



Cambridge City Council Planning

Date: Wednesday, 1 August 2018

Time: 12.30 pm

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

Contact: democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk, tel:01223 457013

Agenda

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**
No Major Planning Applications
- **Part Two**
Minor/Other Planning Applications
Start time: 12.30pm
- **Part Three**
No General and Enforcement Items

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
To follow

Part 2: Minor/Other Planning Applications (12.30pm)

5	18/0560/FUL - 1 Redfern Close	(Pages 17 - 42)
6	18/0509/FUL - 15A Vinery Road	(Pages 43 - 70)
7	18/0778/S73 - 77 Shelford Road	(Pages 71 - 140)
8	17/2050/FUL - 64 Coleridge Road and Land r/o 62 and 60 Coleridge Road	(Pages 141 - 172)
9	18/0618/FUL - Land adj to 22 Mill End Close	(Pages 173 - 192)
10	18/0221/FUL - 48 Chesterton Road	(Pages 193 - 204)

Planning Members: Smart (Chair), Blencowe (Vice-Chair), Hart, Hipkin, McQueen, Nethsingha, Page-Croft, Sinnott, Thornburrow and Tunnacliffe

Alternates: Baigent, Gillespie and Holt

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 457013

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

(Updated August 2015)

1.0 Central Government Advice

1.1 **National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)** – 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
- Air quality
- Appeals
- Before submitting an application
- Climate change
- Conserving and enhancing the historic environment
- Consultation and pre-decision matters
- Crown Development
- Design
- Determining a planning application
- Duty to cooperate
- Ensuring effective enforcement
- Ensuring the vitality of town centres
- Environmental Impact Assessment
- Flexible options for planning permissions
- Flood Risk and Coastal Change
- Hazardous Substances
- Health and wellbeing
- Housing and economic development needs assessments
- Land affected by contamination
- Land stability
- Lawful development certificates
- Light pollution
- Local Plans

Making an application
Minerals
Natural Environment
Neighbourhood Planning
Noise
Open space, sports and recreational facilities, public rights of way and local green space
Planning obligations
Renewable and low carbon energy
Rural housing
Strategic environmental assessment and sustainability appraisal
Travel plans, transport assessments and statements in decision-taking
Tree Preservation Orders and trees in conservation areas
Use of Planning Conditions
Viability
Water supply, wastewater and water quality
When is permission required?

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

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 : 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 2006

3/1 Sustainable development
3/3 Setting of the City
3/4 Responding to context
3/6 Ensuring coordinated development
3/7 Creating successful places
3/9 Watercourses and other bodies of water
3/10 Subdivision of existing plots
3/11 The design of external spaces
3/12 The design of new buildings
3/13 Tall buildings and the skyline
3/14 Extending buildings
3/15 Shopfronts and signage

4/1 Green Belt

4/2 Protection of open space
4/3 Safeguarding features of amenity or nature conservation value
4/4 Trees
4/6 Protection of sites of local nature conservation importance
4/8 Local Biodiversity Action Plans
4/9 Scheduled Ancient Monuments/Archaeological Areas
4/10 Listed Buildings
4/11 Conservation Areas
4/12 Buildings of Local Interest
4/13 Pollution and amenity
4/14 Air Quality Management Areas
4/15 Lighting

5/1 Housing provision
5/2 Conversion of large properties
5/3 Housing lost to other uses
5/4 Loss of housing
5/5 Meeting housing needs
5/7 Supported housing/Housing in multiple occupation
5/8 Travellers
5/9 Housing for people with disabilities
5/10 Dwelling mix
5/11 Protection of community facilities
5/12 New community facilities
5/15 Addenbrookes

6/1 Protection of leisure facilities
6/2 New leisure facilities
6/3 Tourist accommodation
6/4 Visitor attractions
6/6 Change of use in the City Centre
6/7 Shopping development and change of use in the District and Local Centres
6/8 Convenience shopping
6/9 Retail warehouses
6/10 Food and drink outlets.

7/1 Employment provision
7/2 Selective management of the Economy
7/3 Protection of Industrial and Storage Space
7/4 Promotion of cluster development
7/5 Faculty development in the Central Area, University of Cambridge
7/6 West Cambridge, South of Madingley Road
7/7 College and University of Cambridge Staff and Student Housing

7/8 Anglia Ruskin University East Road Campus
7/9 Student hostels for Anglia Ruskin University
7/10 Speculative Student Hostel Accommodation
7/11 Language Schools

8/1 Spatial location of development
8/2 Transport impact
8/4 Walking and Cycling accessibility
8/6 Cycle parking
8/8 Land for Public Transport
8/9 Commercial vehicles and servicing
8/10 Off-street car parking
8/11 New roads
8/12 Cambridge Airport
8/13 Cambridge Airport Safety Zone
8/14 Telecommunications development
8/15 Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory, Lords Bridge
8/16 Renewable energy in major new developments
8/17 Renewable energy
8/18 Water, sewerage and drainage infrastructure

9/1 Further policy guidance for the Development of Areas of Major Change
9/2 Phasing of Areas of Major Change
9/3 Development in Urban Extensions
9/5 Southern Fringe
9/6 Northern Fringe
9/7 Land between Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road
9/8 Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road
9/9 Station Area

10/1 Infrastructure improvements

Planning Obligation Related Policies

3/7 Creating successful places
3/8 Open space and recreation provision through new development
3/12 The Design of New Buildings (*waste and recycling*)
4/2 Protection of open space
5/13 Community facilities in Areas of Major Change
5/14 Provision of community facilities through new development
6/2 New leisure facilities
8/3 Mitigating measures (*transport*)
8/5 Pedestrian and cycle network

- 8/7 Public transport accessibility
- 9/2 Phasing of Areas of Major Change
- 9/3 Development in Urban Extensions
- 9/5 Southern Fringe
- 9/6 Northern Fringe
- 9/8 Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road
- 9/9 Station Area
- 10/1 Infrastructure improvements (*transport, public open space, recreational and community facilities, waste recycling, public realm, public art, environmental aspects*)

4.0 **Supplementary Planning Documents**

- 4.1 **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.
- 4.2 **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.
- 4.3 **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.
- 4.4 **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.

4.5 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.

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

4.7 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.

5.0 Material Considerations

5.1 City Wide Guidance

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

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.

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

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.

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

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

Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire 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.

Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2005) – Study assessing the risk of flooding in Cambridge.

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 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

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

Green Infrastructure Strategy for the Cambridgeshire Sub-Region (2006) - Produced by Cambridgeshire Horizons to assist the implementation of the Areas of Major Change and as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications and appeals.

A Major Sports Facilities Strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region (2006) - Produced by Cambridgeshire Horizons to assist the implementation of the Areas of Major Change.

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

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.

Cambridge City Council - Guidance for the application of Policy 3/13 (Tall Buildings and the Skyline) of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) (2012) - sets out in more detail how existing council policy can be applied to proposals for tall buildings or those of significant massing in the city.

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

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.

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.

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.

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 compliments the Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document.

The Cambridge Shopfront Design Guide (1997) – Guidance on new shopfronts.

Roof Extensions Design Guide (2003) – Guidance on roof extensions.

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

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

Interim Planning Policy Guidance on the Protection of Public Houses in the City of Cambridge (2012) - This interim guidance will provide a policy framework prior to adoption of the new Local Plan to clarify the circumstances when it is acceptable for a public house to be lost to alternative uses and when it is not acceptable. The guidance will also be used to help determine planning applications relating to the loss of a current or former public house to alternative uses.

5.2 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 Plan 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.

Brooklands Avenue Conservation Area Appraisal (2013)
Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal (2006)
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 (1996)
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 (2008)
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.

Mitcham's Corner Area Strategic Planning and Development Brief (2003) – Guidance on the development and improvement of Mitcham's Corner.

Mill Road Development Brief (Robert Sayle Warehouse and Co-Op site) (2007) – Development Brief for Proposals Site 7.12 in the Cambridge Local Plan (2006)

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING COMMITTEE

DATE: 1ST AUGUST 2018

Application Number	18/0560/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	11th April 2018	Officer	Charlotte Burton
Target Date	6th June 2018		
Ward	Arbury		
Site	1 Redfern Close		
Proposal	Erection of 1 x 3bed detached dwelling, with associated access and landscaping, following the demolition of the existing garage of No.1 Redfern Close.		
Applicant	GU & SUN C/O Agent		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The proposal would respond positively to the character of the area;</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The proposal would respect the amenity of neighbouring properties and provide a high quality living environment for the future occupants;</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The proposal complies with the Council's adopted maximum car parking standards and would not have a significant adverse impact on the local highway network.</p>
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

1.1 The application site is situated on the north-west corner of a crossroads at the junction of Brimley Road with Redfern Close, Wynborne Close and Durnford Way. The existing dwelling is semi-detached with an attached single garage to the side and a conservatory to the rear.

1.2 Redfern Close is a cul-de-sac and comprises a mixture of pairs of semi-detached and detached dwellings. The site is not within a conservation area and the site falls outside the controlled parking zone. There are no other relevant site constraints.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

2.1 The proposal is for the erection of a detached 3-bed dwelling (111sqm gross internal floor area), with associated access and landscaping, following the demolition of the existing garage of No.1 Redfern Close. The new dwelling would be separated from the existing dwelling by a gap of 1m.

2.2 The dwelling would have a pitched roof and would be similar in appearance to the existing dwelling. The materials would be brick and pantiles. There would be a porch on the front elevation and chimney stacks.

2.3 The dwelling would have a garden to the rear of the site. The existing brick wall at the front of the site, and brick wall and close boarded fence along Brimley Road would be retained. A new 1.8m high close boarded fence would be retained.

2.4 The existing vehicular access from Redfern Close would be widened to provide a car parking space for the new unit and the existing dwelling. Bin storage would be provided at the rear accessed via a gap of 1m between the dwelling and the site boundary.

2.5 During the course of the application, updated plans were submitted showing the location of recently removed trees on the site, the proposed boundary treatments and permeable paving, an updated internal layout, and a cycle store within the rear garden.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
17/1850/FUL	Two storey side and front extension and change of use to a 7 person HMO (House in Multiple Occupation).	Withdrawn

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 2006 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN		POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Plan 2006	Local	3/1 3/4 3/7 3/10 3/11 3/12 4/4 4/13 5/1 8/2 8/6 8/10

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework March 2012 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014 Circular 11/95 (Annex A) Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard – published by Department of Communities and Local Government March 2015 (material consideration)
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	<u>City Wide Guidance</u> Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (November 2010) Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2005) Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan (2011) Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)

5.4 Status of Proposed Submission – Cambridge Local Plan

Planning applications should be determined in accordance with policies in the adopted Development Plan and advice set out in the NPPF. However, after consideration of adopted plans and the NPPF, policies in emerging plans can also be given some weight when determining applications. For Cambridge, therefore, the emerging revised Local Plan as published for consultation on 19 July 2013 can be taken into account, especially those policies where there are no or limited objections to it. However it is likely, in the vast majority of instances, that the adopted development plan and the NPPF will have considerably more weight than emerging policies in the revised Local Plan.

For the application considered in this report, there are no policies in the emerging Local Plan that should be taken into account.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

- 6.1 The proposal should have no significant impact on the public highway, should it gain the benefit of planning permission, subject to the incorporation of the conditions and informatives for no unbound material, no gates to be erected, access construction, adequate drainage, visibility splays, and no obstruction.

Environmental Health

- 6.2 No objection subject to standard conditions and informatives to control construction/demolition hours, a dust informative and piling condition.

Urban Design Team

- 6.3 No objection.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

Initial comment

- 6.4 The three attractive birch trees in the corner of the frontage should be afforded every chance to be retained in the proposed application. No indication of existing landscape has been shown on the plans or identified for removal or retention. Please include a site plan which shows retained and removed landscape. A tree protection plan is needed to ensure protection for any retained trees.
- 6.5 Secure cycle storage needs to be included in the scheme. If the cycle store is to be in the rear garden, the side access is required to be increased to 1200mm minimum. A street light exists in the general vicinity of the driveway widening. This needs to be shown on the plans and relocating it may be required.

Comment on response from applicant and confirmation that trees have been removed

6.6 No objection

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Officer)

6.7 Part of the site is shown to be at risk of surface water flooding. An assessment of the surface water flood risk is required to ensure that the proposed development will not be at risk of surface water flooding and will not increase the flood risk elsewhere.

UK Power Networks

Initial response 24.04.2018

6.8 Objection. UK Power Networks is the owner/occupier of the electricity substation location within 6m of the proposed works. The appropriate protective measures and mitigation solutions should be agreed and a Party Wall Notice should be served*.

* Officer note: the Party Wall Notice is not a planning matter.

Response to additional information from the applicant 26.04.2018

6.9 Objection removed following confirmation of the distances between the proposed development and the UK Power Networks asset.

6.10 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 objecting to the proposal:

- 2 Redfern Close
- 3 Redfern Close
- 4 Redfern Close

- 5 Redfern Close
- 7 Redfern Close
- 8 Redfern Close
- 11 Redfern Close
- 14 Redfern Close
- 23 Redfern Close
- 88 Coleridge Road
- The Bike Depot, 140 Cowley Road (Camcycle)
- 39 Durnford Way
- 1 Eden Street
- 6 Montgomery Road
- 18 Montgomery Road
- 1 Wynborne Close
- 5 Wynborne Close
- 6 Wynborne Close
- 77 High Street, Longstanton

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Character

- Not in keeping with how houses have been modernised in Redfern Close
- Will set precedent for similar development in the area
- Control over further extensions to the properties
- Degradation of garden space
- Removal of trees of high amenity value has already occurred
- No replacement trees proposed.
- Existing dwelling should be modernised but not with a new dwelling

Residential amenity

- Loss of privacy and overlooking neighbouring properties
- Loss of light to bedroom windows and loss of privacy affecting No. 2 Redfern Close
- Removal of utility room for host dwelling will increase noise on No. 3 Redfern Close.

Parking and highway safety

- Insufficient car parking
- Transport assessment is required
- The proposed increase in density is too great

- Parking, access and highway safety concerns resulting from additional on-street parking
- Redfern Close is too narrow to allow on street parking opposite a driveway, and manoeuvring around the corner from Brimley Road if there is a car trying to exit Redfern Close is already difficult
- Would make entering and leaving neighbouring properties including No. 2 Redfern Close dangerous or impossible
- Impact of additional parked cars on children cycling around the corner due to decreased visibility.
- Development gain money should be used to add double yellow lines to prevent blocking neighbouring driveways
- Likely to be occupied as a house in multiple occupation (HMO) as evidenced by previous application, which would attract more vehicles.
- Likely to be a transient renting population across the two properties
- Occupant should be discouraged from owning more than one car
- The owners would not control how many cars are parked there.
- Heavy congestion
- More ugly street verge parking.

Other

- No affordable housing
- Inadequate cycle parking which provides no alternative to car ownership
- Additional strain on the local water and sewage
- Impact on local water pressure
- Loss of street lamp will impact on safety
- Safety of building so close to the electricity substation
- Applicant does not live locally and has failed to engage with local residents

7.3 Councillor Sheil has requested that the application is called in to the planning committee unless officers are minded to refuse the application. No grounds for the call in have been provided. However, the application is automatically referred under the Scheme of Delegation as objections have been received.

7.4 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. Car and cycle parking
6. Highway safety
7. Surface water drainage
8. Third party representations

Principle of Development

8.2 Policy 5/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) states that proposals for housing development on windfall sites will be permitted subject to the existing land use and compatibility with adjoining land uses. The site is within an existing residential area and therefore the proposal for an additional unit is compatible with this.

8.3 The site forms part of the curtilage of No. 1 Redfern Close and therefore policy 3/10 for the sub-division of existing plots applies. This supports residential development within the garden area or curtilage of existing properties unless it will:

- a. Have a significant adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties through loss of privacy, loss of light, an overbearing sense of enclosure and the generation of unreasonable levels of traffic or noise disturbance;
- b. provide inadequate amenity space, or vehicular access arrangements and parking spaces for the proposed and existing properties;

- c. detract from the prevailing character and appearance of the area;
 - d. adversely affect the setting of Listed Buildings, or buildings or gardens of local interest within or close to the site;
 - e. adversely affect trees, wildlife features or architectural features of local importance located within or close to the site; and
 - f. prejudice the comprehensive development of the wider area of which the site forms part.
- 8.4 For the reasons given below, I consider that the proposal has an acceptable impact on neighbouring properties, provides a good level of amenity for the future occupants, is appropriate to the character of the area, and complies with policy 3/10.
- 8.5 Thus the principle of development is acceptable in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 5/1 and 3/10.

Context of site, design and external spaces

- 8.6 The existing dwelling is a semi-detached two storey property constructed in red brick with pantiles. There is a relative consistency of design along Redfern Close and within the wider estate, however some properties have been extended and altered, and there is some variation in form, such as the bungalow at No. 2 Redfern Close opposite the site. The proposed dwelling has been designed to fit in with No. 1. The new dwelling would be on the same building line as No. 1, continuing the same pattern of driveways and front gardens along Redfern Close. The eaves and ridge height would be consistent with No. 1. The elevation would have a similar arrangement and proportion of windows, front door and porch. The materials would match the host property and I have recommended a condition to secure this. In my opinion, this is an appropriate design response which would fit in with the streetscene and the character of the area.
- 8.7 The proposed dwelling's position within the garden of a spacious corner plot would result in the loss of openness on this corner. These spacious corner plots are common within the area, such as Montgomery Road and Brimley Road. However, I do not consider that the loss of this openness would be harmful to the street scene. There is enough variety of building lines

within the area so that the spacious corner plots do not define the character of the area. Moreover, since the scale and design of the property would be in-keeping with the other properties along Redfern Close and the wider area, I do not consider it would be unduly prominent. The side elevation would be set off the boundary by 1m and behind the existing boundary treatment along Brimley Road which would be retained. The existing street trees along Brimley Road would soften the appearance of the building.

8.8 Third parties have raised concerns about trees that have recently been removed on the site following the withdrawal of the previous application. The applicant has updated the site plan to show the location of those trees that were removed, including birch trees at the front of the site and others along the Brimley Road side of the site. These trees were not protected and therefore the Council had no control over their removal or recourse to require their replacement. The proposed site plan shows planting within the front garden and at the rear of the site which would provide a garden setting for the new dwelling appropriate to the character of the area. There are two mature street trees and a recently planted specimen on the Brimley Road verge. In my opinion, these street trees would soften the visual appearance of the proposed dwelling. The landscape officer has no objection to the proposal.

8.9 For these reasons, in my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/10, 3/11, 4/4 and 3/12.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

8.10 I have assessed the impact on the host dwelling (No. 1 Redfern Close), the bungalow opposite (No. 2 Redfern Close) and the property to the rear (No. 2 Montgomery Road) and the wider area in the sections below.

. No. 1 Redfern Close

8.11 This is a 3-bed property within a large corner plot. The proposed dwelling would occupy the side garden, however the property would retain a good sized garden to the rear which

would be a similar size to other properties along Redfern Close. This would provide a good level of amenity.

8.12 The two storey element of the proposed building would be on the same building line and of a similar scale to No. 1. The single storey rear element would project 3m from the rear elevation along the new boundary to be created with the host dwelling. The eaves of the single storey element would be 2.5m high and the highest part of the sloped roof would be 3.3m. This would not have a significant impact on the ground floor kitchen and dining room windows of No. 1 or this property's amenity space.

8.13 There are no windows on the existing side elevation that would be affected. The property would retain a parking space in front of the dwelling and a 1m wide gap between the existing dwelling and the new boundary would provide access to the rear. While this passageway is less than 1.1m wide for bin and bike access, there would be space for the occupants to store these within the front garden if they wish to.

