height of the new building, its siting on the plot set away from the garden of no 84 and the orientations of the plots, that the proposal would not result in any significant overshadowing to no 84. There are only high level windows and roof lights in the rear elevation above ground floor level. I recommend a condition requiring these windows to be at least 1.7m above the finished floor level or else obscure glazed and for the windows to be on restrictors to prevent any overlooking. I also recommend a condition to restrict permitted development rights for new windows.

8.13 In my opinion the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and I consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 35, 52, 55 and 56.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

8.14 The proposed new dwelling would exceed the internal space standards required by policy 50. The new unit would also benefit from a large rear garden. The garden would be overlooked by the existing house but this is not an unusual relationship in an urban setting. I am satisfied that adequate garden space would be retained by the host dwelling and I

recommend a condition requiring the curtilage to be laid out and retained as on the plans. The new unit is built close to the footpath but some planting is shown to be provided adjacent to windows to provide some defensible space. In my view the new dwelling would provide a high quality living environment for future occupiers.

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	2	4	2	79	91	+12

Size of external amenity space New unit – 60sqm
Retained unit – 95sqm

8.15 In my opinion the proposal provides a high-quality living environment and an appropriate standard of residential amenity for future occupiers, and I consider that in this respect it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 50 and 52.

Refuse Arrangements

8.16 Bin storage is shown to be tucked behind a gate to the rear of the property. I am satisfied that this arrangement would be acceptable.

8.17 In my opinion the proposal is compliant in this respect with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 52 and 57.

Highway Safety

8.18 The Highway Authority has no objection to the proposal subject to the imposition of a condition to ensure the site does not drain onto the public highway. I have recommended this condition. I note that the third party representation raises concerns about the safety of pedestrians and cyclists during construction. The highway authority has not raised any concerns about highway safety during construction and in my view the limited amount of construction traffic for the single dwelling are unlikely to have any significant adverse impact on pedestrian or cyclist safety.

8.19 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 81.

Car and Cycle Parking

8.20 One car parking space is proposed for the new unit. Car parking for the retained unit is to the front of the property and remains unchanged by the proposal. I am satisfied that this provision is acceptable given the sustainable location of the site.

8.21 A shed is proposed for cycle storage. I am satisfied that this is an acceptable arrangement and adequately large to accommodate the two cycle space required by policy. Cycle storage for the retained unit remains within an existing shed in the garden.

8.22 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 52 and 82.

Third Party Representations

8.23 I have addressed the third party representation within the body of my report. See below table:

Representation	Response
Concerned about pedestrian and cyclist safety as this corner is blind and there is a footpath, which is well used, on one side of the road only. Concerned that construction vehicles will impact on safety	See paragraph 8.18
Concerned about height and appearance of the building. Other new builds in the area have been single storey and the adjacent garages are also single storey.	See paragraph 8.3

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 The proposed new dwelling would provide a high quality living environment for future occupiers whilst respecting the amenity of surrounding occupiers. The dwelling is considered to be

acceptable in design terms and to respond to the surrounding context.

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 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as listed on this decision notice.

   Reason: In the interests of good planning, for the avoidance of doubt and to facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

3. No construction work or demolition work shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours and 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 2018 policy 35)

4. There shall be no collections from or deliveries to the site during the demolition and construction stages outside the hours of 0800 hours and 1800 hours on 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 2018 policy 35)

5. In the event of the foundations for the proposed development requiring piling, prior to the development taking place, other than demolition, the applicant shall provide the local authority with a report / method statement for approval detailing the type of piling and mitigation measures to be taken to protect local residents from noise and/or vibration. Potential noise and vibration levels at the nearest noise sensitive locations shall be predicted in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228-1&2:2009 Code of Practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

   Due to the proximity of this site to existing residential premises and other noise sensitive premises, impact pile driving is not recommended.

   Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35)

6. No development shall take place above ground level, other than demolition, until details of the external materials to be used in the construction of the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

   Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the development does not detract from the character and appearance of the area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 56 and 57)

7. Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Classes B and C of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no new windows or dormer windows (other than those expressly authorised by this permission), shall be constructed above ground floor level on the west or south elevations without the granting of specific planning permission.

   Reason: To protect the amenity of occupiers of adjoining properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 52, 55, and 57).

8. Prior to the occupation of the development, hereby permitted, the windows identified as having obscured glass on the approved plans shall be obscure glazed to a minimum level of obscurity to conform to Pilkington Glass level 3 or equivalent and shall have restrictors to ensure that the windows cannot be opened more than 45 degrees beyond the plane of the adjacent wall. . The rooflights on the western (rear) elevation shall be 1.7m above finished floor level or else obscure glazed and on restrictors to ensure that the windows cannot be opened more than 45 degrees beyond the plane of the adjacent wall. The glazing and rooflights shall thereafter be retained in accordance with the approved details

   Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies55, 57/58).