. No. 2 Redfern Close

8.14 This is a detached bungalow on the opposite side of Redfern Close to the application site. The bungalow has a driveway at the front. I understand from the objection submitted by the owner/occupant that there is a bedroom window on the front elevation and concerns have been raised that the proposal would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy and loss of light. The proposed dwelling would introduce new windows facing towards No. 2. This includes on the first floor one large bedroom window and two smaller windows serving a bathroom which is not a habitable room. The distance between the proposed front elevation to the front elevation of No. 2 would be approximately 26m. While I appreciate that the windows on the proposed dwelling would have more direct views towards No. 2 than the existing windows on No. 1 which are more oblique, in my opinion the separation distance is similar to the relationship between other properties on opposite sides of Redfern Close and would not result in an unacceptable loss of privacy. This property has private amenity space to the rear so views from the proposed first floor windows would not have a significant impact on residential amenity. The proposed dwelling would be to the east of No. 2 and due to the separation distance would

not have a significant impact in terms of loss of light. In this regard, again the impact is similar to other properties along Redfern Close.

. No. 2 Montgomery Road

8.15 This is a two storey semi-detached property fronting Montgomery Road with a side and rear garden which backs on the garden of No. 1 Redfern Close, albeit with the electricity substation in between. The proposed dwelling would introduce new first floor windows facing towards No. 2 and its rear garden, however the relationship would be similar to the existing situation. The distance between the proposed first floor windows and the garden of No. 2 would be approximately 18m. I am satisfied the proposal would not have a significant impact on the amenity of the occupants of this property.

. Wider area

8.16 I am not concerned about the impact on No. 42 Brimley Road to the west due to the separation distance of over 21m between the side elevation of the proposal and the front elevation of the dwelling. The area at the front of this property does not provide private amenity space. The proposed drawings show the first floor windows on the side elevation would be obscured.

8.17 The Environmental Health team has recommended conditions and informatives to control construction and demolition hours, piling and dust in order to protect the amenity of residents within the wider area. These conditions are necessary and reasonable in my opinion.

8.18 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 (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/10.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

8.19 The floor space of the proposed unit would be 111sqm. This significantly exceeds the 87sqm standard for a 3-bed (4 person) dwelling within the 'Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard' published by Department of

Communities and Local Government (March 2015) (THS) which is a material consideration. Using the THS as guidance, I am satisfied that the proposal would provide a good quality living environment. The unit would have a good-sized garden which would provide amenity space that is a similar size to other units along Redfern Close and appropriate for the size of the unit and the level of amenity that the future occupants moving into this area would expect.

- 8.20 The revised site plan shows bin and bike storage within the rear garden. The access from the front of the site along the side of the property to the rear garden would be 1m wide which is too narrow to comply with the Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010). However, a side gate would provide access from the footpath on Brimley Road, which would be a more convenient arrangement.
- 8.21 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 (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12.

Refuse Arrangements

- 8.22 As above, bins would be stored within the rear garden in a convenient location. Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012). In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12 in this regard.

Car and Cycle Parking

- . Car parking

- 8.23 The garage to the existing dwelling would be lost, however the host dwelling would retain one car parking space on the driveway in front of the property. The new dwelling would also have one car parking space. This is in accordance with the Council's adopted maximum car parking standards and complies with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/10.

8.24 Third parties have raised concerns about the proposed car parking levels and the impact of additional demand for on-street parking. In my opinion, there would be no sound policy basis on which to recommend refusal of the application on parking grounds. The proposal provides off-street parking for both units. The Highways Authority has raised no concerns about additional demand for on-street car parking spaces impacting on highway safety.

. Cycle parking

8.25 As above, updated plans show a cycle store within the rear garden which would provide space to park two cycles in accordance with the Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010). The store would be accessible from the street via a side gate onto Brimley Road. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/6.

Highway Safety

8.26 Third parties have raised strong concerns about parking, access and highway safety resulting from additional demand for on-street parking and increased traffic congestion. As explained above, the proposed car parking levels comply with the Council's adopted maximum car parking standards. The Highways Authority has not advised me that there would be reasonable grounds on which the proposed parking arrangements or additional traffic generated would have a significant impact on highway safety. I accept their advice. I have addressed the specific concerns of residents on this matter in the section below. Visibility splays would be provided within the site for the widened vehicle access. The Highways Authority has recommended conditions to secure acceptable arrangements for the access. Subject to these conditions, in my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Surface Water Drainage

8.27 The Sustainable Drainage Engineer has advised that part of the site is shown to be at risk of surface water flooding. An assessment of the surface water flood risk is required to ensure that the proposed development will not be at risk of surface

water flooding and will not increase the flood risk elsewhere. I am satisfied that this can be resolved through conditions due to the large permeable areas within the site which provide sustainable drainage options.

Third Party Representations

8.28 I have addressed the third party representations as follows:

Representation	Response
<u>Character</u>	
Not in keeping with how houses have been modernised in Redfern Close	I have provided my reasons in my assessment why in my opinion the proposal is in-keeping with the character of the area.
Will set precedent for similar development in the area	Proposals for similar developments within the area – should these come forward – would be assessed on their own merits.
Control over further extensions to the properties	The proposed dwelling would be in a relatively prominent position particularly in views towards the rear along Brimley Road. In my opinion, the proposal is acceptable because it has been sensitively designed to complement the existing street scene. I agree that later extensions and alterations – particularly to the roof form – could increase the scale and bulk of the building, making it more prominent within the street scene. I have therefore recommended conditions to remove permitted development rights for roof extensions and other extensions, which in my opinion are necessary and reasonable.

Degradation of garden space	I have provided my reasons in my assessment above why I consider that the loss of the side garden is acceptable.
Removal of trees of high amenity value has already occurred	These trees were not protected and the Council had not control over their removal.
No replacement trees proposed.	For the reason given in my assessment, the proposal is acceptable without replacement planting, due partly to the presence of street trees which provide greenery along Brimley Road. The landscape officer has not objected.
Existing dwelling should be modernised but not with a new dwelling	The application has to be assessed on the basis of the proposal submitted and not an alternative scheme.
<u>Residential amenity</u>	
Loss of privacy and overlooking neighbouring properties	See relevant section of assessment.
Loss of light to bedroom windows and loss of privacy affecting No. 2 Redfern Close	See relevant section of assessment.
Removal of utility room for host dwelling will increase noise on No. 3 Redfern Close.	I have no information on the relocation of the existing utility room within No. 1. Nonetheless, the potentially noise generating facilities within a utility room – presumably washing machines and the like – are domestic in nature and would not have an unacceptable impact.
<u>Parking and highway safety</u>	
Insufficient car parking	I have explained in my assessment that the proposal meets the Council's adopted maximum car parking standards and that in my
The proposed increase in density is too great	
Parking, access and highway safety concerns resulting from	

additional on-street parking	<p>opinion there are no reasonable grounds on which to recommend the proposed car parking would be unacceptable. The Highways Authority has not raised concerns that the proposal would have a significant impact on highway safety.</p>
Redfern Close is too narrow to allow on street parking opposite a driveway, and manoeuvring around the corner from Brimley Road if there is a car trying to exit Redfern Close is already difficult	
Would make entering and leaving neighbouring properties including No. 2 Redfern Close dangerous or impossible	
Impact of additional parked cars on children cycling around the corner due to decreased visibility.	
Heavy congestion	<p>Transport assessments are not normally required for proposals for single dwellings. The Highways Authority has not recommended one is necessary.</p>
Transport assessment is required	
Development gain money should be used to add double yellow lines to prevent blocking neighbouring driveways	<p>The Highways Authority has not requested planning obligations to mitigate the impact of the development, so this would not be sought.</p>
Likely to be occupied as a house in multiple occupation (HMO) as evidenced by previous application, which would attract more vehicles.	<p>Dwellings can be occupied as HMOs for up to 6 people under permitted development without the need for planning permission. In my opinion, I have no reasonable grounds to recommend that this permitted development right should be removed for the proposed unit, as I have no evidence that an HMO would have an unacceptable impact on residential amenity or highway safety.</p>

Likely to be a transient renting population across the two properties	The Council has no control over whether the properties are owner-occupied or rented. Nonetheless, the assessment of the impact is the same for both scenarios. I have no evidence that the occupation by renters would have a significant impact on the local highway network compared to owner-occupation.
Occupant should be discouraged from owning more than one car	The Council has no mechanism to discourage the future occupants from owning multiple cars, much like it does not have any powers to restrict any of the existing occupants of Redfern Close from purchasing cars. The existing competition for on-street parking would serve to discourage future occupants who rely on more than one vehicle from choosing to move into the units.
The owners would not control how many cars are parked there.	
More ugly street verge parking.	I have no reasonable grounds on which to take the view that the current proposal would result in significant levels of on-verge parking.
<u>Other</u>	
No affordable housing	The proposal for a single dwelling would not trigger the requirement to provide affordable housing under Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 5/5, which sets a threshold of 15 units or more, or sites of 0.5 hectares or more.
Inadequate cycle parking which provides no alternative to car ownership	Updated plans submitted during the course of the application show a cycle store in the rear garden of the

	proposed unit which meets the Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Development (2010).
Additional strain on the local water and sewage	The recommended surface water drainage condition would ensure that surface water is suitably drained. Connection into the sewerage network would require consent from Anglian Water.
Impact on local water pressure	This is a civil matter and not a planning matter.
Loss of street lamp will impact on safety	Consent would be required from the Highways Authority for the removal of the street lamp and the impact on safety would be a consideration in determining whether this is acceptable or requires relocation of the street lamp.
Safety of building so close to the electricity substation	UK Power Networks who own/occupy the substation have advised that the proposal is acceptable due to the distance between the proposed dwelling and the substation. The Environmental Health team has raised no concerns about the substation for the future occupants.
Applicant does not live locally and has failed to engage with local residents	The abode of the applicant is not a relevant planning matter, however it is regrettable that the local residents feel that the applicant has failed to engage with them as this is encouraged in the National Planning Policy Framework.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 In summary, I acknowledge the strong local opposition to this proposal primarily based on parking and highway safety

concerns. However the proposed car parking complies with the Council's adopted maximum car parking standards and the Highways Authority has advised me that there would be no highway safety grounds on which to recommend refusal. I accept this advice. In my opinion, the proposal would make good use of the site to provide an additional dwelling with a good level of residential amenity for the future occupants. The proposal complies with the adopted development plan and - in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development at the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) - the officer recommendation is for approval subject to conditions.

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. 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 2006 policy 4/13)

4. In the event of the foundations for the proposed development requiring piling, prior to the development taking place 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 2006 policy 4/13)

5. Prior to commencement of the development hereby permitted (other than demolition), a surface water drainage scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This shall:
 - a) include the results of the 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 associated Guidance. The scheme 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
 - b) 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
 - c) 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.

Prior to occupation of the development, the surface water drainage scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed details, and managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the agreed management and maintenance plan.

Reason: In the interests of surface water management (National Planning Policy Framework 2012).

6. Prior to the commencement of use of the widened access hereby approved, the vehicular access where it crosses the public highway shall be laid out and constructed in accordance with the Cambridgeshire County Council construction specification. The access and parking areas shall be constructed with adequate drainage measures to prevent surface water run-off onto the adjacent public highway. No unbound material shall be used in the surface finish of the driveway within 6 metres of the highway boundary of the site. Thereafter, the access and parking areas shall be retained in accordance with the approved plans and free of obstruction.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2).

7. Prior to the commencement of use of the widened vehicle access hereby approved, two 2.0 x 2.0 metre visibility splays shall be provided as shown on the approved drawings. Thereafter this area shall be retained and kept clear of all planting, fencing, walls and the like exceeding 600mm high.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2).

8. Notwithstanding the provision of Class A of Schedule 2, Part 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, (or any order revoking, amending or re-enacting that order) no gates shall be erected across the approved vehicular access unless details have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2).

9. Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class 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 enlargement, improvement or other alteration of the dwellinghouse(s) shall not be allowed without the granting of specific planning permission.

Reason: To protect the character of the area (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/12).

10. Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class B 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 without the granting of specific planning permission.

Reason: To protect the character of the area (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/12).

11. The materials used in the construction of the external elevations of the dwelling hereby permitted shall match those used on the original dwelling at No. 1 Redfern Close in terms of the type, colour and texture.

Reason: To ensure the proposal responds to the context (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/12).

12. Prior to the first occupation of the dwelling hereby permitted, the curtilage (garden) of the dwelling shall be fully laid out in accordance with the approved plans. This shall include the erection of curtilage boundaries in accordance with the approved plans. Thereafter the curtilage shall remain for the benefit of the occupants of the proposed property and the boundaries shall be retained.

Reason: To avoid a scenario whereby the property could be built and occupied without its garden land, which is currently part of the host property (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11 and 3/10).

HIGHWAYS 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.

DUST INFORMATIVE: As the proposal involves demolition of a garage, 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

PLANNING COMMITTEE

DATE: 1ST AUGUST 2018

Application Number	18/0509/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	3rd April 2018	Officer	Mairead O'Sullivan
Target Date	29th May 2018		
Ward	Romsey		
Site	15A Vinery Road		
Proposal	Demolition of existing commercial unit and the provision of 6 residential units along with access and associated landscaping and works.		
Applicant	N/A C/O Agent		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The proposed design would preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area - The proposal would not have any significant adverse impact on the amenity of surrounding occupiers - 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 encompasses part of an industrial building which lies to the west of the southern end of Vinery Road. The site is accessed between a gap in the houses (13 and 15 Vinery Road). Part of the building is not within the site edged red; this remains unchanged and has its own access further north on the street. To the south of the site is a car park which serves the Mill Road doctor's surgery. To the west of the site are the

residential gardens of properties on Belgrave Road. To the east of the site are residential gardens of properties on Vinery Road. The area is predominantly residential in character but in close proximity to more commercial uses in the Mill Road east local centre.

- 1.2 The site lies within the Mill Road Character Area of the central Conservation Area.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The application seeks full planning permission for the demolition of the existing commercial unit and construction of a new block comprised of 6 flats.

- 2.2 The replacement building is of a similar scale to existing but with some glazing and revised materials. The new building would attach to the retained industrial building and would have a height to match the existing/retained building. The brick would match existing and a light grey zinc standing seam roof is proposed. The site would be accessed from Vinery Road. The building would be divided into three floors; lower ground, upper ground and first floor. Bike and bin storage is proposed to the front of the building but in a position set back from the street. There is also some landscaping shown to the frontage but this is predominantly to provide defensible space to the front of the units.

- 2.3 The application has been submitted following the withdrawal of a previous application due to concerns about amenity for future occupiers.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
17/2253/FUL	Demolition of existing commercial unit and the provision of 7 residential units along with access, associated landscaping and works.	Withdrawn

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 2006 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan 2006	3/1 3/4 3/7 3/11 3/12 4/3, 4/11 4/13 4/15 5/1 7/3 8/2 8/6 8/10 10/1

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework March 2012 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014 Circular 11/95 (Annex A) Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard – published by Department of Communities and Local Government March 2015 (material consideration)
-----------------------------	--

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	<u>City Wide Guidance</u> Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)
	Mill Road Area Conservation Area Appraisal (2011)

5.4 Status of Proposed Submission – Cambridge Local Plan

Planning applications should be determined in accordance with policies in the adopted Development Plan and advice set out in the NPPF. However, after consideration of adopted plans and the NPPF, policies in emerging plans can also be given some weight when determining applications. For Cambridge, therefore, the emerging revised Local Plan as published for consultation on 19 July 2013 can be taken into account, especially those policies where there are no or limited objections to it. However it is likely, in the vast majority of instances, that the adopted development plan and the NPPF will have considerably more weight than emerging policies in the revised Local Plan.

For the application considered in this report, there are no policies in the emerging Local Plan that should be taken into account.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

- 6.1 No objection: The proposal does not provide any off-street car parking and there is uncontrolled car parking on the surrounding

streets. The proposal may result in an increase to on street car parking pressure. This is unlikely to impact on highway safety but may impact residential amenity.

Environmental Health

- 6.2 Objection: Clarification is required regarding sound insulation and the structure of the end wall. If satisfactory details are provided a number of conditions are likely to be recommended.
- 6.3 No objection: The structural separation and sound insulation performance is acceptable; a compliance condition is recommended. Conditions are recommended regarding construction hours, collections during construction, construction/demolition noise/vibration & piling, dust, artificial lighting and contaminated land. A number of informatives are also requested.

Refuse and Recycling

- 6.4 No comments received.

Urban Design and Conservation Team

- 6.5 No objection: The proposed development of the southern end of this warehouse has taken into consideration the character and materials of the existing building. The form, scale and massing will not differ greatly from the existing building and therefore the proposal will preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area. Conditions should be applied to ensure that the palette of materials is appropriate to the site.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Tree Team)

- 6.6 No comments received.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

- 6.7 No objection: All units include a private amenity space which more or less faces east or west however, the aspects are affected by the structure's walls and privacy balustrades so the amount of sunlight they receive in amenity terms may be limited. Two conditions are recommended regarding boundary treatment and hard and soft landscape details.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Nature Conservation Officer)

- 6.8 The Nature Conservation Office has not commented on this application but did provide comments on the broadly similar previous application. A condition regarding bird box numbers and locations was recommended. Informatives were also recommended.

Drainage

First comment

- 6.9 Objection: further information and amendments to the drainage strategy are needed.

Second comment

- 6.10 No objection: Conditions are recommended in relation to surface water drainage and foul water.
- 6.11 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:

- 4 Belgrave Road
- 8 Belgrave Road
- 18 Belgrave Road
- 20 Belgrave Road
- 22 Belgrave Road x2
- 24 Belgrave Road
- 30 Belgrave Road
- 17 Romsey Road (on behalf of EMRAG (East Mill Road Action Group))
- 6 Vinery Road
- 13 Vinery Road
- 17 Vinery Road
- 25 Vinery Road
- 45 Vinery Road

- 7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- The design of the building is not in keeping
- If the existing warehouse is at odds with the conservation area replacing it with a similar style of building would be inappropriate; should copy positive rather than negative buildings in the Conservation Area
- Overdevelopment
- Overlooking
- Increase to high density residential use will cause noise and disturbance; would be in use 24 hours a day
- Units would not be adequately large and would not receive adequate sunlight
- Romsey has low levels of green space per capita and the development should not rely on public parks for outdoor space for occupants
- Shared bins will attract fly-tipping which is an existing problem on site
- Who will manage the communal bins
- Type of development likely to appeal to buy-to-let market or short-term lets rather than meeting need for family housing in area
- Unsustainable development; will increase traffic, put pressure on local infrastructure and harm the local environment
- The replacement of a derelict warehouse is not an excuse to provide sub-standard housing.
- Environmental elements do not go far enough
- The cumulative impact from the new occupiers of these flats and other recently approved flats nearby will result in a significant increase in demand for on-street car parking in the area and increase pressure for access to public green space
- Site should be redesigned to accommodate off-street car parking and green space
- Would set a precedent for other high density residential development nearby
- Concerned about accuracy of bat report
- Inadequate cycle provision
- Construction traffic would be unsafe for school children who use this route

7.3 Councillor Baigent commented on the application. His comments can be summarised as follows:

- There are sufficient objections for the application to be determined at committee if officers are minded to recommend approval of the proposal.
- Would there be a benefit if the developer was to hold a consultation with residents?

7.4 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

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 asset
3. Residential amenity
4. Refuse arrangements
5. Highway safety
6. Car and cycle parking
7. Third party representations
8. Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

Principle of Development

8.1 The site is located within a residential area and thus the principle of a residential use on site is acceptable and in accordance with policy 5/1.

8.2 Policy 7/3 relates to the protection of floorspace within use classes B1(c), B2 and B8. The policy is stated to apply to areas of protected industrial/storage use but should be applied in any instances where there is a loss of this type of floorspace. This states that the change will be permitted if:

- a) There is sufficient supply of such floorspace in the City to meet the demand and/or vacancy rates are high; and either
- b) The proposed development will generate the same number or more unskilled or semi-skilled jobs than could be expected from the existing use; or

- c) The continuation of industrial and storage uses will be harmful to the environment or amenity of the area; or
- d) The loss of a small proportion of industrial or storage floorspace would facilitate the redevelopment and continuation of industrial and storage use on a greater part of the site; or
- e) Redevelopment for mixed use or residential development would be more appropriate.