9. Prior to the occupation of the development, hereby permitted, the curtilage(s) of the approved dwelling(s) shall be fully laid out and finished in accordance with the approved plans. The curtilage(s) shall remain as such thereafter.

   Reason: To ensure an appropriate level of amenity for future occupiers and to avoid the property being built and occupied without its garden land (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 50, 52, 55 and 56)

10. The driveway hereby approved shall be constructed so that its falls and levels are such that no private water from the site drains across or onto the adopted public highway. Once constructed the driveway shall thereafter be retained as such.

    Reason: To prevent surface water discharging to the highway, in the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 81).

11. Prior to the commencement of development, other than demolition, a scheme for surface water drainage works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include an assessment of the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system in accordance with the principles set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and the National Planning Policy Guidance, and the results of the assessment provided to the Local Planning Authority. The system should be designed such that there is no surcharging for a 1 in 30 year event and no internal property flooding for a 1 in 100 year event + an allowance for climate change. The submitted details shall include the following:

    1) Information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters;

    2) A management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.

    The approved details shall be fully implemented on site prior to the first use/occupation and shall be retained thereafter.

    Reason: To ensure appropriate surface water drainage. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 31 and 32)

12. The cycle store shown on drawings 18/435/15 and 18/435/12 shall be provided prior to the occupation of the dwelling and shall be retained thereafter.

    Reason: To ensure adequate cycle storage for the new dwelling (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 52 and 82)

13. The new dwelling shall be constructed to meet the requirements of Part M4(2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings' of the Building Regulations 2010 (as amended 2016).

Reason: To secure the provision of accessible housing (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 51)

INFORMATIVE: Cambridge City Council recommends the use of low NOx boilers i.e. appliances that meet a dry NOx emission rating of 40mg/kWh, to minimise emissions from the development that may impact on air quality.

Reason: To protect local air quality and human health by ensuring that the production of air pollutants such as nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter are kept to a minimum during the lifetime of the development, to contribute toward National Air Quality Objectives in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Policy 36 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 and in accordance with Cambridge City Councils adopted Air Quality Action Plan (2018)

PLANNING COMMITTEE **4th September 2019**

Application Number	18/1712/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	7th November 2018	**Officer**	Alice Young
Target Date	2nd January 2019		
Ward	Kings Hedges		
Site	198A Kings Hedges Road Cambridge CB4 2PB		
Proposal	Extensions to existing development of flats (including an additional floor) to create three additional flats and one duplex unit.		
Applicant	Mr M Webb 33 St Andrews Street South Bury St Edmunds IP33 3PH		

SUMMARY	The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons: - The proposal would not harm the character of the area - The proposal is considered to have an acceptable impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers. - The proposal provides adequate amenity space for the proposed and existing units.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

1.1 198A Kings Hedges Road is on the north-eastern side of Kings Hedges Road and south of the guided busway which runs to the north of the site. The site comprises a two-storey brick building currently arranged as two one-bedroom flats and two two-bedroom flats set within a triangular shaped plot. The building provides communal outside amenity space to the front and rear

of the flats as well as bin and bike storage to the north west of the site.

1.2 The building is not listed or a building of local interest and does not fall within the conservation area. There are no tree preservation orders on site.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

2.1 The proposal seeks to extend the existing development of flats (including an additional floor, totalling three storeys) to create three additional flats including one duplex unit.

2.2 During the application process, the proposal was amended twice:

- to comply with the internal space standards and accessible homes
- by moving F2's balcony from the north-east to the north elevation to mitigate against overshadowing and enclosure to F1's outside amenity space. The bin store was also moved away from F2's balcony to increase the quality of the outdoor space.

2.3 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:

1. Design and access statement
2. Drawings

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
16/2227/S73	Section 73 application to vary condition 2 of planning permission 16/1027/FUL for a two storey extension to existing flats to form 2 no. additional 1 bed units.	Permitted
16/1027/FUL	Extension to existing flats to form 2 No. additional 1 bed studio units	Permitted
16/0379/FUL	Extension to existing flats to form 2No. additional 1 bed units	WDN dated

		28.04.2016
14/0851/FUL	2 storey front and side extension to flats	Permitted
13/1656/FUL	Erection of a 2 bedroom house. Resiting of parking spaces, bin and cycle store	WDN dated 21.01.2014

4.0 PUBLICITY

4.1

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

5.0 POLICY

5.1 See Appendix 1 for full details of Central Government Guidance, Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 **Relevant Development Plan policies**

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan 2018	1, 3 28, 31, 35 50, 51, 55, 56, 58, 82

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework February 2019 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014 Circular 11/95 (Annex A)

Supplementary Planning Guidance	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Cambridge Landscape and Character Assessment (2003) Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan (2011) Cambridgeshire Design Guide For Streets and Public Realm (2007) Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

6.1 No significant adverse effect upon the Public Highway should result from this proposal, should it gain benefit of Planning Permission.

Environmental Health

6.2 The development proposed is acceptable subject to the imposition of the construction hours condition.

Refuse and Recycling

6.3 No comments received.

Drainage

6.4 The development proposed is acceptable subject to the imposition of the surface water drainage condition.

Landscape

6.5 The development proposed is unacceptable and should be refused for the reason(s) set out below.

- The proposals do not provide private external amenity space for all of the new dwellings. Juliet balconies can be an acceptable option if the internal space is large enough to allow it to be used practically. As all the dwellings are under the internal space standards, it is considered that this is not the case. (Policy 50 External Residential Space Standards)
- The balcony to Flat 2, the duplex unit, is the only private external space proposed within this application overhangs the garden of the studio flat below which will create a poor quality space for the ground floor flat. The gardens are northeast facing and as such will achieve limited amounts of light, the overhang with further limit light and create a fairly dark and unpleasant space.

6.6 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 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations:

- 196 Kings Hedges Road

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- The addition of the third storey would adversely impact no.196 in terms of light and air
- Noise and disturbance
- Over-intensification of the small residential site would generate additional parking stress

7.3 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

Context of site, design and external spaces

8.1 The application site currently has an extant permission for the extension and provision of an additional two one bed studio flats which carries great weight within the assessment process. The proposed extension would be sited 1.7 metres beyond the existing front elevation of the existing flats in the same position as the previously approved scheme but at three storey instead of two. Whilst the section of Kings Hedges Road to the south-east has a uniform building line, the building line of the area in which the application site sits is not as uniform, with several buildings like Cambury Court being set further forward. Furthermore, given the site is the last building of this row, it is considered that the stepped building line would not adversely impact the prevailing character of the area. Whilst the proposed design would contrast with the prevailing two storey pitched roof terrace/semi-detached dwellings, it would bridge the gap between the industrial flat roofed units to the west and the pitched roof dwellings to the south-east. Therefore, I consider that the proposal would enhance the street scene and make a positive contribution to the character of the area.

8.2 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 55, 56, 58.

Disabled access

8.3 The proposal seeks to extend the existing building, but the two flats in this section (F1 and F2) would be accessed independently of the existing building and would need to comply with policy 51. However, due to the extant permission which was approved under the old local plan which did not require building regulations Part M4(2) compliance, it is the view of the council that it would be unreasonable to apply Part M4(2) to the previously approved units as these would remain the same.

8.4 The proposal is not compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 51, but significant weight has been given to the extant permission which is not Part M4(2) compliant.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

8.5 The proposal would result in a loss of communal amenity space to the north for the existing four flats. It is considered that due to the positioning of the existing block of flats within the triangular site, the existing usable amenity space is to the north. However, it is considered that this space is already compromised by the car parking and bike/bins store and therefore, does not provide a high-quality private amenity space. The development would retain land to the rear and front of the existing flats which would provide some level of amenity to the existing occupants. As such it is considered that the proposed extension to the north would not have an unacceptable impact upon the amenity of the existing flats.

8.6 No. 196 is south east of the application site. The proposed extensions would not project further than the existing rear of no. 196 and, therefore, the proposal would have a limited impact upon no.196's rear garden or rear habitable rooms.

8.7 The existing roof form is pitched with an eaves height of 5.25 metres which slopes upwards to 7.7 metres to the ridge. As the proposal is to erect a second floor on the existing block of flats, the proposal changes the roof profile. The section of proposed roof closest to the adjacent dwellinghouse (no. 196) would have a lean-to roof design (eaves 5.1 metres, ridge 6.1 metres) with a parapet on both the front and rear elevation. The second floor would be set in from the side elevation by 1.45 metres with an eaves height of 7.55 metres sloping up to 8.3 metres to the ridge, 4.55 metres from no. 196. By virtue of the proposed roof profile alongside the proposed heights and separation distance between the proposal and no. 196, it is considered that the overbearing and overshadowing impact to no. 196 would be limited. No. 196 has several openings on the side elevation adjacent to the application site, a high level window at ground floor which looks to serve the front garage, a side door at ground floor which appears to be a secondary opening, an obscure glazed window at ground floor and a first floor window which appears to serve a hallway. As this first-floor window serves a non-habitable room, the impact of the proposal on the residential amenity of no. 196 would not be significant.