8.3 The planning statement references a recent permission at 213 Mill Road (17/1527/FUL). The case officer states here that they accept there is sufficient supply of B8 floorspace in the city to meet demand. I do not consider there has been any significant change in this situation and agree that this continues to be the case. The planning statement goes on to argue that the proposal meets with criterion e) of policy 7/3. The site is located in a predominantly residential area and is in close proximity to a large number of residential properties. The site is in a sustainable location, close to the Mill Road East Local Centre and sustainable transport links. As a result I accept that the proposed residential use would be more appropriate for the site. I therefore consider the loss of the existing industrial use to be compliant with policy 7/3.

Context of site, design and external spaces and impact on heritage asset

- 8.4 The scale and massing of the proposal would be similar to the part of the industrial building which it would replace and as a result is considered to be of an appropriate scale for the site. The Conservation Officer considers that the proposal has taken into consideration the character and materials of the existing building and as a result is considered to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. I share this view and have recommended the suggested conditions requiring roofing details and a material sample panel.
- 8.5 The representations raise concerns about the approach of replacing a building which they consider to be inappropriate to the conservation area with a similar building. The proposed industrial use is considered to be inappropriate to the residential context of the site but the building itself, although of no architectural merit, is not considered harmful to the conservation area. As discussed above, the replacement of part of the industrial building with a building of a similar scale and

massing is considered appropriate. I am satisfied that subject to the building being finished in high quality materials, it would preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

- 8.6 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12 and 4/11.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.7 The footprint, scale and massing of the proposal is broadly the same as the part of the warehouse it would replace. As a result I am satisfied that in terms of enclosure or overshadowing, there would be no significant further impact on any of the surrounding occupiers.
- 8.8 A number of the representations raise concerns about increased noise and disturbance from the residential use of the site. The current use is industrial storage and in my view a residential use is less likely to cause noise disturbance. A number of the representations raise concerns that a residential use on site would be 24 hours a day as opposed to the current industrial use which is used during the day. There are no conditions restricting the hours of use of the existing building so it could be used at any time. I accept that the residential use is more intensive but the nature of residential use is less noisy than the industrial use. I am satisfied there would be no significant noise disturbance to any of the surrounding occupiers. I note that the Environmental Health Officer has not raised an objection on these grounds.
- 8.9 The only windows on the western elevation are high level and as a result the proposal would not cause any overlooking to the gardens on Belgrave Road. There are a number of openings on the eastern elevation which face towards the properties and gardens on Vinery Road. The lower ground level units due would not cause any overlooking of neighbouring properties. The upper ground floor units are elevated above the existing ground floor level so could have the potential to overlook neighbouring gardens. Apartment 3 is shown to be served by a large glazed element on the eastern elevation. The outlook from this window is looking down the accessway but also towards the

end of the garden of 15 Vinery Road. As a result, a condition is recommended requiring this window to be obscure glazed up to 1.8m or else for an alternative method of screening to be provided to ensure that it does not harm the privacy of no.15. As this room is also served by a rooflight and has an additional window looking towards the car park to the south, obscure glazing this window is not considered to have any significant adverse impact on the amenity of future occupiers.

- 8.10 A glass balustrade is proposed adjacent to the windows of apartment 4 on the upper ground floor and apartment 6 on the first floor. Details of the balustrade are recommended to be required by condition to ensure that it would be at least 1.8m above the finished floor level and obscure glazed to ensure it screen views into the gardens on Vinery Road.
- 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 (2006) policies 3/4 and 3/7.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

- 8.12 The original application was withdrawn; the primary concern was the amenity of the proposal for future occupiers. The revised proposal has reduced the number of units proposed on site, from 7 to 6 units, and thus increased the size of the units proposed. Further CGI drawings have been provided to better illustrate the outlook from the units.
- 8.13 Apartments 1 and 2 are on the lower ground level. A CGI has been provided which shows the outlook from apartment 1. On plan form the outlook appears enclosed but the CGI illustrates that the occupier of this unit would not have as constrained an outlook as it appears on plan form. These units are only partially below the existing ground floor level and views up towards the street would be possible. Both units exceed the nationally described space standards. Apartment 1 is single aspect with a small terrace area to the front of the property. Apartment 2 would be dual aspect and the occupier would have access to a small enclosed terrace space to the north.
- 8.14 Apartments 3 and 4 are contained wholly on the upper ground floor level. A condition is recommended requiring the large

glazed element to the front of apartment 3 to be obscure glazed up to 1.7m above finished floor level or else an alternative screen incorporated to ensure it does not overlook 15 Vinery Road. I am satisfied that the unit would still provide adequate amenity to future occupiers as it has a rooflight and additional window in the south elevation. Apartment 3 is 39sqm so meets with the nationally described space standards. Apartment 4 is 38sqm so is 1sqm short of meeting the standards. Details of the glass balustrade adjacent to the front window of this property are required to ensure there are no overlooking issues. This unit also has access to an enclosed private terrace to the south. Both apartments 3 and 4 are considered to provide a sufficiently high quality living environment to future occupiers.

- 8.15 Apartment 5 is a duplex unit. The lower level has a rooflight to the west and an enclosed window looking into the light well to the west. The bedroom on the upper floor is to be served by a high level window. This unit would provide 54sqm of internal floorspace. As this unit is contained over 2 storeys it is 4sqm short of meeting the standard. Nevertheless, it is less than 10% below the standards, is considered adequately large and I am satisfied it would provide a quality living environment for future occupiers.
- 8.16 Apartment 6 is wholly contained on the first floor. This unit has access to its own terrace. Details of the balustrade to serve the terrace are required by condition to ensure it would not result in overlooking of neighbouring gardens. The unit is shown as providing 1 bed space with 42sqm of internal space and as a result would meet with the internal space standards for a single occupancy unit. This unit is served by rooflights in the east and west roof planes as well as the large glazed element leading onto the terrace. I am satisfied that this unit would provide a quality living environment for a future occupier.
- 8.17 Apartments 2, 4 and 6 have access to small private terrace areas. Apartment 1 has access to a small semi-private area to the front of the unit. The remaining units do not have access to any private outdoor space. Given that all of the units are 1 bedroom or studio units, they are unlikely to be occupied by families and the lack of garden provision is considered to be acceptable. The units would be within easy walking distance of a large area of public green space at Romsey Recreation Ground. I note that public open space is in high demand in

Romsey. However I am satisfied that given the scale of this development, it is not likely to add significantly to this pressure.

8.18 The Environmental Health Officer initially raised concern regarding the building noise insulation between the proposed new building and retained industrial unit. The information provided was deemed to be adequate and a compliance condition is recommended. A number of other conditions regarding noise, construction hours and contaminated land are also recommended.

8.19 For clarity, the below table provides the internal space provision for each unit compared with the Nationally Described Space Standards.

Unit no.	Internal space	Nationally described standard
Apartment 1	40sqm	39sqm
Apartment 2	42sqm	39sqm
Apartment 3	39sqm	39sqm
Apartment 4	38sqm	39sqm
Apartment 5	54sqm	58sqm
Apartment 6	42sqm	39sqm

8.20 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 (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12.

Refuse Arrangements

8.21 Bins are to be contained within a covered store to the front of the units adjacent to the cycle parking. A bin collection point is proposed on the accessway closer to the highway. A management agency is likely to be needed to move the bins. I

consider that the proposed bin storage would meet with the requirements of the RECAP Waste Design Guide.

8.22 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

Highway Safety

8.23 The highway authority does not consider the proposal would have any significant adverse impact on highway safety. I share this view.

8.24 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Car and Cycle Parking

8.25 A number of the representations raise concerns about the lack of car parking spaces for the proposed development and that this would exacerbate on-street parking problems in the surrounding streets. The site is located in a sustainable location, close to bus and cycle infrastructure and local service at the Mill Road East Local Centre. As a result I am satisfied that the lack of off-street car parking would be acceptable.

8.26 The plans show 10 cycle parking spaces in a covered store. This provision is in excess of minimum standards and is considered acceptable. Details of the store are required by condition.

8.27 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10.

Third Party Representations

8.28 I have addressed the majority of the third party representations in the body of my report but will cover any outstanding matters in the below table:

Representation	Response
The design of the building is not in keeping	See paragraphs 8.4 - 8.5
If the existing warehouse is at odds with the conservation area	The proposed industrial use is at odds with the residential use of

replacing it with a similar style of building would be inappropriate; should copy positive rather than negative buildings in the Conservation Area	the area rather than the building being harmful. The Conservation Officer is satisfied that the replacement building is appropriate and would preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. I share this view.
Overdevelopment	The scale and massing of the replacement building is similar to the part of the building it replaces and as a result is considered to be of an appropriate scale for the plot.
Overlooking	See paragraphs 8.9 - 8.11
Increase to high density residential use will cause noise and disturbance; would be in use 24 hours a day	See paragraph 8.8
Units would not be adequately large and would not receive adequate sunlight	See paragraphs 8.12 - 8.20
Romsey has low levels of green space per capita and the development should not rely on public parks for outdoor space for occupants	See paragraph 8.17
Shared bins will attract fly-tipping which is an existing problem on site	There is no evidence that this would be the case. The communal bin arrangement is considered acceptable
Who will manage the communal bins	A managing agent may be required to move the bins to the footpath given their large size
Type of development likely to appeal to buy-to-let market or short-term lets rather than meeting need for family housing in area	This is not a material planning consideration. The proposed units would be meeting a housing need.
Unsustainable development; will increase traffic, put pressure on local infrastructure and harm the local environment	The proposal is located in a sustainable location.

The replacement of a derelict warehouse is not an excuse to provide sub-standard housing.	The housing provided is considered to provide a quality living environment for future occupiers
Environmental elements do not go far enough	The environmental elements are considered adequate
The cumulative impact from the new occupiers of these flats and other recently approved flats nearby will result in a significant increase in demand for on-street car parking in the area and increase pressure for access to public green space	See paragraphs 8.17 and 8.25
Site should be redesigned to accommodate off-street car parking and green space	There is no requirement to provide off-street car parking given the sustainable location of the site; see paragraph
Would set a precedent for other high density residential development nearby	The density is considered acceptable for the site. Each application is assessed on its own merits.
Concerned about accuracy of bat report	The nature Conservation officer has not commented on this application but reviewed the information submitted as part of the previous application. He has not raised any concerns with the report.
Inadequate cycle provision	See paragraph 8.26
Construction traffic would be unsafe for school children who use this route	The Highway Authority has not raised this as a concern.

Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

8.29 National Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph 031 ID: 23b-031-20160519 sets out specific circumstances where contributions for affordable housing and tariff style planning obligations (section 106 planning obligations) should not be sought from small scale and self-build development. This follows the order of the Court of Appeal dated 13 May 2016, which gives legal effect to the policy set out in the [Written](#)

[Ministerial Statement of 28 November 2014](#) and should be taken into account.

- 8.30 The guidance states that contributions should not be sought from developments of 10-units or fewer, and which have a maximum combined gross floorspace of no more than 1000sqm. The proposal represents a small scale development and as such no tariff style planning obligation is considered necessary.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The proposed development is considered acceptable in terms of design and is considered to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposal would not have any significant adverse impact on the amenity of surrounding occupiers. The development would provide a quality living environment for future occupiers.

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 2006 Policy 4/13.

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 2006 Policy 4/13.

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 2006 Policy 4/13.

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 2006 Policy 4/13

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 2006 policy 4/13.

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 2006 Policy 4/13.

9. 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 2006 policy 4/13)

10. There should 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 2006 policy 4/13)

11. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved (including any pre-construction, demolition, enabling works or piling), the applicant shall submit a report in writing, regarding the demolition / construction noise and vibration impact associated with this development, for approval by the local authority. The report shall be in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228:2009 Code of Practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites and include full details of any piling and mitigation measures to be taken to protect local residents from noise and or vibration. 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 nearby properties
(Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

12. 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 2006 policy4/13

13. Prior to the commencement of use an artificial lighting scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include details of any artificial lighting of the site and an artificial lighting impact assessment with predicted lighting levels at the nearest light sensitive receptor shall be. Artificial lighting on and off site must meet the Obtrusive Light Limitations for Exterior Lighting Installations contained within the Institute of Lighting Professionals Guidance Notices for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light - GN01:2011 (or as superseded).

The approved lighting scheme shall be installed, retained and operated in accordance with the approved details / measures unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

Reason: In the interests of amenity. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/11 and 4/15)

14. Prior to the occupation of the flats the sound insulation scheme and structural separation as stated within the Cass Allen 'Addendum to noise assessment report RP01-17669' dated 11th May 2018 (ref: LR01-17669) shall be fully implemented. The development shall be maintained in accordance with the details thereafter.

Reason: To protect the amenity of future occupiers (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7 and 4/13)

15. Before starting any brick or stone work, 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: In the interests of the visual amenity of the Conservation Area and to ensure that the quality and colour of the detailing of the brickwork/stonework and jointing is acceptable and maintained throughout the development. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/12 and 4/11)

16. No roofs shall be constructed until full details of the type and source of roof covering materials and the ridge, eaves and hip details, if appropriate, have been submitted to the local planning authority as samples and approved in writing. Roofs shall thereafter be constructed only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/11)

17. No development shall take place 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 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 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12)

18. No development shall take place until full details of hard landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include proposed finished levels or contours; car parking layouts, other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials; minor artefacts and structures (e.g. refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting); proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. drainage, pipelines indicating lines, manholes, supports).

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 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12)

19. Prior to the occupation of the flats, details of facilities for the covered, secured parking of bicycles for use in connection with the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The approved facilities shall be provided in accordance with the approved details before use of the development commences.

Reason: To ensure appropriate provision for the secure storage of bicycles. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/6)

20. Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or with any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modifications) no windows, at upper ground level or above shall be constructed in the front or rear elevations other than with the prior formal permission of the local planning authority.

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

21. Prior to the occupation of the units, the large glazed element to the eastern elevation of apartment 3 shall be non-opening and obscure glazed to 1.7m above finished floor level or an alternative means of screening views from the apartment into the garden of no. 15 Vinery Road shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The agreed screening method shall be in place prior to the occupation of the units and shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: To protect the privacy of the garden of no. 15 Vinery Road (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/7)

22. Prior to the occupation of the units details of the Balustrades at upper ground floor and first floor as shown on drawings 0950.01.200 rev F and 0950.01.300 rev F shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The balustrades shall be installed as per the approved details prior to the occupation of the units and shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To protect the privacy of the surrounding gardens of Vinery Road (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/7)

23. Notwithstanding the approved plans, no mezzanine floor levels shall be inserted.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity to prevent overlooking of neighbouring gardens (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 3/12).

24. No building hereby permitted shall be occupied until details of surface water drainage works have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Surface water drainage will be implemented in accordance with these agreed details.

Reason: To ensure the development will not increase flood risk in the area in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

25. No development shall commence until a plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority detailing the proposed specification, number and locations of internal and / or external bird boxes on the new buildings. The installation shall be installed prior to the occupation of the flats and subsequently maintained in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason: to provide ecological enhancements for protected species on the site (Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 4/3).

INFORMATIVE: The drainage system should be designed such that there is no surcharging for a 1 in 30 year event and no internal property flooding or flooding of third party land for a 1 in 100 year event + 40% allowance for climate change. The submitted details shall:

- a. provide information about the design storm period and intensity, the site and contributing areas, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site to ensure no increase in surface water runoff from the site;
- b. provide results of infiltration testing and calculations in accordance with BRE

Digest 365 if infiltration is to be used. The information shall include:

- a) Identification of the water level within the trial pits at timed intervals;
- b) the trial pit dimensions;
- c) a plan showing the location of the trial pits; and
- d) the depth of the water table below ground level
- e) provide information on the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters; and

f) 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.

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: The site investigation, including relevant soil, soil gas, surface and groundwater sampling should be carried out by a suitably qualified and accredited consultant/contractor in accordance with a quality assured sampling, analysis methodology and relevant guidance. The Council has produced a guidance document to provide information to developers on how to deal with contaminated land. The document, 'Contaminated Land in Cambridge- Developers Guide' can be downloaded from the City Council website on <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/land-pollution>.

Hard copies can also be provided upon request

INFORMATIVE: Approved remediation works shall be carried out in full on site under a quality assurance scheme to demonstrate compliance with the proposed methodology and best practice guidance.

INFORMATIVE: Any material imported into the site shall be tested for a full suite of contaminants including metals and petroleum hydrocarbons prior to importation. Material imported for landscaping should be tested at a frequency of 1 sample every 20m³ or one per lorry load, whichever is greater. Material imported for other purposes can be tested at a lower frequency (justification and prior approval for the adopted rate is required by the Local Authority). If the material originates from a clean source the developer should contact the Environmental Quality Growth Team for further advice.

INFORMATIVE: The Council's document 'Developers Guide to Contaminated Land in Cambridge' provides further details on the responsibilities of the developers and the information required to assess potentially contaminated sites. It can be found at the City Council's website on <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/land-pollution>
Hard copies can also be provided upon request.

INFORMATIVE: 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.

INFORMATIVE: The Housing Act 2004 introduced the Housing Health & Safety Rating System as a way to ensure that all residential premises provide a safe and healthy environment to any future occupiers or visitors.

Each of the dwellings must be built to ensure that there are no unacceptable hazards for example ensuring adequate fire precautions are installed; all habitable rooms have adequate lighting and floor area etc.

Further information may be found here:

<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/housing-health-and-safety-rating-system>

INFORMATIVE: The boundary treatments should include sufficient gaps (150mm X 150mm) to allow hedgehogs access.

INFORMATIVE: The applicant is reminded that, under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended (section 1), it is an offence to remove, damage or destroy the nest of any wild bird while that nest is in use or being built. Planning consent for a development does not provide a defence against prosecution under this act. Trees and scrub are likely to contain nesting birds between 1st March and 31st August inclusive. Trees and scrub are present on the application site and are to be assumed to contain nesting birds between the above dates, unless a recent survey has been undertaken by a competent ecologist to assess the nesting bird activity on site during this period and has shown it is absolutely certain that nesting birds are not present

INFORMATIVE: Prior to commencement of above ground works, confirmation should be sought from Anglia Water to confirm that they are satisfied with the foul water drainage proposals.

Agenda Item 7

PLANNING COMMITTEE

DATE: 1ST AUGUST 2018

Application Number	18/0778/S73	Agenda Item	
Date Received	15th May 2018	Officer	Charlotte Burton
Target Date	10th July 2018		
Ward	Trumpington		
Site	77 Shelford Road		
Proposal	S73 Application to vary condition 2 (approved drawings) of planning permission 16/1371/FUL (proposed demolition of existing dwelling and workshops and erection of 9 dwellings) to include alterations to the footprints of Plots 4-9 and the garage of Plot 1, alterations to the site levels of Plots 4-9, amendments to the arrangement of windows, roof lights and garage openings, changes to the materials, and alterations to the parking layout and landscaping scheme.		
Applicant	Camhouse Developments Ltd. c/o Agent		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The principle of development has been established through the extant consent;</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The proposed amendments would not have a significant impact on residential amenity;</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The proposed amendments would be acceptable in urban design and landscaping terms.</p>
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The site is comprised of the curtilage of No. 77 Shelford Road; the industrial site behind it, referred to as No. 77a; and part of the garden of No. 75. There is an existing vehicular access into the site from Shelford Road.
- 1.2 No. 77 is a 3-bedroom bungalow with rear garden and a detached single storey garage at the rear. The bungalow is set back from the road and is rendered with a concrete tile hipped roof. The rear part of the garden of No. 75 is comprised of greenhouses and sheds.
- 1.3 The former industrial units comprise a complex of single storey industrial workshops. The buildings are a mixture of brick, block work and metal. The front buildings are flat-roof and the rear part has a pitched roof.
- 1.4 To the rear (north east) of the site are Nos. 41-45 Royal Way which form part of the Clay Farm development. These are two storey properties with shallow rear gardens which back onto the application site.
- 1.5 To the north is No. 75 and the garden of No. 73. No. 73 is a detached property with a long rear garden which runs along part of the length of the application site and backs onto the Royal Way properties. The part of the garden adjacent to the application site is used as an orchard. There are several mature trees along the boundary.
- 1.6 To the south is the garden of Nos. 79 and 81. These are detached properties. No. 79 has a shallower rear garden. No. 81 has a long rear garden which runs along the length of the application site. The garden is formally laid out and appears to be well used amenity space.
- 1.7 The site is not within the conservation area. The existing buildings are not Listed and are not Buildings of Local Interest. There are no tree preservation orders on the site or within the vicinity. The site is not a protected industrial site on the proposals map and is not part of an allocation on the draft Local Plan. There are no other site constraints.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposal is to amend the approved plans under the consent for the demolition of existing dwelling and workshops and erection of 9 dwellings which was approved by the planning committee on 30 November 2017 (16/1371/FUL). The variation is to condition 2 which refers to the list of approved plans.
- 2.2 During the course of the current application, the description of development was updated to make clear the amendments sought. The updated description includes the following amendments:
- alterations to the footprints of Plots 4-9 and the garage of Plot 1,
 - alterations to the site levels of Plots 4-9,
 - amendments to the arrangement of windows, roof lights and garage openings, changes to the materials,
 - alterations to the parking layout and landscaping scheme.
- 2.3 The approved scheme would be laid out around a new access, with 6 semi-detached units at the rear of the site (Plots 4-9); a pair of semi-detached properties in the centre of the site (Plots 2-3); and a replacement dwelling on the street frontage (Plot 1). The materials would be dark brown and weather grey brickwork with grey or 'rustic coloured' plain tiled roof.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
C/65/0626	Demolition of existing dilapidated sheds and erection of new concrete frame workshop	Approved
C/65/0347	Erection of new pre-fab concrete workshop to replace derelict buildings	Approved
C/70/0072	Erection of offices and alteration of existing storage buildings	Approved
C/82/0077	Installation of oil storage tank	Approved
C/90/0530	Use of workshop for high technology firm B1 (section S53 application)	Unknown
16/1371/FUL	Proposed Demolition of Existing	Approved

Dwelling and Workshops and
Erection of 9 Dwellings

17/1219/FUL Proposed demolition of the existing dwelling and workshops and the erection of 7 dwellings Approved

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 2006 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN		POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan 2006	Local	3/1, 3/4, 3/7, 3/8, 3/10, 3/11, 3/12 4/4, 4/13, 4/14 5/1, 5/14 7/3 8/2, 8/3, 8/4, 8/6, 8/10 10/1

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework March 2012 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014
-----------------------------	---

	Circular 11/95 (Appendix A)
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	<u>City Wide Guidance</u> Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)

5.4 Status of Proposed Submission – Cambridge Local Plan

Planning applications should be determined in accordance with policies in the adopted Development Plan and advice set out in the NPPF. However, after consideration of adopted plans and the NPPF, policies in emerging plans can also be given some weight when determining applications. For Cambridge, therefore, the emerging revised Local Plan as published for consultation on 19 July 2013 can be taken into account, especially those policies where there are no or limited objections to it. However it is likely, in the vast majority of instances, that the adopted development plan and the NPPF will have considerably more weight than emerging policies in the revised Local Plan.

For the application considered in this report, there are no policies in the emerging Local Plan that should be taken into account.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

6.1 **Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)**

No significant adverse impact on the operation of the highway network.

6.2 Environmental Health

No objection subject to the imposition of conditions as per the original consent to protect nearby residential uses.

6.3 Refuse and Recycling

The best option would be to have a bin collection point at the top of the private road near Shelford Road, then the refuse vehicles would not need to reverse in from a very busy road. This could easily be placed along the boundary fence, still leaving 5m road for access.

6.4 Urban Design and Conservation Team

No material Urban Design issues.

6.5 Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

No material Landscape issues.

6.6 Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Officer)

No objection.

Recommended condition:

- Implementation of surface water drainage scheme

6.7 Access Officer

No comment received.

6.8 Policy Team

No comment received.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

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

- 41 Royal Way
- 43 Royal Way
- 45 Royal Way
- 47 Royal Way
- 51 Royal Way
- 72 Royal Way
- 74 Royal Way
- 73 Shelford Road

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Objections to the original scheme remain. Over-development. Overcrowded. Increase in cars. Noise and disturbance. Loss of green space. Proposed three storey Plots 4-9 are out of keeping. Loss of privacy for Royal Way properties. Overshadowing. Concerns about bats. Drainage and flooding. Ground stability. Impact on trees.
- Concerns about change in level of Plots 4-9.
- Distance between proposed plot 9 and No. 45 Royal Way, and the depth of the rear gardens should be specified.
- Rear windows on Plots 4-9 should be smaller and should have privacy screens.
- Overlooking towards Royal Way properties from additional roof lights.
- Additional noise and disturbance from roof lights affecting Royal Way properties.
- Concerns about tree species along Royal Way boundary providing an effective screen and about height, spread and density. Trees should be planted at the rear of No. 41 and the privet hedge removed to protect privacy.
- Boundaries at the rear of Royal Way properties should be observed.
- Confirmation of fully enclosed bin stores, and height of bin and bike stores required.
- Roof lights should be specified above the internal floor level.
- Object to window on the side of the house overlooking No. 73 Shelford Road.
- Do not give consent to the removal of the fence along the boundary with No. 73 Shelford Road or the installation of a parallel fence.
- Confirmation of refuse collection arrangements.

- 7.3 The Member of Parliament for Cambridge City, Daniel Zeichner MP, has submitted a representation objecting to the scheme on behalf of his constituent on the grounds of loss of green space, negative impact on street, pressure on parking spaces, overshadowing and loss of privacy.
- 7.4 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 The principle of development has been established through the extant consent on the site (16/1371/FUL). While the granting of the current application would issue a new consent, I do not intend to rehearse the assessment of the scheme as a whole, as this has been undertaken in the officer's report on the approved scheme 16/1371/FUL. I have attached a copy of this report as an appendix. Instead, my assessment concentrates on the amendments sought in the current application as listed in paragraph 2.2 in relation to relevant material considerations.

Alterations to the footprints and site levels of Plots 4-9

- 8.2 Plots 4-9 are the semi-detached properties at the rear of the site backing onto Royal Way. These units would be two-and-a-half storey properties with large dormer windows on the front elevation. The approved plans show the properties within the semi-detached pairs would be staggered. The amendment sought would remove the stagger and create a consistent building line. This is acceptable in urban design terms.
- 8.3 During the course of the application, additional drawings were submitted showing what the change in the building line would do to the relationship with the Royal Way properties at the rear. This shows that the units would be no closer to the boundary than the approved scheme. The southernmost property (Plot 4) would remain on the same building line as approved with 20m between the rear elevation of the proposed unit and the rear elevation of No. 41 Royal Way. The plots to the north would be on the same building line as Plot 4 so that all dwellings would be 20m from the rear elevations of the Royal Way properties. As a result, there would be an increase in the distance between the elevations at the northern end of approximately 1m. This

would have a lesser impact on the Royal Way properties than the approved scheme. The impact on Nos. 75 and 73 Shelford Road would not be significantly different than the approved scheme.

- 8.4 The proposed amendments also include changes to the site levels of the units at the rear. Again, additional drawings submitted during the course of the application show that there would be a reduction in the ridge and eaves height of the units compared to the approved scheme, which would have a lesser impact on the Royal Way properties. The southernmost properties (Plots 4 and 5) would be lowered by 433mm, Plots 6 and 7 would be lowered by 283mm, and the northernmost units (Plots 8 and 9) would be 133mm lower than the approved scheme. This is supported.

Alterations to the footprint of the garage of Plot 1

- 8.5 The approved scheme had the garage to Plot 1 attached to the western elevation of Plot 2. The variation sought is for the garage to be detached with a narrow gap between. The effect of this is to reduce slightly the garden area of Plot 1, however I consider this would still provide a good level of amenity similar to the approved scheme. This is acceptable in urban design and landscaping terms.

Amendments to the arrangement of windows, roof lights and garage openings, changes to the materials

- 8.6 These minor amendments comprise:

Proposed amendment	Assessment
Plot 1	
Window opening changes to all elevations, including the addition of 1no. obscure glazed window to the first floor on the South East Side elevation.	The changes to the window proportions on the front and side (north west) elevation are acceptable. The windows on the first floor rear elevation would be smaller and due to an internal rearrangement, the previously obscured ensuite window would become an unobscured bedroom window. This is acceptable. The

	additional first floor window on the side (south east) elevation would serve an ensuite and would be obscured, so there would be no views towards No. 79 Shelford Road. The obscure glazing would be secured through condition 9.
A projecting brick detail has been added to the front elevation at first floor level, between altered window openings.	This is acceptable in urban design terms.
The bay window and porch to the front elevation has been changed from a grey powder-coated aluminium material, to a brown zinc cladding.	This is acceptable in urban design terms.
Relocation of roof lights on the rear elevation.	Sections show the base of the roof light would be over 1.8m from the internal finished floor level, which would not afford views towards the neighbouring properties and is acceptable
The garage side door has been relocated.	This would remain on the side (south west) elevation but would be positioned more to the rear of the building. This would be acceptable.
Plots 2&3	
The materials on the bay windows, porches to the front elevation and angled windows on side elevations have been changed from a grey powder-coated aluminium material to a dark grey zinc cladding.	This is acceptable in urban design terms.
Roof light arrangement has been changed.	There is no significant change from the approved plans and the base of the roof lights would be at least 1.7m from the internal finished floor level.

Plots 4-9	
1 no. obscure window added to ground floor WC on south east side elevation.	This window would serve a bathroom and would be obscure glazed, which would be secured though a condition.

- 8.7 For these reasons, the proposed amendments are considered to be acceptable in urban design terms and would not have a significant impact on residential amenity.

Alterations to the parking layout and landscaping scheme.

- 8.8 The proposed changes includes relocation of the Plot 4 car parking space from within the turning head to an on-plot parking space, and the loss of one visitor parking space within the turning head. The provision of on-plot parking is supported and would be the same as the approved arrangement for the other units. The loss of one visitor car parking space would be acceptable and would not have a significant impact on parking availability for visitors as two spaces would remain. The associated landscaping changes which would increase the amount of hard surfacing in front of Plot 4 would be acceptable as the arrangement would be the same as the other units.

Other matters

- 8.9 I have recommended the same conditions would be applied to the new consent as the previous consent. Where those conditions have been discharged on the previous consent, I have recommended condition 37 which requires the development to be carried out in accordance with those details. Some conditions – such as the landscaping scheme – would need to be discharged for the new consent as they relate to details that would be changed.
- 8.10 The Waste Team has commented that their recommendation would be for details of a waste collection point so that their vehicles do not have to enter the site. However, the current application does not include changes that would affect the previously approved waste collection arrangements, so it would not be reasonable for me to amend this condition. Nonetheless, should the applicant's preference be for a collection point close to the site entrance to avoid the need for vehicles to enter and

turn, then this could be agreed through the landscaping condition.

Third Party Representations

8.11 I have addressed the third party representations below:

Representation	Response
<p>Objections to the original scheme remain. Over-development. Overcrowded. Increase in cars. Noise and disturbance. Loss of green space. Proposed three storey Plots 4-9 are out of keeping. Loss of privacy for Royal Way properties. Overshadowing. Concerns about bats. Drainage and flooding. Ground stability. Impact on trees.</p>	<p>These issues relate to the principle and form of the development, which has already been established, and do not relate to the current amendments sought. I refer to the officer's report on the approved scheme 16/1371/FUL where these issues have been assessed.</p>
<p>Concerns about change in level of Plots 4-9.</p>	<p>The change in levels proposed has been clearly shown on additional drawings submitted during the course of the application. I have assessed this in paragraphs 8.2-8.4 of my report.</p>
<p>Distance between proposed plot 9 and No. 45 Royal Way, and the depth of the rear gardens should be specified.</p>	<p>The distance between the proposed rear elevation of No. 9 and the rear elevation of No. 45 Royal Way is 20m as measured on the drawings submitted. The length of the garden of Plot 9 is shown as approximately 11.5m.</p>
<p>Rear windows on Plots 4-9 should be smaller and should have privacy screens.</p>	<p>There is no change proposed to the windows on the first floor rear elevation compared to the approved scheme. As such, it would not be reasonable to recommend that the windows are reduced or obscured.</p>

Overlooking towards Royal Way properties from additional roof lights.	No additional roof lights on the rear elevation are proposed compared to the approved scheme.
Additional noise and disturbance from roof lights affecting Royal Way properties.	
Concerns about tree species along Royal Way boundary providing an effective screen and about height, spread and density. Trees should be planted at the rear of No. 41 and the privet hedge removed to protect privacy.	The boundary planting has been agreed through condition 22 on the original consent. No changes are proposed under the current application, so this is not a relevant consideration. Nonetheless, the approved scheme includes a row of 12 Hornbeam trees within the rear garden of the Plot 4-9 which would extend across the rear boundary of the site.
Boundaries at the rear of Royal Way properties should be observed.	The agreed landscaping scheme is in accordance with the site ownership boundaries as shown on the applicant's submission documents. Boundary disputes are civil matters and not planning matters.
Confirmation of fully enclosed bin stores, and height of bin and bike stores required.	The bin stores to Plots 4-9 would be three-sided. This is a common arrangement. The stores would not be located against the boundary with the Royal Way properties so would not have an unacceptable environmental health impact. The bin stores would be approximately 1.7m high and the bike stores would be approximately 2.2m high, which is acceptable.
Roof lights should be specified above the internal floor level.	The height of the roof lights is specified on the drawings which show these would be at

	least 1.7m above the internal floor level. I do not consider it necessary to impose a condition to control this.
Object to window on the side of the house overlooking No. 73 Shelford Road.	This would be obscured glazed. Recommended condition 9 would ensure that all windows shown as obscure glazed are obscured prior to occupation and to have restricted opening to prevent overlooking.
Do not give consent to the removal of the fence along the boundary with No. 73 Shelford Road or the installation of a parallel fence.	The removal of a fence within third party ownership would be a civil matter.
Confirmation of refuse collection arrangements.	The current application proposes no changes to the waste collection arrangements which would be the same as the approved scheme, which includes waste vehicles entering the site to collect waste.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 I acknowledge the third party representations objecting to the scheme, however the principle of development has been established through the extant consent and the local planning authority must limit its assessment to the changes to the approved scheme that are being sought. I have assessed these above and consider these to be acceptable in urban design and landscaping terms, as well as residential amenity.

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 the permission referenced 16/1371/FUL, namely 05 December 2019.

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

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12).

4. No development (other than demolition) shall take place until full details of all non-masonry walling systems, cladding panels or other external screens including structural members, infill panels, edge, junction and coping details, colours, surface finishes/textures and relationships to glazing and roofing have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This may consist of large-scale drawings and/or samples. Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To accord with policies 3/4 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

5. Full details of all windows, doors and rainwater goods, as identified on the approved drawings, including materials, colours, surface finishes/textures are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to their installation. This may consist of large-scale drawings and/or samples. Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To accord with policies 3/4 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

6. 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 accord with Policies 3/4 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

7. The cycle parking shall be provided in accordance with the approved details prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted, and shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure appropriate provision for the secure storage of bicycles. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/6)

8. The bin stores shall be provided in accordance with the approved details prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted, and shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13).

9. The windows identified as having obscured glass on the approved drawings shall be obscure glazed to a minimum level of obscurity to conform to Pilkington Glass level 3 or equivalent prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted, and shall have restrictors to ensure that the windows cannot be opened more than 45 degrees beyond the plane of the adjacent wall and shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 3/12).

10. The timber panels on the first floor windows on the rear elevations of Plots 2 and 3 as shown on drawing number 'PI(21)02 REV P2' shall be installed prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted, in accordance with details submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The screens shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 3/12).

11. Prior to the commencement of above ground development, further details of the projecting brickwork detailing and window reveals as shown in the approved drawings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development should be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to enhance the appearance of the building (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/4).

12. No unbound material shall be used in the surface finish of the driveway within 6 metres of the highway boundary of the site.

Reason: To avoid displacement of loose material onto the highway in the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2).

13. Notwithstanding the provision of Class A of Schedule 2, Part 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), (or any order revoking, amending or re-enacting that order) no gates shall be erected across the approved vehicular access unless details have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan policy 8/2).

14. Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted, the vehicular access where it crosses the public highway shall be laid out and constructed in accordance with the Cambridgeshire County Council construction specification.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to ensure satisfactory access into the site (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2).

15. Prior to first use of the development hereby permitted, the access shall be constructed with adequate drainage measures to prevent surface water run-off onto the adjacent public highway, in accordance with a scheme submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with the Highway Authority.

Reason: To prevent surface water discharging to the highway (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2).

16. Prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted, two 2.0 x 2.0 metres visibility splays shall be provided as shown on the approved drawings. One visibility splay is required on each side of the access, measured to either side of the access, with a set-back of two metres from the highway boundary along each side of the access. This area shall be kept clear of all planting, fencing, walls and the like exceeding 600mm high.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2).

17. Prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted, the manoeuvring area shall be provided as shown on the drawings and retained free of obstruction thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2).

18. Prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted, the access shall be provided as shown on the approved drawings and a width of access of 5 metres provided for a minimum distance of ten metres from the highway boundary and retained free of obstruction.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2).

19. No development shall commence until details of the construction of the hardstanding for the access have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The hardstanding shall, as a minimum, be capable of supporting vehicles of 26 tonne weight and shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2)

20. No development shall commence until details of the proposed arrangements for future management and maintenance of the streets within the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The streets shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved management and maintenance details.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory development of the site and to ensure estate roads are managed and maintained thereafter to a suitable and safe standard. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2)

21. Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted, surface water drainage works shall be implemented in accordance with details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by 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:
 - i. 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

- ii. provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development.
- iii. The surface water drainage scheme shall be managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the agreed details and management and maintenance plan.

Reason: In the interests of surface water drainage and flood management.

22. No development (other than demolition) shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these 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 (e.g. furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting); proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines indicating lines, manholes, supports); 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.

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 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12)

23. No development (other than demolition) shall take place 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 before the use hereby permitted is commenced and retained thereafter unless any variation is agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure an appropriate boundary treatment is implemented. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12)

24. 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 2006 policy 4/9)

25. The specification and position of fencing, or any other measures to be taken for the protection of any trees from damage during the course of development, shall be implemented in accordance with the Arboricultural Implications Assessment dated July 2016 and the Tree Protection Plan drawings 'TIP 16 210', 'TIP 16 210 1', 'TIP 16 210 2' and 'TIP 16 210 3' before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought onto the site for the purpose of development (including demolition). The agreed means of protection shall be retained on site until all equipment, and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area protected in accordance with this condition, and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered nor shall any excavation be made without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the retention of the trees on the neighbouring sites. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11, 3/12 and 4/4)

26. 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 2006 Policy 4/13.

27. 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 2006 Policy 4/13.

28. 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 2006 Policy 4/13.

29. 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 2006 Policy 4/13

30. 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 2006 policy 4/13.

31. 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/or 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 2006 Policy 4/13.

32. 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 2006 policy 4/13)

33. There should 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 2006 policy 4/13)

34. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved (including any pre-construction, demolition, enabling works or piling), the applicant shall submit a report in writing, regarding the demolition / construction noise and vibration impact associated with this development, for approval by the local authority. The report shall be in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228:2009 Code of Practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites and include full details of any piling and mitigation measures to be taken to protect local residents from noise and or vibration. 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 nearby properties
(Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

35. 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 2006 policy4/13

36. Prior to the commencement of development/construction, a noise insulation scheme detailing the acoustic noise insulation performance specification of the external building envelope of the residential units (having regard to the building fabric, glazing and ventilation) to reduce the level of noise experienced in the residential units as a result of the proximity of the habitable rooms to the high ambient noise levels in the area be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall achieve internal noise levels recommended in British Standard 8233:2014 "Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings". The scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall thereafter be retained as such.