8.8 As the proposed side elevation adjacent to no. 196 would not include any non-obscure glazed windows, the only potential overlooking impact to no. 196 could be the rear balcony serving F3. Due to the depth and width of the proposed balcony along with the privacy screen on the south-eastern elevation, it is considered that the proposal would not result in a loss of privacy or overlooking to no. 196.

8.9 In my opinion the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and I consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 55 and 58.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

8.10 The internal floor space has been amended throughout the application process to now comply with the requirements set out in policy 50. The gross internal floor space measurements for new 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
F1	1	1	1	37	38	+1
F2	2	3	2	70	74	+4
F3	2	3	1	61	82	+21

Size of external amenity space

8.11 Policy 50 states that all new residential units have to provide external private amenity space. The proposal provides a garden space to the north-east for F1, a balcony on the north-western elevation for F2 and a balcony on the north-eastern elevation for F3. The Landscape Officer and I shared concerns regarding the quality of the private amenity space attributed to F1 due to the overshadowing and enclosing impact caused by F2's balcony. The location of F2's balcony was amended during the application process to be on the northern elevation and so the private rear garden of F1 would be of acceptable quality. The private amenity space provided for all of the new units is sufficient size for a table and chairs which would result in an acceptable quality of amenity for future occupiers.

8.12 In my opinion the proposal provides a high-quality living environment and an appropriate standard of residential amenity for future occupiers, and I consider that in this respect it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 50 and 55.

Refuse Arrangements

8.13 A bin store is located to the north west of the site adjacent to the existing car parking spaces. The store is within adequate distance from the proposed new units and from the street for collection.

8.14 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 57.

Car and Cycle Parking

8.15 The proposal provides three car parking spaces and twenty cycle parking spaces. Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposal would result in a loss of two car parking spaces and an increase in occupants, it is considered that, due to the sustainable site location and the increased provision of cycle parking, the proposal would not result in unacceptable parking stress.

8.16 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 82.

Third Party Representations

8.17 Third party concerns in relation to light and car parking have been addressed in paragraphs 8.5-8.9 and 8.13 respectively. In terms of added noise and disturbance, despite the increase in the number of occupants on site, the majority of the proposed units would be located to the northwest of the site and as such would be located an adequate distance to offset the increase in noise and disturbance to no. 196.

9.0 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 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as listed on this decision notice.

   Reason: In the interests of good planning, for the avoidance of doubt and to facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

3. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the extension(s) hereby permitted shall be constructed in external materials to match the existing building in type, colour and texture.

   Reason: To ensure that the extension(s) is(are) in keeping with the existing building. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55 and 58)

4. Prior to first occupation of the development, hereby permitted, or commencement of the use, full details of facilities for the covered, secure parking of bicycles for use in connection with the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The facilities shall be provided in accordance with the approved details before the development is occupied or the use commences and shall be retained in accordance with the approved details thereafter.

   Reason: To ensure appropriate provision for the secure storage of bicycles. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 82)

5. Prior to the occupation of the development, hereby permitted, or the commencement of the use, full details of the on-site storage facilities for waste including waste for recycling shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall identify the specific positions of where wheeled bins will be stationed and the specific arrangements to enable collection from within 10m of the kerbside of the adopted highway/refuse collection vehicle access point. The approved facilities shall be provided prior to the occupation of the development or the commencement of the use hereby permitted and shall be retained thereafter for their intended use.

   Reason: To protect the amenities of nearby residents/occupiers and in the interests of visual amenity. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 35, 36 and 57)

6. No construction work or demolition work shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours and 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 2018 policy 35)

7. Prior to the commencement of development, other than demolition, a scheme for surface water drainage works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include an assessment of the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system in accordance with the principles set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and the National Planning Policy Guidance, and the results of the assessment provided to the Local Planning Authority. The system should be designed such that there is no surcharging for a 1 in 30 year event and no internal property flooding for a 1 in 100 year event + an allowance for climate change. The submitted details shall include the following:

   1) Information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters;

2) A management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.

The approved details shall be fully implemented on site prior to the first use/occupation and shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure appropriate surface water drainage. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 31 and 32)

8. Prior to first occupation of F3, the privacy screen shall be provided in accordance with drawing no. P-03 REV E and shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 55 and 58).