Reason: To protect the amenity of future occupants of this property from the high ambient noise levels in the area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

37. The following conditions of planning permission 16/1371/FUL shall continue to apply to this permission and correspond to the same numbered conditions above: 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 15, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 34, 35 and 36. Where those conditions pertaining to 16/1371/FUL have been discharged, those conditions shall be deemed to be discharged for this permission also and the development of 18/0778/S73 shall be carried out in accordance with the terms of discharge.

Reason: To define the terms of the application.

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: 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: Demolition/Construction noise/vibration report

The noise and vibration report should include:

a) An assessment of the significance of the noise impact due to the demolition/construction works and suitable methods for this are to be found in BS 5228:2009 Part 1 Annex E - Significance of noise effects. It is recommended that the ABC method detailed in E.3.2 be used unless works are likely to continue longer than a month then the 2-5 dB (A) change method should be used.

b) An assessment of the significance of the vibration impact due to the demolition/construction works and suitable methods for this are to be found in BS 5228:2009 Part 2 Annex B - Significance of vibration effects.

If piling is to be undertaken then full details of the proposed method to be used is required and this should be included in the noise and vibration reports detailed above.

Following the production of the above reports a monitoring protocol should be proposed for agreement with the Local Planning Authority. It will be expected that as a minimum spot checks to be undertaken on a regular basis at site boundaries nearest noise sensitive premises and longer term monitoring to be undertaken when:-

- Agreed target levels are likely to exceeded
- Upon the receipt of substantiated complaints
- At the request of the Local Planning Authority / Environmental Health following any justified complaints.

Guidance on noise monitoring is given in BS 5228:2009 Part 1 Section 8.4 - Noise Control Targets and in Annex G - noise monitoring.

A procedure for seeking approval from the Local Planning Authority (LPA) in circumstances when demolition/construction works need to be carried out at time outside the permitted hours. This should incorporate a minimum notice period of 10 working days to the Local Planning Authority and 5 working days to neighbours to allow the Local Planning Authority to consider the application as necessary. For emergencies the Local Planning Authority should be notified but where this is not possible the Council's Out of Hours Noise service should be notified on 0300 303 3839.

Contact details for monitoring personnel, site manager including out of hours emergency telephone number should be provided.

Application Number	16/1371/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	25th July 2016	Officer	Charlotte Burton
Target Date	19th September 2016		
Ward	Trumpington		
Site	77 And 77A Shelford Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB2 9NB		
Proposal	Proposed Demolition of Existing Dwelling and Workshops and Erection of 9 Dwellings		
Applicant	Mr Peter Wedd c/o Agent		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The loss of the industrial use is acceptable in principle and the proposal would reuse a brownfield site.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The proposal would have an acceptable impact on residential amenity and would provide a good quality of amenity for future residents.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The proposal would not harm the character of the area and the street scene.</p>
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

1.1 The site is comprised of the curtilage of No. 77 Shelford Road; the industrial site behind it, referred to as No. 77a; and part of the garden of No. 75. There is an existing vehicular access into the site from Shelford Road.

- 1.2 No. 77 is a 3-bedroom bungalow with rear garden and a detached single storey garage at the rear. The bungalow is set back from the road and is rendered with a concrete tile hipped roof. The rear part of the garden of No. 75 is comprised of greenhouses and sheds.
- 1.3 The industrial units comprise a complex of single storey industrial workshops. The buildings are a mixture of brick, block work and metal. The front buildings are flat-roof and the rear part has a pitched roof. There is an area of hardstanding and gravel in front of the building.
- 1.4 To the rear (north east) of the site are Nos. 41-45 Royal Way which form part of the Clay Farm development. These are two storey properties with shallow rear gardens which back onto the application site.
- 1.5 To the north is No. 75 and the garden of No. 73. No. 73 is a detached property with a long rear garden which runs along part of the length of the application site and backs onto the Royal Way properties. The part of the garden adjacent to the application site is used as an orchard. There are several mature trees along the boundary.
- 1.6 To the south is the garden of Nos. 79 and 81. These are detached properties. No. 79 has a shallower rear garden. No. 81 has a long rear garden which runs along the length of the application site. The garden is formally laid out and appears to be well used amenity space.
- 1.7 The site is not within the conservation area. The existing buildings are not Listed and are not Buildings of Local Interest. There are no tree preservation orders on the site or within the vicinity. The site is not a protected industrial site on the proposals map and is not part of an allocation on the draft Local Plan. There are no other site constraints.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposal is for the erection of 9 four-bedroom residential units following demolition of the existing bungalow and workshops, including access, car parking, bin and cycle stores, and landscaping. Access would be via the existing access from Shelford Road.

- 2.2 The site would be laid out with 6 semi-detached units at the rear of the site (Plots 4-9); a pair of semi-detached properties in the centre of the site (Plots 2-3); and a replacement dwelling on the street frontage (Plot 1). The materials would be dark brown and weather grey brickwork with grey or 'rustic coloured' plain tiled roof.
- 2.3 During the course of the application, revised plans were submitted which included the following amendments:
- Amended the tree species to the rear of Plots 4-9 to native hornbeam and beech trees.
 - Revised the planting on the edge of the site with Royal Way and the positioning of the cycle sheds now set back from the rear boundary with landscaping on the rear boundary.
 - Extended the roof over the bay of Plot 1 to form an entrance canopy.
 - Details of the refuse storage enclosures for Plots 4-9.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
C/65/0626	Demolition of existing dilapidated sheds and erection of new concrete frame workshop	Approved
C/65/0347	Erection of new pre-fab concrete workshop to replace derelict buildings	Approved
C/70/0072	Erection of offices and alteration of existing storage buildings	Approved
C/82/0077	Installation of oil storage tank	Approved
C/90/0530	Use of workshop for high technology firm B1 (section S53 application)	Unknown

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 2006 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan 2006	3/1, 3/4, 3/7, 3/8, 3/10, 3/11, 3/12 4/4, 4/13, 4/14 5/1, 5/5, 5/14 7/3 8/2, 8/3, 8/4, 8/6, 8/10, 8/11, 8/16 10/1

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework March 2012 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014 Circular 11/95 (Appendix A)
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	<u>City Wide Guidance</u> Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential

	Developments (2010)
--	---------------------

5.4 Status of Proposed Submission – Cambridge Local Plan

Planning applications should be determined in accordance with policies in the adopted Development Plan and advice set out in the NPPF. However, after consideration of adopted plans and the NPPF, policies in emerging plans can also be given some weight when determining applications. For Cambridge, therefore, the emerging revised Local Plan as published for consultation on 19 July 2013 can be taken into account, especially those policies where there are no or limited objections to it. However it is likely, in the vast majority of instances, that the adopted development plan and the NPPF will have considerably more weight than emerging policies in the revised Local Plan.

For the application considered in this report, there are no policies in the emerging Local Plan that should be taken into account.

6.0 **CONSULTATIONS**

6.1 **Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)**

Comment 1 August 2016

Normally for this level of development the Highway Authority would seek adoption of the street within the site to safeguard residential amenity, however the layout as proposed would not comply with the Highway Authority's requirements for an adoptable street and so we would be unable to do so. This should be brought to the attention of the applicant and an appropriate informative added to any permission that the Planning Authority is minded to issue in regard to this proposal.

The information provided is insufficient to verify the manoeuvring characteristics of a delivery vehicle or refuse vehicle visiting the site. A tracking plot from a recognised vehicle manoeuvre simulation package must be provided. The applicant must show the dimensions for the proposed car

parking spaces, which should measure 2.5m x 5m with a 6m reversing space. The access onto Shelford Road should provide a splayed surface to allow vehicles turning left to do so without excessive swinging out into the carriageway. Please provide this information and amended drawings to the Highway Authority for comment prior to determination of this application.

Recommended conditions:

- No unbound material
- No gates across the access
- Vehicle access to be laid out
- Vehicle access drainage
- Visibility splays
- Manoeuvring area
- Access to be provided

Comment on 7 October 2016 referring to additional drawings showing visibility splay, access, vehicle tracking and parking spaces

Acceptable.

6.2 Environmental Health

No objection.

Recommended conditions/informatives:

- Preliminary Contamination Assessment
- Site Investigation Report and Remediation Strategy
- Implementation of remediation
- Completion Report
- Material Management Plan
- Unexpected contamination
- Demolition and construction hours
- Collections and deliveries during demolition and construction
- Demolition/construction noise and vibration (including piling)
- Dust
- Building noise insulation
- Dust condition informative
- Demolition/construction noise and vibration informative

6.3 Refuse and Recycling

No objection.

Recommended informative:

- Unadopted road construction standard

6.4 Urban Design and Conservation Team

Comments 5 September 2016

This section of Shelford Road is characterised by 2 storey and the occasional 2.5 storey pitched roof detached and semi-detached houses. The houses are set back from the road and include driveways and front gardens. The gardens to the rear of the houses are typically 65-75m in length and back on to the rear gardens of houses in Royal Way (part of the Great Kneighton growth site).

Scale and massing

The proposed units are all 2.5 storeys with rooms located within the pitched roof space. The pitched roof form relates to the existing neighbouring houses and the ridge and eaves heights align with those of the No. 79 Shelford Road to the southeast (as shown in the street elevation – DAS page 11). The site sections referred to on the submitted site plan (Sections A and B) should be provided and extended to show the scale relationship with the houses in Royal Way. However given that Plots 4-9 are 2 storey with pitched roofs (with roof windows) from the rear, it is likely the scale of the units will be comparable to the existing houses in Royal Way and will therefore be acceptable in design terms.

Elevations and materials

A contemporary approach has been taken to the proposed elevations and materials. The submitted materials pallet is acceptable in design terms and will relate well with the contemporary design of dwellings on Great Kneighton. The extent of the roof on the aluminium clad bay to Plot 1 should be extended to form a porch canopy over the front entrance. Proposed materials should be conditioned should the application be approved. Further details of the projecting brickwork, window reveals, rainwater goods and flue/vent extracts need to be provided and should be conditioned.

Residential amenity

During pre-application discussions we raised concerns that the number of units represented over development of the site and resulted in adverse amenity impacts to neighbouring houses. We previously raised concerns that the number and arrangement of units adjacent to the garden boundary of No. 81 Shelford Road had the potential to result in an overbearing impact (as a result of the proposed small garden depth and proximity of units to the neighbouring garden) and overlooking due to the arrangement of windows are first floor level. The submitted scheme reduces the number of units from 11 to 9 and reduces the number of units adjacent to the side garden boundary of No. 81 Shelford Road from 4 to 2. We support this arrangement, the rear gardens of these units (Plots 2 and 3) have increased in depth from approximately 7.7m to 10.4m.

The accommodation at first floor level has also been reconfigured so that obscured bathroom and en-suite windows are located on the rear elevation and projecting timber louvered screens introduced for the bedroom windows which will direct views away from the rear gardens of No. 79 and 81 Shelford Road. The second floor bedroom windows on the gable ends have been arranged so that they are angled away from the rear garden of Plot 1 and No. 79 Shelford Road to the southwest and the front elevations of Plots 7 and 8 to the northeast. These changes are supported in design terms and address previous concerns.

Following pre-application discussions, the rear gardens of Plots 4-9 have increased in depth from 9 to 13m and the back to back distance between the existing houses on Royal Way and the proposed units have increased from 17m to almost 20m. The increased garden depths allows for tree planting which will help soften and filter views of the proposed units from the neighbouring gardens in Royal Way.

The City Council do not have any minimum back to back distances. However the proposed 19-20m back-to-back distance between the existing and proposed units, the

introduction of tree planting in the proposed rear gardens and the limited number of first floor windows on the rear elevation of houses in Royal Way (limited to 1 bedroom window, 1 home office window and a obscure bathroom and en-suite window), it is likely that the proposal will not result in significant inter-looking impacts between the existing and proposed units.

The full height windows shown on the front elevations of Plots 4-9 have been reduced in size and obscured glazing introduced on the lower section of the 1st and 2nd floor level windows. This approach is supported and reduces the sense of overlooking to the rear gardens of No. 75 and 79 Shelford Road and improves the privacy for future occupants.

The submitted cast shadow diagrams (DAS page 17-22) shows that the proposed scheme will result in additional overshadowing to the rear garden of No. 73 Shelford Road in the morning and early afternoon (9:00am-1:00pm on the 20th March). Overshadowing to the rear gardens of No. 41-45 Royal Way is limited to the late evenings (5:00pm onwards on the 20th March) and is no worse than the existing situation (and forms a moderate improvement). The level of overshadowing to neighbouring houses is acceptable in design terms.

Cycle storage

The proposed treatment (design and materials) of the cycle stores needs to be provided and should be conditioned should the application be approved. Covered storage should also be provided for the refuse storage within the rear gardens and details of these stores needs to be provided.

Recommended conditions

- Materials samples
- Details of non-masonry walling systems
- Details of windows and doors
- Details of cycle and refuse store treatment
- Details of projecting brickwork, window reveals, rainwater goods and flue/vent extracts

Comments on 17 October on revised plans

The proposed amendments are acceptable in design terms and have addressed all of the concerns raised in our previous application comments.

6.5 Access Officer

The roadway should have some form of kerb/upstand for a visually impaired person to use to way-find down the drive.

6.6 Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

Comments 10 August 2016

No objection.

Recommended conditions:

- Hard and soft landscaping
- Boundary treatment

6.7 Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Officer)

No objection.

Recommended condition:

- Implementation of surface water drainage scheme

6.8 Cambridgeshire County Council (Archaeology)

Records indicate that the site is situated in an area of high archaeological potential. Archaeological investigations adjacent to application area at Clay Farm revealed evidence of Late Bronze Age / Early Iron Age settlement and Roman enclosures and settlement. Archaeological investigations to the south west at Glebe Farm revealed evidence of Early Middle Iron Age settlement, which may have been superseded by a later Iron Age settlement enclosure. A single inhumation was also recovered. In addition, to the south east are designated site revealed by aerial photography.

Recommended condition:

- Implementation of a programme of archaeological work

6.9 Policy Team

No objection.

The property was marketed for a period of two years between 2012 and 2014, however no occupier was found. The marketing exercise described and the length of time the property was marketed demonstrates that Policy 7/3 criterion a) has been met.

Criterion e) states that loss of floorspace within Use Classes B1(c), B2 and B8 will be permitted if redevelopment for mixed use or residential development would be more appropriate. The site, which is not particularly large, is surrounded on all sides by residential properties. The noise and disturbance likely to be caused by an industrial use in this location will impact on these properties. These expected impacts mean that redevelopment for residential use would be more appropriate and criterion e) is met.

The proposal is therefore compliant with policy 7/3 and acceptable in policy terms.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

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

- 73 Shelford Road
- 79 Shelford Road
- 81 Shelford Road
- 41 Royal Way
- 43 Royal Way
- 45 Royal Way
- 1 Glanville Road
- 44 Fairfax Road

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Principle

- Not opposed to the principle of development.
- Support the need for housing.
- Support the demolition of existing industrial building.

Context

- Over-development on the site. The number and size of the buildings are too large.
- Ambiguity around current borders, trees and shrubbery, and plans for refuse storage and collection.
- Not in keeping with the context of the surrounding area.

Residential amenity

- Loss of privacy to Nos. 79 and 81 Shelford Road, and the Royal Way properties. The proposed timber louvres do little to prevent overlooking the garden of No. 81.
- Impact of construction noise, disturbance, dust and potentially asbestos. The developer should pay to re-clean the houses along Royal Way following demolition.
- Noise impact from vehicle movements using the access.
- Noise and disturbance impact on neighbouring properties.
- Overshadowing impact on No. 79.
- Overbearing and overshadowing impact on No. 81 Shelford Road and the Royal Way properties. The shadow plans do not include the impact of trees along the boundary.
- Trees along the boundary should be retained for privacy purposes
- Light pollution from the second and third storeys and skylights
- Concern that renewal of this access to the rear of Royal Way would reduce security. Would like to retain this path to increase privacy, but request that access is not given to it from Shelford Road.
- Unclear about boundary treatments

Highway safety

- Safety of pedestrians and cyclists using the existing foot path and cycle way along Shelford Road to local services.
- Limited visibility along the pavement.
- Poor access for emergency vehicles and refuse vehicles
- Poor turning area for vehicles.
- Not enough car parking spaces will lead to demand for on street parking.
- Impact of additional traffic generated on Shelford Road.

Bin and bike stores

- Lack of bin stores.
- Bike stores should be located away from the boundary to prevent loss of trees.

Drainage

- Hard surfacing will lead to surface water run-off

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. Affordable Housing
3. Context of site, design and external spaces
4. Residential amenity
5. Refuse arrangements
6. Highway safety
7. Access
8. Car parking
9. Cycle parking
10. Drainage
11. Third party representations
12. Planning obligations

Principle of Development

8.2 The Government's planning policy – the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) - places strong emphasis on the need to deliver a wide choice of high quality homes. Paragraph 49 states that 'housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development'. The Government encourages the 'effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land)' as one of the core planning principles

(paragraph 17). Weight must be given to the 'presumption in favour of sustainable development' which for decision-taking means 'approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay' (paragraph 14).

- 8.3 The site is mixed use including a residential unit and curtilage, and light industrial use. Policy 7/3 aims to protect industrial and storage space. This site does not lie within a protected industrial site. The policy states that development where there is a change of use will only be permitted if:
- a) There is a sufficient supply of industrial/storage within the City to meet the demand and/or vacancy rates are high; and either
 - d) The continuation of industrial and storage uses will be harmful to the environment or amenity of the area; or
 - e) Redevelopment for mixed use or residential development would be more appropriate.
- 8.4 The applicant has submitted information regarding the current use of the industrial units and recent marketing efforts. The property was marketed for a period of two years between 2012 and 2014, however no occupier was found. The Policy Team has commented that the marketing exercise and the length of time the property was marketed demonstrates that criterion a) has been met.
- 8.5 The industrial site is located within a residential area. Following the Clay Farm development on land to the rear, the site is now surrounded on all sides by residential properties. The noise and disturbance that could be generated by industrial use in this location is likely to have an impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties. In my opinion, the redevelopment for mixed use or residential development would be more appropriate than continued use of the site for industrial purposes. The Policy Team agrees with this view and comment that criterion e) is met. The principle of the loss of industrial use is compliant with policy 7/3.
- 8.6 The proposal is for residential development on an unallocated site. Policy 5/1 for residential development in windfall sites applies. The policy supports such development subject to the existing land use and the compatibility with adjoining uses. As stated above, the loss of the existing land use is acceptable. The site is surrounded by residential properties. For the

reasons given in this report, I consider the proposal is compatible with adjoining uses. In my opinion, the proposal is compliant with policy 5/1 and the principle of development is acceptable.

Affordable Housing

- 8.7 Policy 5/5 states that on sites of 0.5ha or more and all developments including an element of housing which have 15 or more dwellings, the Council will seek affordable housing of 40% or more of the dwellings or an equivalent site area. The proposal is for 9 units on a site area of 0.25 ha and therefore does not trigger the requirement for affordable housing. Given the site constraints, I am content that the proposal does not represent low density development. For these reasons, in my opinion, the current application for 9 units is acceptable and does not conflict with policy 5/5.

Context of site, design and external spaces (and impact on heritage assets)

- 8.8 This part of Shelford Road is characterised by detached properties with long rear gardens. The character of the area has been substantially altered in recent years following the Clay Farm development. The Great Kneighton development at the rear of the site has a different character to the more traditional properties along Shelford Road, in terms of the scale of units, their design and materials palette, and the limited amount of amenity space compared to the traditional properties. In my opinion, the Great Kneighton development has introduced an important change to the character of the area compared to other examples of backland development.
- 8.9 The site has a backland position with a narrow frontage onto Shelford Road. There is existing development on the site, although the proposal includes part of the rear garden of No. 75. In my opinion, this sets a precedent for some development on the site. There are examples nearby of dwellings erected in backland positions, including Nos.87a and 88a Shelford Road. While the current proposal is for more units, and a larger scale and massing than these examples, in my opinion, the principle of development on the site would not be contrary to the character of the area.

Layout

- 8.10 The site would be laid out in a 'T' shape around the existing access, which would have turning heads on either side. Plots 4-9 would be laid out at the rear of the site. Plots 2-3 would be on the southern side of the access road. The replacement of the bungalow would be at the front of the site. In my opinion, this is a good layout which responds to the constraints of the site. In particular, the private amenity space backs onto the gardens of neighbouring properties; there is good surveillance of communal areas and car parking spaces; and there is space to retain and enhance landscaping on the site.
- 8.11 The proposed development would be well connected to existing vehicle, pedestrian and cycle routes along Shelford Road. The access would provide a shared surface for all users. The Highways Authority has stated that the layout would not comply with its requirements for an adoptable street but is nevertheless satisfied with the access arrangements and I accept its advice. In my opinion, the proposed shared surface would provide safe access for all users taking into account the volume of traffic likely to be generated by the proposed development.
- 8.12 On-plot parking would be provided for all units and visitor parking bays would be provided within the turning heads. Cycle and bin storage would be provided either in separate stores in the rear garden or within a private garage. In my opinion, the car and cycle parking and bin storage would be convenient for all users.

Scale and massing

- 8.13 During the course of the application, sections were provided which show the relationships between the proposed units and neighbouring properties on Shelford Road and Royal Way. The Urban Design Team commented that the overall scale and massing is acceptable in design terms and is comparable with nearby houses, and I agree with this advice. The ridge height of the units would be 8.5m which would be similar to the Royal Way properties (8.3m), No. 79 (8.4m) and No. 75 (7.5m). While I accept that the units would be slightly taller than surrounding development, in my opinion, the scale would be similar enough

so that it would not be out of character with the surrounding area.

Open Space and Landscape

- 8.14 The units would all have private amenity space. The gardens would be a similar size to the Royal Way properties. The proposal includes landscaping along the access and frontage which in my opinion would make a positive contribution to the street scene compared to the existing situation. The proposal also includes landscaping in front of and around the units to contribute towards defining defensible space and the separation between communal and private areas.
- 8.15 The applicants have submitted an Arboricultural Implications Assessment. The proposal would require the loss of two trees within the garden of No. 75 which are close to the boundary with No. 77. Replacement planting is proposed in this location. The proposal would also require the loss of the hedge at the rear of the site near to the boundary with the Royal Way properties, which would be replaced by tree planting.
- 8.16 During the course of the application, the bin stores in the rear gardens of Plots 4-9 were relocated further from the rear boundary of the site to allow for planting within the curtilages of the proposed units against the boundary with the Royal Way properties. The tree species were also amended to native Hornbeam and Beech trees to form year round screening.
- 8.17 The Landscape Officer supports the proposal subject to conditions requiring details of a hard and soft landscaping scheme and boundary treatments, and I accept this advice. In my opinion, the landscaping scheme would contribute positively to the appearance of the site and the street scene.

Elevations and Materials

- 8.18 The materials for Plots 1 (house type A), and Plots 6 and 7 (house type C) would be multi-brown brickwork and rustic red roof tiles. Plots 2, 3 (house type B), 4, 5 and 8 and 9 (house type C) would be grey weathered brickwork with grey plain roof tiles. The elevations include projecting brickwork detailing. The Urban Design Team has commented that the materials palette is acceptable in design terms and will relate well with the

contemporary design of the dwellings on Great Kneighton. It has recommended conditions for materials samples, details of non-masonry walling systems and details of windows and doors to be submitted for approval, and I accept this advice.

Street scene

- 8.19 There is a mix of building styles along Shelford Road. The existing bungalow has a hipped roof and is white render. In my opinion, the existing bungalow does not make a positive contribution to the street scene. The proposed replacement dwelling would be two storeys with a pitched roof, and would be multi-brown brickwork and rustic red roof tiles. The dwelling would have a contemporary appearance and, in my opinion, would be similar to the recent developments that are part of Clay Farm. The street scene would be enhanced through new landscaping in front of the dwelling and along the access.
- 8.20 The Urban Design Team has recommended approval, subject to conditions. I accept this advice, and in my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.21 The nearest neighbouring residential properties are Nos. 73-75 Shelford Road to the north of the site; Nos. 79 and 81 Shelford Road to the south of the site; and Nos. 39-45 Royal Way to the rear (east) of the site. The impact on the residential amenity of these properties in terms of overlooking, overbearing and overshadowing is considered below.
- 8.22 Third parties have raised concerns about the impact of noise, disturbance and dust during construction. The Environmental Health Team is satisfied with the proposal subject to conditions to restrict construction and delivery hours, and to control noise, vibration and dust during construction. I accept this advice and in my opinion, subject to these conditions, the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on residential amenity in this regard. In my opinion, it would not be reasonable to require the developer to pay for the neighbouring properties to be cleaned

following the development. The disposal of asbestos is addressed through other legislation.

Royal Way properties

- 8.23 I have visited No. 41 Royal Way. These properties are two storeys with shallow rear gardens. There are some windows on the ground and first floor rear elevations facing the application site.
- 8.24 Plots 4-9 would be approximately 11-12m from the site boundary and 19–20m from the rear elevation of the Royal Way properties. The rear elevations would be two storeys plus an attic storey, and approximately 5.4m high to the eaves and 8.8m high to the ridge. There would be one first floor window on the rear elevation of each unit which would serve a bedroom. A 1.8m high close boarded fence is proposed along the rear boundary. During the course of the application, the bin and bike stores in the rear gardens were relocated away from the boundary and planting proposed within the curtilages along the boundary.
- 8.25 The only views from Plots 4-9 towards the Royal Way properties would be from one bedroom window on the first floor rear elevation. There would be rooflights on the rear roof slope, however the base of these would be 1.7m above the internal floor level, as shown on the sections. Bedrooms are generally considered to have a lesser overlooking impact than living rooms and kitchens. In my opinion, the 19m minimum separation distance from the window to the rear elevation of the Royal Way properties would have an acceptable overlooking impact into existing windows. In my view, the 11m minimum separation distance to the boundary would have an acceptable overlooking impact on the rear gardens. Views would be partially obscured by a 1.8m high close-boarded fence and planting along the boundary. I have recommended a condition requiring this landscaping to be planted prior to first occupation of the units.
- 8.26 The existing industrial buildings have a single storey element that abuts the boundary with No. 43 Royal Way. There is a taller element with a pitched roof which is within 2.3m of the boundary. In my opinion, these buildings have a strong enclosing impact on No. 43. At the rear of Nos. 39-41 and 45

the site is open, however there is mature vegetation along the boundary which, in my opinion, has an enclosing impact on the rear gardens.

- 8.27 The proposal would remove the existing building on the boundary with No. 43 and there would be no buildings along this boundary. Plots 4-9 would introduce built form at the rear of the Royal Way properties where there currently is open space on the site, however these would be set back at least 11m from the boundary. The eaves height of the proposed units would be 5.5m compared to 4.5m for the Royal Way properties as shown on the sections. The ridge height would be 8.9m compared to 8.3m respectively. In my opinion, the scale of the units and the set back from the boundary would not result in an unacceptable overbearing impact compared to the existing situation.
- 8.28 The applicant has provided shadow diagrams which show that the additional overshadowing of the Royal Way properties is limited to:
- Overshadowing of rear garden of No. 39 Royal Way in the evening at the March/September equinox; and
 - Overshadowing of rear garden of No. 45 Royal Way in the afternoon in December solstice.
- 8.29 The Urban Design and Conservation Team has commented that the level of overshadowing to neighbouring houses is acceptable in design terms and in some cases forms a moderate improvement compared to the existing situation. In my opinion, while I accept that there would be additional overshadowing of two properties, this would be at the end of the day and, in my opinion, would not have an unacceptable impact on residential amenity.

Nos. 73 and 75 Shelford Road

- 8.30 I have visited No. 73 Shelford Road. These are two storey properties set back from Shelford Road. No. 73 has a long rear garden which extends the length of the application site. The rear part of the garden is used as an orchard. No. 75 would lose part of its garden as a result of the development, however would retain a garden that is approximately 24m long from the rear elevation.

- 8.31 The side elevation of Plot 9 would be set back 1.2m from the boundary with No. 73. This would be a gable end elevation with an eaves height of 5.5m and a maximum height of 8.9m to the ridge. There would be no windows on this elevation. There would be two first floor windows on the front elevation (one would be obscured) and one second floor dormer window. The elevations have been handed so that the un-obscured windows are furthest away from the site boundary. I have recommended a condition for the windows identified on the drawings as being obscured to be implemented prior to first occupation.
- 8.32 There would be direct views from un-obscured windows on the first and second floor towards No. 75. These windows would be approximately 44m from the rear elevations of No. 75 and approximately 20m from the rear garden boundary. As such, in my opinion, there would not be unacceptable overlooking into windows on the rear elevation of No. 75 or this property's garden.
- 8.33 There would be oblique views from these windows towards No. 73. The distance to the rear elevation of No. 73 would be approximately 49m and as such in my opinion, there would not be any overlooking into windows of No. 73. There would be some oblique views of the middle part of the garden which is currently used as an orchard. As previously stated, bedrooms are generally considered to have a lesser overlooking impact than living rooms and kitchens. The middle part of the garden is less sensitive than areas closer to the house which are generally more intensively used for private amenity space. For these reasons, in my opinion, there would not be an unacceptable loss of privacy for No. 73.
- 8.34 I am not concerned about any overbearing impact on No. 75 due to the separation distance and the set back of Plots 8-9 from the rear garden boundary. There would be some visual impact from the side gable end of Plot 9 on the garden of No. 73 which would be set back by 1.2m but in my opinion this would not appear overbearing. In my opinion, as previously stated, the rear part of the garden is generally considered to be less intensively used for private amenity space. As such, the visual impact of the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of this property.

- 8.35 The shadow diagrams show that the existing buildings have some overshadowing impact on the rear part of the garden of No. 73. In comparison, the proposal would result in:
- Some additional overshadowing of the rear part of the garden of No. 73 in the mornings at the June summer solstice
 - Some additional overshadowing of the rear part of the gardens of Nos. 71 and 73 in the mornings at the March and September equinoxes;
 - Some additional overshadowing of the rear part of the gardens of Nos. 69, 71 and 73 in the late morning and early afternoon at the December winter solstice.
- 8.36 The Urban Design and Conservation Team has commented that the level of overshadowing to neighbouring houses is acceptable in design terms. I accept that there would be additional overshadowing, however, these properties have long rear gardens which provide plenty of amenity space. In my opinion, the limited amount of additional overshadowing of the rear part of the gardens would not have an unacceptable impact on residential amenity.

Nos. 79 and 81 Shelford Road

- 8.37 I have visited No. 79 Shelford Road and gained a view into the rear garden of No. 81. These are two storey properties set back from Shelford Road. The rear garden of No. 79 is approximately 15m from the rear elevation to the application site. No. 81 has a long rear garden which extends the length of the application site. There is an outbuilding in the middle part of the garden which is well-used private amenity space. There are some windows on the rear elevations of the properties.
- 8.38 There is an existing single storey garage at the rear of No. 77 which abuts the boundary of the rear part of the garden of No. 79. The existing industrial buildings are approximately 10m away from the boundary with the rear garden of No. 81.
- 8.39 The south west corner of Plot 2 would adjoin the corner of the garden of No. 79. There would be a single storey element along approximately half of the rear boundary of the garden. This would be 3m high with a flat roof. There would be a single storey garage at the rear of Plot 1 which would be set back approximately 1m from the side boundary of the garden. This

would have an eaves height of approximately 2.6m and a ridge height of approximately 4m. The rear elevation of Plots 2 and 3 would be approximately 10m from the boundary of the application site with the rear garden of No. 81. The rear elevation would have three first floor windows each, two of these would be obscured and serve ensuites/bathrooms. There would be one un-obscured window in each dwelling serving a bedroom which would have a projecting timber panel on one side. There would be a second floor window in the side gable elevation serving a bedroom which would have oblique panels to restrict views. A 1.8m high close boarded fence and planting in the rear gardens is proposed.

- 8.40 The projecting timber panel on the first floor bedroom windows of Plots 2-3 would, in my opinion, prevent obscure views to the rear elevations of Nos. 79 and 81 and parts of the garden closest to the house which are generally considered to be more sensitive to overlooking. I have recommended a condition for the timber panels to be installed prior to first occupation of these units and to be retained thereafter.
- 8.41 There would be some direct views from these windows towards the middle part of the garden of No. 81 which is well-used private amenity space. In my opinion, the set back of 10m from the boundary and there only being one un-obscured window serving each bedroom, means that the overlooking would not result in an unacceptable loss of privacy. I have recommended a condition for the obscure glazing of the other windows on the rear elevation identified on the drawings to be implemented prior to first occupation of these units.
- 8.42 Views from the second floor window on the gable end of Plot 2 would be directed away from the gardens of Nos. 79 and 81 through the use of angled timber panels. In my opinion, this would be effective in avoiding overlooking of the gardens. The Urban Design and Conservation Team has recommended a condition for window details to be submitted for approval, and I accept this advice.
- 8.43 There would be some oblique views from the first floor window and second floor dormer window of Plot 4 towards the middle part of the garden of No. 81. These have been handed so that the windows are furthest away from the boundary. Similar to the impact on No. 73, in my opinion, the oblique views from a

bedroom window – mitigated by existing mature trees within the curtilage of No. 73 – towards the middle part of the garden would not have an unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of the occupiers of this property.

8.44 The rear elevation of Plots 2-3 would be 5.8m high to the eaves and 8.6m high to the ridge. In my opinion, due to the length of the rear gardens of the Shelford Road properties and the set back of 10m from the boundary, this would not have an unacceptable overbearing impact on these gardens. The garage for Plot 1 would be single storey and would not have an overbearing impact on the garden of No. 79.

8.45 There would be some visual impact from the side gable end of Plot 4 on the garden of No. 81 which would be set back by 1.2m but in my opinion this would not appear overbearing. In my opinion, as previously stated, the rear part of the garden is generally considered to be less intensively used for private amenity space. As such, the visual impact of the proposal would not have an unacceptable overbearing impact on the residential amenity of this property.

8.46 As the proposed units would be to the north of Nos. 79 and 81, the proposal would not overshadow Nos. 79 and 81, as demonstrated by the shadow diagrams.

Impact of Plot 1

8.47 Plot 1 would replace the existing bungalow with a two storey dwelling with a rear single storey element. The nearest neighbour is No. 79 to the south. No. 75 to the north is separated by the access. The two storey element would not project beyond the front or rear elevations of No. 79. The single storey rear element would have a flat roof with a maximum height of 2.9m. It would not cut the 45 degree line taken from the centre of any windows on the rear elevation of No. 79. There are no windows on the side elevation. In my opinion, Plot 1 would have an acceptable impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties.

Amenity of future occupiers

8.48 The properties would have private amenity space. In my opinion, the amount and quality of this amenity space is

acceptable. In my opinion, the layout of the site means there would be acceptable levels of privacy and the proposal would not result in overbearing or overshadowing impacts. As such the future occupiers would have a good level of amenity. The timber panels on the second floor window on the gable ends of Plots 2-3 would prevent direct views into the rear garden of Plot 1 and the windows on the front elevation of Plots 4-5.

- 8.49 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 (2006) policies 5/2, 3/7 and 3/12.

Trees

- 8.50 There are no tree preservation orders on the site or within the vicinity. The Tree Survey and Arboricultural Implications Assessment submitted by the applicant identifies three Ash trees, mixed conifers, a Cherry tree and a privet hedge within the application site that would be lost for construction. These trees have been identified by the applicant's qualified arboriculturalist as category C or U trees of low quality. Moreover, as they are not protected, they could be removed by the site owner at any time. The landscaping proposal includes replacement of these trees and the Landscape Officer supports the proposed landscaping scheme, subject to conditions.
- 8.51 There are several trees within the gardens of the neighbouring properties that would be protected during construction. Some would require some minor works to parts of the tree within the application site. In my opinion, as the trees are not protected, the proposed works are reasonable as they could be done by the site owner without the need for permission from the Local Planning Authority. Nonetheless, I have recommended a condition requiring the tree protection measures to be implemented in accordance with the details submitted. Subject to this, in my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 4/4.

Refuse Arrangements

- 8.52 The proposal includes bin stores in the rear gardens of Plots 4-9, and in the garages of Plots 2 and 3. I have recommended a

condition for these the bin stores to be provided prior to first occupation. The Refuse and Recycling Team is satisfied with the site layout for refuse vehicles to enter the site for collections. I have recommended conditions to ensure the access is suitable for refuse vehicles and to control its on-going maintenance. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

Highway Safety

- 8.53 The proposal uses an existing access into Shelford Road and there would be an intensification of the use of this access. During the course of the application, additional information was submitted regarding the visibility of the access point and maneuvering within the site. The Highways Authority is satisfied with the proposed arrangements, subject to conditions, and I accept their advice. I have also recommended conditions to control the construction of the access and to ensure its on-going maintenance.
- 8.54 Third parties have raised concern about the impact of the access on the safety of pedestrians and cyclists using the footpath and cycle way along Shelford Road which is used to access local services. This is an existing access. Although there would be some intensification of the use of the access, the number of traffic movements generated by the 9 units is likely to be low. The Highways Authority has not objected to the proposal and, in my opinion, this would not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety.
- 8.55 For these reasons, in my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Access

- 8.56 The Access Officer has commented that the roadway should have some form of kerb/upstand for a visually impaired person to use to way-find down the drive. The Landscape Officer has recommended a condition for a hard and soft landscaping scheme, and details of the curb would be provided as part of this.

Car Parking

8.57 The proposal is for one on-plot car parking space per unit and 3 visitor spaces. While the number of visitor car parking spaces exceeds the maximum standard, the number of spaces per unit is less than the maximum. Third parties have raised concern about the lack of car parking leading to demand for on-street car parking, however in my opinion, as the site is well connected to public transport and cycle path links along Shelford Road, the site is in a sustainable location and the proposed provision is acceptable. In my opinion, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/10.

Cycle Parking

8.58 The proposal includes cycle stores to be provided in the rear gardens of Plots 4-9 and with the garages of Plots 1–3. This provides secure and covered cycle parking which meets the adopted standards. During the course of the application, details of the cycle stores were submitted. I have recommended a condition for the cycle stores to be provided prior to occupation of the units and thereafter retained. In my opinion, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/6.

Drainage

8.59 The Sustainable Drainage Officer has recommended a condition for a detailed surface water drainage scheme to be submitted for approval. I accept this advice.

Third Party Representations

8.60 I have addressed the third party representations in the relevant sections above.

Planning obligations

8.60 National Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph 031 ID: 23b-031-20160519 sets out specific circumstances where contributions for affordable housing and tariff style planning obligations (section 106 planning obligations) should not be sought from small scale and self-build development. This follows the order of the Court of Appeal dated 13 May 2016, which gives legal effect to the policy set out in the [Written Ministerial Statement of 28 November 2014](#) and should be taken into account.

8.61 The guidance states that contributions should not be sought from developments of 10-units or fewer, and which have a maximum combined gross floorspace of no more than 1000sqm. The proposal represents a small scale development and as such no tariff style planning obligation is considered necessary.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 In my opinion, the principle of development is acceptable in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 7/3 and 5/1. I have assessed the application against the relevant development plan policies and have given full consideration to third party representations. The revisions submitted during the course of the application have addressed the initial concerns raised by officers. In my opinion, the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on residential amenity. I have been advised through the consultation process by other officers that there are no outstanding technical matters that cannot be resolved through conditions. On this basis, in my opinion, the proposal is compliant with all relevant development plan policies and therefore I must give weight to the 'presumption in favour of sustainable development' within the NPPF.

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

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12).

4. No development (other than demolition) shall take place until full details of all non-masonry walling systems, cladding panels or other external screens including structural members, infill panels, edge, junction and coping details, colours, surface finishes/textures and relationships to glazing and roofing have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This may consist of large-scale drawings and/or samples. Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To accord with policies 3/4 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

5. Full details of all windows, doors and rainwater goods, as identified on the approved drawings, including materials, colours, surface finishes/textures are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to their installation. This may consist of large-scale drawings and/or samples. Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To accord with policies 3/4 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

6. 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 accord with Policies 3/4 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

7. The cycle parking shall be provided in accordance with the approved details prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted, and shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure appropriate provision for the secure storage of bicycles. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/6)

8. The bin stores shall be provided in accordance with the approved details prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted, and shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13).

9. The windows identified as having obscured glass on the approved drawings shall be obscure glazed to a minimum level of obscurity to conform to Pilkington Glass level 3 or equivalent prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted, and shall have restrictors to ensure that the windows cannot be opened more than 45 degrees beyond the plane of the adjacent wall and shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 3/12).

10. The timber panels on the first floor windows on the rear elevations of Plots 2 and 3 as shown on drawing number 'PI(21)02' shall be installed prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted, in accordance with details submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The screens shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 3/12).

11. Prior to the commencement of above ground development, further details of the projecting brickwork detailing and window reveals as shown in the approved drawings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development should be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to enhance the appearance of the building (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/4).

12. No unbound material shall be used in the surface finish of the driveway within 6 metres of the highway boundary of the site.

Reason: To avoid displacement of loose material onto the highway in the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2).

13. Notwithstanding the provision of Class A of Schedule 2, Part 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, (or any order revoking, amending or re-enacting that order) no gates shall be erected across the approved vehicular access unless details have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan policy 8/2).

14. Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted, the vehicular access where it crosses the public highway shall be laid out and constructed in accordance with the Cambridgeshire County Council construction specification.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to ensure satisfactory access into the site (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2).

15. Prior to first use of the development hereby permitted, the access shall be constructed with adequate drainage measures to prevent surface water run-off onto the adjacent public highway, in accordance with a scheme submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with the Highway Authority.

Reason: To prevent surface water discharging to the highway (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2).

16. Prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted, two 2.0 x 2.0 metres visibility splays shall be provided as shown on the approved drawings. One visibility splay is required on each side of the access, measured to either side of the access, with a set-back of two metres from the highway boundary along each side of the access. This area shall be kept clear of all planting, fencing, walls and the like exceeding 600mm high.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2).

17. Prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted, the manoeuvring area shall be provided as shown on the drawings and retained free of obstruction thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2).

18. Prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted, the access shall be provided as shown on the approved drawings and a width of access of 5 metres provided for a minimum distance of ten metres from the highway boundary and retained free of obstruction.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2).

19. No development shall commence until details of the construction of the hardstanding for the access have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The hardstanding shall, as a minimum, be capable of supporting vehicles of 26 tonne weight and shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2)

20. No development shall commence until details of the proposed arrangements for future management and maintenance of the streets within the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The streets shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved management and maintenance details.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory development of the site and to ensure estate roads are managed and maintained thereafter to a suitable and safe standard. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2)

21. Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted, surface water drainage works shall be implemented in accordance with details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by 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:
- i. 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
 - ii. provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development.
 - iii. The surface water drainage scheme shall be managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the agreed details and management and maintenance plan.

Reason: In the interests of surface water drainage and flood management.

22. No development (other than demolition) shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these 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 (e.g. furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting); proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines indicating lines, manholes, supports); 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.

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 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12)

23. No development (other than demolition) shall take place 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 before the use hereby permitted is commenced and retained thereafter unless any variation is agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure an appropriate boundary treatment is implemented. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12)

24. 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 2006 policy 4/9)

25. The specification and position of fencing, or any other measures to be taken for the protection of any trees from damage during the course of development, shall be implemented in accordance with the Arboricultural Implications Assessment dated July 2016 and the Tree Protection Plan drawings 'TIP 16 210', 'TIP 16 210 1', 'TIP 16 210 2' and 'TIP 16 210 3' before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought onto the site for the purpose of development (including demolition). The agreed means of protection shall be retained on site until all equipment, and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area protected in accordance with this condition, and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered nor shall any excavation be made without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the retention of the trees on the neighbouring sites. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11, 3/12 and 4/4)

26. 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 2006 Policy 4/13.

27. 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 2006 Policy 4/13.

28. 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 2006 Policy 4/13.

29. 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 2006 Policy 4/13

30. 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 2006 policy 4/13.

31. 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/or 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 2006 Policy 4/13.

32. 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 2006 policy 4/13)

33. There should 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 2006 policy 4/13)

34. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved (including any pre-construction, demolition, enabling works or piling), the applicant shall submit a report in writing, regarding the demolition / construction noise and vibration impact associated with this development, for approval by the local authority. The report shall be in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228:2009 Code of Practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites and include full details of any piling and mitigation measures to be taken to protect local residents from noise and or vibration. 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 nearby properties
(Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

35. 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 2006 policy4/13

36. Prior to the commencement of development/construction, a noise insulation scheme detailing the acoustic noise insulation performance specification of the external building envelope of the residential units (having regard to the building fabric, glazing and ventilation) to reduce the level of noise experienced in the residential units as a result of the proximity of the habitable rooms to the high ambient noise levels in the area be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall achieve internal noise levels recommended in British Standard 8233:2014 "Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings". The scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall thereafter be retained as such.

Reason: To protect the amenity of future occupants of this property from the high ambient noise levels in the area.
(Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

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: 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: Demolition/Construction noise/vibration report

The noise and vibration report should include:

- a) An assessment of the significance of the noise impact due to the demolition/construction works and suitable methods for this are to be found in BS 5228:2009 Part 1 Annex E - Significance of noise effects. It is recommended that the ABC method detailed in E.3.2 be used unless works are likely to continue longer than a month then the 2-5 dB (A) change method should be used.
- b) An assessment of the significance of the vibration impact due to the demolition/construction works and suitable methods for this are to be found in BS 5228:2009 Part 2 Annex B - Significance of vibration effects.

If piling is to be undertaken then full details of the proposed method to be used is required and this should be included in the noise and vibration reports detailed above.

Following the production of the above reports a monitoring protocol should be proposed for agreement with the Local Planning Authority. It will be expected that as a minimum spot checks to be undertaken on a regular basis at site boundaries nearest noise sensitive premises and longer term monitoring to be undertaken when:-

- Agreed target levels are likely to exceeded
- Upon the receipt of substantiated complaints
- At the request of the Local Planning Authority / Environmental Health following any justified complaints.

Guidance on noise monitoring is given in BS 5228:2009 Part 1 Section 8.4 - Noise Control Targets and in Annex G - noise monitoring.

A procedure for seeking approval from the Local Planning Authority (LPA) in circumstances when demolition/construction works need to be carried out at time outside the permitted hours. This should incorporate a minimum notice period of 10 working days to the Local Planning Authority and 5 working days to neighbours to allow the Local Planning Authority to consider the application as necessary. For emergencies the Local Planning Authority should be notified but where this is not possible the Council's Out of Hours Noise service should be notified on 0300 303 3839.

Contact details for monitoring personnel, site manager including out of hours emergency telephone number should be provided.

Application Number	17/2050/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	7th December 2017	Officer	Mairead O'Sullivan
Target Date	1st February 2018		
Ward	Coleridge		
Site	64 Coleridge Road and Land to the rear of 62 and 60 Coleridge Road		
Proposal	Erection of 2no. houses to the rear of site. First floor side and rear extension to main house. Conversion of house to 1no. 3-bed and 1no. 1-bed flat.		
Applicant	Miss Emily Ceraudo 56 Selwyn Ave, Richmond TW92HD		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposal would not harm the character of the area - The proposal is on balance considered to have an acceptable impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers. - The units would provide an adequate standard of amenity for future occupiers
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

1.1 The application site is part of a pair of semi-detached properties on the western side of Coleridge Road. The site also comprises land which would formally have served as garden land to no's 62 and 60 Coleridge Road. The area is predominantly in residential use. It has a mixed character. The west side of the road is predominantly characterised by semi-detached two storey dwellings. Many of these have been extended to the

side, rear and into the roof. These are finished in a mixture of brick and render. The eastern side of the road is predominantly two storey terraced properties which are also finished in a mixture of brick and render.

1.2 There are no site constraints.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

2.1 The application seeks full planning permission for extensions to the host dwelling and dividing the property into two apartments; one 3 bedroom duplex and a studio flat in the roof. The application also seeks full planning permission for the construction of two 2 storey dwellings on land to the rear.

2.2 The host dwelling is to be extended to the side and rear and roof. The side extension would consist of a first floor element above an undercroft which provides access to the rear. The side extension has been amended to be reduced in height, so it steps down from the main ridge height, and set back from the front elevation to create a shadow line. The revised proposal retains the existing bay window. The rear extension would consist of a flat roof ground floor element and flat roof first floor element. The ground floor element would replace the existing ground floor extensions and not project beyond the existing footprint of 6.3 metres. The first floor extension would project 3.3 metres and would be set in from the south side elevation by 2.2 metres. The proposed roof extensions consist of a hipped to gable and flat roof dormer in the rear roof space. The house is to be converted into two flats; 1no. 3 bedroom duplex flat (110sqm) and a 1 bed flat (51sqm). The duplex flat is accessed from the undercroft area and is contained on the ground and first floors. Bike storage is shown within the rear garden. Bin storage is shown to be at the front of the property. The studio flat would be contained within the roof space and accessed from a door on the Coleridge Road frontage. The bike store for this unit would be integral and accessed from the undercroft. Bins for this flat are also shown at the frontage.

2.3 The pair of semi-detached properties to the rear of the building would be 1.5 storeys in terms of scale with the rooms on the first floor being contained within the roofspace. The internal layout of these units has been amended to ensure that both bedrooms at 1st floor can have means of escape. These units

would have bin and bike storage in stores to the side of each building. Both units would have rear gardens.

- 2.4 This is the third application on the site. Since the original submission, the scale of the first floor extension has been reduced due to concerns regarding the impact of the extension on the single aspect kitchen of no 62 Coleridge Road. As noted above the side extension has also been reduced in height and set back from the principal elevation as the original proposal was not considered to read as adequately subservient to the host dwelling. Since the original application was submitted, the scale, massing and height of the proposed buildings to the rear has been reduced due to concerns regarding their impact on neighbour amenity and the character of the area.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
17/1465/FUL	Erection of 2 no. houses to the rear of site. First floor side and rear extension to main house. Conversion of house to 1no. 3-bed and 1 no. 2-bed flat.	Withdrawn
17/0645/FUL	Erection of 4no. 3x bed terraced houses to the rear site. Conversion of house to 2 flats following a two storey front and side extension, part two storey part single storey rear extension and roof extension incorporating rear dormer.	Withdrawn

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 2006 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN		POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Plan 2006	Local	3/1 3/4 3/10 3/11 3/12 3/14 4/13 4/15 5/1 5/2 8/2 8/6 8/10

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

Central Government Guidance	<p>National Planning Policy Framework March 2012</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014</p> <p>Circular 11/95 (Annex A)</p> <p>Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard – published by Department of Communities and Local Government March 2015 (material consideration)</p>
Supplementary Planning Guidance	<p>Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007)</p> <p>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012)</p>
Material Considerations	<p><u>City Wide Guidance</u></p> <p>Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)</p>

5.4 Status of Proposed Submission – Cambridge Local Plan

Planning applications should be determined in accordance with policies in the adopted Development Plan and advice set out in the NPPF. However, after consideration of adopted plans and the NPPF, policies in emerging plans can also be given some weight when determining applications. For Cambridge, therefore, the emerging revised Local Plan as published for consultation on 19 July 2013 can be taken into account, especially those policies where there are no or limited objections to it. However it is likely, in the vast majority of instances, that the adopted development plan and the NPPF will have considerably more weight than emerging policies in the revised Local Plan.

For the application considered in this report, there are no policies in the emerging Local Plan that should be taken into account.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

- 6.1 Objection: The proposed parking arrangement is unclear and there is contradictory information in the Design and Access Statement. The access is only sufficient to provide access to one parking space if each car is to be able to access the site independently. The proposed parking arrangement needs to be clarified. The proposal may increase the demand for on-street car parking which is unlikely to impact on highway safety but may impact on residential amenity.

Environmental Health

- 6.2 No objection: Conditions are recommended in relation to construction hours, collection/delivery hours and piling.

Refuse and Recycling

- 6.3 Unclear as to whether the site will be using a shared bin store. If this is proposed then details of the pull distance to the collection point is required.

Urban Design and Conservation Team

- 6.4 Objection: There is inadequate space for off-street parking. The duplex unit should have its own front door. A set-back should be retained. Materials should match. Cycle and bin storage has been overprovided. The new units could have smaller stores in their gardens. The removal of the integral communal bike and bins stores allows a better entrance space. The new houses would benefit from porches. The roofing materials should continue to the first floor of the extension. Hit and miss lighting should be incorporated into the covered access.

Senior Sustainability Officer (Design and Construction)

- 6.5 No comments received

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Tree Team)

- 6.6 No comments received

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

- 6.7 Objection: The parking area is not adequately large. Cycle and bin storage is poorly considered. The proposals have improved but still do not adequately respond to the constraints of the site. The proposed arrangement has created spaces and uses which do not relate to the needs of the residents well.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Officer)

- 6.8 The proposed development is acceptable subject to a surface water drainage condition. All new or altered external surfaces within the site should be of permeable construction. If ground investigation identifies that infiltration techniques are not appropriate, the surface water runoff rates should be reduced to the equivalent greenfield runoff rates for the new houses and the additional roof area from the extension of the existing dwelling. An overall reduction in surface water runoff from the existing dwelling should be achieved.

Cambridgeshire Constabulary (Architectural Liaison Officer)

6.9 The area is at a low to medium vulnerability to the risk of crime. The proposal is to use an entry system of Secured by Design standards which is welcomed.

6.10 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:

- 30 Barham Avenue (owner of 66 Coleridge Rd) x3
- 1B Brackyn Road
- 2A Brackyn Road x3
- 56 Coleridge Road
- 62 Coleridge Road x4
- 67 Coleridge Road x3
- 68 Coleridge Road x3
- 71 Coleridge Road
- 73 Coleridge Road
- Camcycle x3
- The Hollies, Derenham x2

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Design, scale and layout:

- Overdevelopment;
- The houses to the rear should be 1/1.5 storeys maximum
- Footprint of houses does not appear significantly reduced since original application
- Out of character; nothing similar in Coleridge
- The design of the houses to the rear is contrasting and unpleasant
- The density is greater than elsewhere on the road
- Additional bins would further obstruct the footpath
- Loss of long garden form which is a characteristic of the area

- Would set a precedent
- The Coleridge Rd precedent has vehicular access and is at the end of a row of houses
- The Catharine Street precedent sited involves a commercial use to the frontage and is also not relevant.
- The precedent cited at 115 Coleridge Road retained a traditional design and had road access to the new dwelling
- The precedent cited at 79 is a single dwelling and therefore no comparable
- The area has character, good quality houses and is a desirable place to live.

Residential amenity

- Loss of light/overshadowing of no.66 and 62
- Loss of light to conservatory, rooflights that serve front room and bedroom of no. 62.
- Occupiers of upper floor will be able to look down into skylights at no.62
- The east facing window will overlook the garden of no.62
- Will be overbearing and cause tunnelling to bedroom of no. 62
- Will result in loss of privacy to adjoining gardens due to increase in movements to the rear
- Odour from bins adjacent to boundary with no.62
- Noise and light pollution from houses to the rear
- Noise disturbance from 1st floor kitchen
- Concerned about timing of work and disturbance from noise and dust during construction while recovering from serious operation

Car, cycle parking, bin storage, and highway safety/traffic

- Inadequate off-street car parking provision; will increase demand for on-street parking
- The roads are already overcapacity
- There is a planned residents parking scheme on Bracklyn Road
- Concerned about disruptions during construction
- No emergency access to the rear
- Cycle stands are too close

- Cycle parking behind bins are inaccessible
- Cycle parking is not a substitute for car parking
- Visitor cycle parking should be provided
- The revised plans result in an under provision of cycle parking; the cycles stored behind the bins are inaccessible.
- The Coleridge Rd precedent has vehicular access and is at the end of a row of houses

Other issues:

- Loss of trees
- Concerned about drainage due to increase in hardstanding
- Concerned about sewer capacity
- Concerned about fire risk
- The land is not a wasteland but a garden which has been poorly maintained.
- Would impact ecological green corridor
- The Catharine Street precedent sited involves a commercial use to the frontage and is also not relevant.

7.3 Councillor Herbert has commented on the application. His comments can be summarised as follows:

- Excessively intensive backland development on a small footprint
- Fails to respond to issues raised on previous applications regarding access and by Landscape/Urban Design and neighbours.
- The revised plans do not overcome the objections.
- Minor changes do not change my assessment of the negative overall impacts of this proposal, and breach of policies in the 2006 Plan.

7.4 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. Other
8. Third party representations
9. Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

Principle of Development

8.2 Policy 5/1 states that applications for housing on windfall sites will be permitted subject to the existing land use and compatibility with adjoining uses. The site is currently in residential use and Coleridge Road is a predominantly residential area characterised by two storey dwellings. As a result, I consider the proposal to comply with policy 5/1.

8.3 Policy 5/2 relates to the conversion of larger properties. This states that the conversion of single residential properties into self-contained dwellings will be permitted except where: a) the property has a floorspace of less than 110m²; b) there would be an unacceptable impact on parking c) the living accommodation provided would be unsatisfactory; d) the proposal would fail to provide for satisfactory refuse bin/bike storage e) the location of the property or the nature of nearby land uses would not offer a satisfactory level of residential amenity.

8.4 The extended property has a floorspace greater than 110sqm and as a result would satisfy criterion a). I have noted the compatibility of the site with residential use in paragraph 8.2. I will assess the proposal against criteria b), c) and d) in the below paragraphs.

8.5 The proposed pair of semi-detached dwellings would be built on land to the rear of 60-64 Coleridge Road. As a result policy 3/10 which relates to the sub-division of plots is relevant. This policy

requires consideration to be given to the impact on amenities of neighbours (part a), amenity space/car parking (b), impact on the character of the area (c), affect on listed buildings/BLI (d), impact on trees (e) and whether the proposal would compromise comprehensive redevelopment (f). In this case parts (d) and (f) are not relevant. I have addressed the other parts of policy 3/10 below.

Context of site, design and external spaces

- 8.6 There are two elements to the proposal; the extensions and alteration to the main dwelling; and introduction of 2no. two storey buildings on land to the rear. I set out below my assessment of each element.

Proposed extensions, alterations and subdivision to the main dwelling:

- 8.7 Coleridge Road has a mixed character and many of the properties on the street have been visibly extended. The proposed side extension has been amended to try and overcome the original concerns with the proposal. The revised proposed side extension is set down from the ridge and set back from the front elevation by approx. 200mm. In my view the revised proposal would appear less dominant and the amendments would mean that the extension would read as subservient later addition to the host dwelling I have recommended a condition requiring it to be finished in materials to match the existing dwelling.
- 8.8 The proposal also incorporates a change from hip to gable and a box dormer to the rear. Both of these elements are considered to be in keeping with other similar extensions in the vicinity. Whilst I am concerned by the potential visual impact of the dormer and roof form from Brackyn Road, in light of there being other similar extensions to properties within the area, I feel it would be difficult to warrant refusal of these elements.
- 8.9 The design and scale of the proposed ground and first floor rear extensions are, in my opinion, acceptable and would read as subservient additions to the main dwelling. The ground floor element would consolidate the existing extensions at ground floor and cover the same footprint. The first floor element would project 3.4m and would be set in from the southern elevation by

2.3m. The first floor element would read as a subservient addition.

8.10 In terms of the layout, the proposed subdivision of the dwelling would consist of two flats; 1 x 3bed flat (110m²) on the ground and first floor and 1 x bed flat (51m²) within the loft space. Access to the 3bed flat would be on the side elevation and access via the undercroft. The undercroft would also provide access to the cycle store for the flat which would be located adjacent to the rear boundary. Access to the 1bed would be via the entrance in the front elevation. The cycle store for this flat would be located within the side elevation and access via the undercroft. The undercroft would also lead to the two proposed dwellings to the rear. The bin storage area for both flats would be located adjacent to the northern boundary at the front of the site. The location of the bin store, adjacent to the boundary with no.62, is not ideal as no.62 has openable windows adjacent to the bin store. The bins should be located either within the footprint of the development or in a location that is easily accessible to both flats. I have therefore recommended a bin storage condition so that details of the type and appearance of the bin enclosure are submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

8.11 The 3 bed flat would have the kitchen and living room on the ground. The kitchen would be dual aspect with a window in the southern elevation and large opening in the west elevation which also provides access into the private garden. The living room, which is separate from the kitchen, is a single aspect room with two windows in the south elevation facing towards no.66. The windows in the southern elevation of the ground floor will be located under the undercroft and 2m from the side elevation of no.66 and could be looked into from occupiers of the proposed dwellings to the rear and duplex flat passing by. I therefore have some concerns with the proposed layout and amount of development trying to be achieved on the site but I do not consider these concerns to be significant enough to warrant refusal. Therefore on balance, the benefits from the proposal in terms of additional housing within the City would in my view outweigh the harm caused by the quality of the living environment.

2no. one and a half storey dwellings:

- 8.12 The pair of semi-detached dwellings to the rear would be 2 storey in terms of scale. These have been reduced in scale and number of proposed houses since the original planning application (ref: 17/0645/FUL) which proposed 4no. x 2 storey 3bed dwellings. This application was withdrawn due to concerns regarding overdevelopment, being out of character with the area and impact on the residential amenity of the occupier at no.66.
- 8.13 The current proposed dwellings would be set approx. 600mm below ground level and be 6.4m to the ridge and 3.8m to the eaves line. The dwellings have been designed with pitched roofs and would in my opinion clearly read as subservient to the host dwelling. The proposed design is contemporary and unfussy. I note that a number of the representations raise concerns regarding the impact of these dwelling on the character of the area. I am satisfied that the dwellings would read as subservient. Whilst a number of the precedents cited are not directly relevant, I am satisfied that the scale and density proposed is acceptable given the large size of the plot.
- 8.14 A representation has raised concerns regarding the loss of trees on site. There are a number of mature trees on site. However these are garden trees and are not protected by Tree Preservation Order (TPO) so there is no restriction on the applicant removing these trees from site. A number of trees are shown to be retained and a hard and soft landscaping condition is recommended requiring details of retained trees and replacement landscaping to be approved prior to commencement.
- 8.15 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/10, 3/11, 3/12 and 4/4.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

Impact of extensions on 66 Coleridge Road

- 8.16 The original application submitted was considered to have an unacceptable enclosure impact on the single aspect kitchen window to the unattached neighbour at 66 Coleridge Road. The subsequent applications have been amended to overcome this

objection by setting the rear extension away from the boundary with this occupier. This allows some space between the extension and the neighbouring kitchen and as a result the impact in terms of enclosure is no longer considered significantly harmful. No. 66 is to the south of the application site so there are no light implications.

Impact of the extensions on 62 Coleridge Road

- 8.17 The existing pitched roofed conservatory is proposed to be removed and replaced with a flat roofed extension with a similar footprint to existing. This would sit roughly in line with the extension at no. 62. The replacement extension would have a flat roof with a height of 2.9m and replaces the pitched roof conservatory which is 2.65m at the ridge. Given the minor increase to the height and as this element is in line with the conservatory to the attached property, I do not consider there would be any significant impact in terms of enclosure or loss of light.
- 8.18 The original first floor rear wall is stepped with the element nearest no. 62 being set back and an element protruding forward 0.6m near the boundary with no. 66. The proposal would extend 3.5m beyond the rear wall adjacent to no. 62. The extension would break the 45 degree horizontal plane when taken from the nearest first floor window of no. 62 which serves as a bedroom. The proposal would result in some enclosure to this window but given that there is no obstruction to the outlook from the other side and as the window is quite large and serves a bedroom rather than a living room or kitchen, which would be more intensively used, I am of the view that the enclosure impact would on balance be acceptable.
- 8.19 The applicant has provided a daylight, sunlight and overshadowing report which assesses the impact of the proposed extensions on light to no. 64 using the criteria set out under BRE guidance. The study looks at the impact of the extension on the nearest first floor window which serves a bedroom, and on two rooflights which serve a living room on the ground floor. The ground floor living room assessed is a single room but has been broken down into two rooms as part of the report; the element of the room which forms part of the original house and the element which forms part of the more recent extension. The extended element is served by the two

rooflights, the other part of the room only receives borrowed light. The report concludes that the proposal would have a minor adverse impact on light to no. 62. The following paragraphs address the assessment in more detail.

- 8.20 The impact of the extension on the first floor bedroom passes all of the light tests; although the impact in terms of annual probable sunlight hours is reduced to the limit of acceptability during winter. The results suggest that the impact of the extension on this room in terms of loss of light would be acceptable.
- 8.21 The two rooflights assessed serve a living room space on the ground floor. Rooflight B is nearest the boundary with no.64 and rooflight C is further north on the flat roof. The living room which the rooflights serve is already enclosed by a conservatory to the rear. The assessment breaks the room down into rooms B and C. Room B is the area under the rooflights, which appears to be part of an extension to the property and has a higher ceiling than room C. Room C is not served by any windows and appears to be part of the original house with a lower ceiling than room B. Rooms B and C are not divided by a door and appear as one room. The room primarily gets its light from the two rooflights but also has a glazed door which leads to the conservatory. This provides limited light due to the orientation of the plot and because the roof of the conservatory is designed to restrict light to prevent it from overheating. At the time of my site visit and in the photographs provided in the light assessment, this glazed door was covered with a net curtain which potentially further restricts light into these rooms. The representation from no. 62 explains that this conservatory was built following the construction of the ground floor extension to no. 64 which blocked light and enclosed the living room of no.62.
- 8.22 The sky component to the rooflights is assessed as part of the light study provided. This indicates the change in level of daylight received to windows as a result of the proposal. The assessment found that the impact on rooflight C to be minimal but rooflight B did not pass the test.
- 8.23 The living room was also assessed in terms of daylight distribution. The level of impact on both parts of the room (rooms B and C) was considered to be acceptable by BRE

guidelines. Average Daylight Factor (ADF) was assessed. As noted above, this breaks down the enclosed living room space into two rooms; room b and room c. Room B, the part of the room under the skylights, passes and receives an ADF of 1.8% above the minimum of 1.5%. Room C, the part of the room without a window and with a lower ceiling, currently fails to get the recommended minimum ADF and the ADF would be reduced further below the minimum standard; the standard being 1.5% with room C reducing from 1.3% to 1.1%. Whilst the reduction to room C is less than ideal, the majority of the room would still receive an acceptable level of light by BRE standards. Essentially, the proposal would make a poor existing situation marginally worse but it is my view that the change would not be significantly harmful to warrant refusal and that, on balance, this impact would be acceptable.

- 8.24 To conclude, the light study finds that the proposal would result in some adverse impacts in terms of loss of light to no. 62. Rooflight B fails to meet the vertical sky component level but rooflight C which serves the same room comfortably passes the test. Light to room C is already poor and the increased worsening of this situation is in my view not sufficiently harmful to warrant refusal. Room C is joined to room B without any door to separate the rooms. Room B passes the test. Room C only receives borrowed light which is currently substandard in terms of the BRE Guidelines and as a result the further worsening of the situation is in my view, on balance, acceptable.

Impact of the new dwellings on residential amenity

- 8.25 The proposed new buildings are set off the boundary with the neighbours to the north (no.66) and south (no.58) by 4.5m and 4.7m respectively. Both buildings would result in some enclosure to these gardens but only the ends of these long gardens would be impacted and as a result the impact is not considered significantly harmful to warrant refusal. The neighbour at no. 66 is to the south of the site and there would be no loss of light to this garden. There would be some minor overshadowing of the garden of no. 58 but only the end of the garden would be impacted and given the set off the boundary and relatively low height, at 3.6m to the eaves and 6.5m to the ridge, this impact would in my view be acceptable. There are two windows on both side elevations facing towards the gardens of no. 66 and no. 58 Coleridge Road. These windows

are shown to be obscure glazed. A condition is recommended requiring the windows to be obscured and on restrictors, to limit the amount these can be opened and ensure there would be no overlooking of these gardens.

- 8.26 The buildings would be relatively close to the boundary with no. 60 and no. 62 Coleridge Road as well as the garden of the proposed 3 bed flat. The height adjacent to these boundaries is lower as the eaves height of the proposal would be 3.6m. Whilst the buildings would result in some additional enclosure to these occupiers, this impact is to the end of the garden and as a result is not considered significantly harmful to warrant refusal. The buildings would result in some minor overshadowing to these gardens but this would only impact the end of the gardens and for a limited time.
- 8.27 Objections have been received from the occupiers of no. 2 Brackyn Road. The proposed buildings to the rear are significantly set away from the boundary with this property; the new houses have gardens of over 8m which provide separation between the new buildings and 2 Brackyn Road. There are no first floor windows on the rear elevation and a condition is recommended requiring the velux windows to be at least 1.7m above the finished floor level to prevent any overlooking.

Noise and disturbance

- 8.28 A number of the representations raise concerns regarding noise and disturbance from coming and goings. The two new buildings do not have any vehicular access so people would access the units by foot or bicycle. A boundary treatment condition is required to ensure that there is adequate screening around the adjoining gardens. As noted previously, a number of trees are to be retained, details of which are required by a recommended condition, which would also help provide additional buffering. As a result of the lack of vehicular movements and the potential to provide buffering through the boundary treatment and trees, I am satisfied that there would be no significant noise and disturbance to surrounding occupiers.
- 8.29 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 (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/10.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

- 8.30 The occupiers of the unit would have their own access directly into the flat from an independent entrance to the side of the building. This flat would have a substantial private garden. Bike and bins for this flat are to be provided within stores in the garden; conditions requiring these details to be approved are recommended and discussed under the relevant paragraphs below. The flat is dual aspect and adequately large for the proposed use (110sqm).
- 8.31 The proposed studio flat is contained in the roof space. This would be accessed from a door in the front elevation on Coleridge Road. This unit is small (38sqm) and does not have access to private outdoor amenity space. However, it would be a one bedroom flat that would be occupied by a single individual rather than by a family. The unit is double aspect and the internal space level is considered to provide an adequate standard of living accommodation for future occupiers. Bike and bin storage for this unit could be dealt with by conditions discussed under the relevant headings below.
- 8.32 The two new dwellings are accessed through the undercroft from Coleridge Road. Some lighting is shown for security purposes but details of this are requested by a recommended condition. These houses each provide three bedrooms. The upper floor bedrooms have been rearranged as one of the rooms only had a high level window and this would not be suitable for means of escape. The two upper floor bedrooms are served by obscure glazed windows on restrictors to prevent overlooking. This situation is not ideal as these rooms will have no outlook and will receive limited light. However, given the substantial garden space (smaller garden is 114sqm) and adequate size of the buildings (110sqm), I consider that on balance the units would provide an adequate level of amenity for future occupiers.
- 8.33 For clarity, the internal floorspace for each unit and the National Space Standard for each unit type is provided in the below table:

Unit	Internal floorspace	Nationally described space standards
3 bed duplex flat	117sqm	102sqm
Studio flat	38sqm	39sqm
House to rear	110sqm	102sqm

8.34 In my opinion the proposal, on balance, provides an adequate standard of residential amenity for future occupiers, and I consider that in this respect it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7, 3/10, 3/12, 3/14 and 5/2.

Refuse Arrangements

8.35 The proposal has been revised as originally there was an over provision of bikes and bins. The revised plans resulted in there being a conflict with the stores for the new houses whereby bikes were shown stored behind the bins and were thus not adequately accessible. The bike and bin provision has been further revised to address these concerns.

8.36 The bins for the two units in the existing building are shown in the frontage. In my view the bins for the larger duplex flat should be within a bin store in the garden. I am satisfied that there is adequate space to provide this along with a cycle store and I have recommended that we request details by condition. In my view it would be acceptable to have the bins for the studio unit to the frontage but these should be within a low rise store. Details of the store could also be dealt with by condition.

8.37 The stores for the two proposed new houses have been revised. These seem to show an under provision of bins. However I am satisfied with the proposed approach and consider that revised bin/bike stores which are marginally larger can be provided on site and can be dealt with by the recommended condition.

8.38 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/12 and 5/2.

Highway Safety

- 8.39 The Highway Engineer objected to the proposal as there was inadequate space to provide off-street car parking space without the spaces overhanging the highway. The off street car parking has been removed to overcome this objection and car parking provision is dealt with under the relevant heading below. Many of the representations raise concerns regarding the impact of the proposal on highway safety. A construction traffic management plan is recommended to minimize disruptions during construction. In my view the additional users of the site would not result in such a significant intensification of use of the site to cause highway safety concerns.
- 8.40 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Car and Cycle Parking

- 8.41 As noted above, there was a conflict with the bike and bin storage arrangement as part of the previous proposed plans. This has been revised and now the houses appear to be showing an under provision of bikes and bins. Both houses have large gardens to the side and rear and have elements to the front which would accommodate a store. Details of a store or stores of adequate size to accommodate 3 cycles and 3 bins for each unit are required by a recommended condition.
- 8.42 The cycle store for the duplex flat is in the rear garden. Details of this store could be required by condition. The cycle parking for the studio flat is accessed from the undercroft and is considered to be acceptable.
- 8.43 Off-street car parking has been removed from the proposal as there is not adequate space to accommodate car parking without a car overhanging the footpath. Given the sustainable location of the site, I am satisfied that the lack of car parking is acceptable.
- 8.44 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/10, 5/2, 8/6 and 8/10.

Other

8.45 The adjoining occupier at no. 62 has signed a disclaimer allowing some personal information regarding the status of their health to be published as part of their representation due to their concerns about the impact of any constructions works on their health. The occupier is currently recovering from a medical procedure and needs to be free of disturbance to ensure their recovery is successful. A planning condition has been agreed with the applicant that would prevent any works beginning on site until November 2018. This condition is recommended in place of the standard time condition.

8.46 This condition would not be strictly required in planning terms to make the development acceptable; however, in light of the written agreement of the applicant to this approach, Members are invited to consider this as a pragmatic way of accommodating the neighbours particular health circumstances in this instance.

Third Party Representations

8.47 I have addressed the majority of the representations within the body of my report. I will address any outstanding matters below:

Representation	Response
<i>Design, scale and layout</i>	
Overdevelopment	The proposed development is considered to be of an appropriate scale for the plot
The houses to the rear should be 1/1.5 storeys maximum	The houses are now 1.5 storey in scale
Footprint of houses does not appear significantly reduced since original application	The footprint of the houses has been reduced since both previous applications. The length has been reduced by over 3m since the previous application. The overall footprint of the building has been reduced from 148sqm to 119sqm
Out of character; nothing similar in Coleridge	See paragraphs 8.6 and 8.15
The design of the houses to the rear is contrasting and unpleasant	The design is considered acceptable. See paragraphs 8.11

	and 8.15
The density is greater than elsewhere on the road	The proposal is considered to adequately respect the amenity of surrounding occupiers and to provide a quality living environment for future occupiers and therefore the increase in density is considered acceptable.
Additional bins would further obstruct the footpath	The additional bins would only be on the footpath for a limited time on collection day. I accept that this will result in some clutter but given that this would be for a limited time I do not consider it to be significantly harmful
Loss of long garden form which is a characteristic of the area	Gardens elsewhere on Coleridge Road have been subdivided and the loss of the long garden is not considered significantly harmful to the character of the area
Would set a precedent	Each application is assessed on its own merits.
The Coleridge Rd precedent has vehicular access and is at the end of a row of houses	I note that a number of the precedents cited are not directly relevant. However some small scale backland development is found in the surrounding area
The Catharine Street precedent sited involves a commercial use to the frontage and is also not relevant.	See above
The precedent cited at 115 Coleridge Road retained a traditional design and had road access to the new dwelling	See above
The precedent cited at 79 is a single dwelling and therefore no comparable	See above
The area has character, good quality houses and is a desirable place to live.	Noted
<i>Residential amenity</i>	
Loss of light/overshadowing of	See paragraphs 8.17-8.24

no.66 and 62	
Loss of light to conservatory, rooflights to living room and bedroom of no. 62	See paragraphs 8.17-8.24
Occupiers of upper floor will be able to look down into living room skylights of no. 62	Any views from the extension into these rooflights would be at an oblique view and as a result there would be no significant impact to the privacy of this room
Will result in loss of privacy to adjoining gardens due to increase in movements to the rear	See paragraphs 8.25 & 8.27 - 8.28
Odour from bins adjacent to boundary with no.62	The bin storage location has been revised and is no longer adjacent to this boundary
Noise and light pollution from houses to the rear	The houses to the rear are set away from all boundaries and in my view the proposal would not result in a significant level of noise or light disturbance given the low number of units proposed
Noise disturbance from 1 st floor kitchen	The use of the kitchen is unlikely to cause significant noise and disturbance through the walls
Concerned about timing of work and disturbance from noise and dust during construction	Although the EHO has not recommended a dust condition, given the concerns, I consider it to be reasonable and have recommended the dust condition and informative. A bespoke time condition is also recommended. See paragraphs ###
<i>Car, cycle parking, bin storage, and highway safety/traffic</i>	
Inadequate off-street car parking provision will increase demand for on-street parking	The site is located in a sustainable location. There is no requirement for off-street car parking
The roads are already overcapacity	I do not consider that the additional two units to the rear and subdivision of the house would have any significant impact on traffic generation

There is a planned residents parking scheme on Brackyn Road	Noted
Concerned about disruptions during construction	A construction traffic management plan has been recommended.
No emergency access to the rear	This is not a planning matter
Cycle stands are too close	I am satisfied that adequate cycle storage details can be provided by condition
Cycle parking behind bins are inaccessible	This has been resolved by the most recent set of plans. Final details of cycle parking and bin storage for all units are recommended to be dealt with by condition.
Cycle parking is not a substitute for car parking	Given the sustainable location of the site I am satisfied that the lack of car parking and proposed cycle parking provision would be acceptable.
Visitor cycle parking should be provided	In my view, there is no requirement for visitor cycle parking given the small number of units proposed.
<i>Other issues</i>	
Loss of trees	See paragraph 8.14
Concerned about drainage due to increase in hardstanding	The sustainable drainage engineer has no objection subject to conditions
Concerned about sewer capacity	There is no evidence to suggest this is a concern
Concerned about fire risk	This is not a planning matter
The land is not a wasteland but a garden which has been poorly maintained.	Noted.
Would impact ecological green corridor	The site has no ecological designation

Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

8.48 National Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph 031 ID: 23b-031-20160519 sets out specific circumstances where contributions for affordable housing and tariff style planning

obligations (section 106 planning obligations) should not be sought from small scale and self-build development. This follows the order of the Court of Appeal dated 13 May 2016, which gives legal effect to the policy set out in the [Written Ministerial Statement of 28 November 2014](#) and should be taken into account.

- 8.49 The guidance states that contributions should not be sought from developments of 10-units or fewer, and which have a maximum combined gross floorspace of no more than 1000sqm. The proposal represents a small scale development and as such no tariff style planning obligation is considered necessary.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The proposed extensions are in keeping with the area and would read as subservient later additions to the buildings. The two new dwellings in the rear are of a scale which would also read as subservient and are not considered harmful to the character of the area. The proposed units would provide an adequate standard of amenity for future occupiers. The light study submitted shows that the proposal would have a minor adverse impact on the amenity of no. 62 but overall the impact on amenity is, on balance, considered to be acceptable.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun after the end of October 2018 and 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 and the personal health of the neighbouring occupier.

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. The extension hereby permitted shall be constructed in external materials to match the existing building in type, colour and texture.

Reason: To ensure that the extension is in keeping with the existing building. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, and 3/14)

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

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12)

5. The curtilage (garden) of the proposed properties (flats and houses to the rear) as approved shall be fully laid out and finished in accordance with the approved plans prior to the occupation of the proposed dwellings or in accordance with a timetable otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter remain for the benefit of the occupants of the proposed property.

Reason: To avoid a scenario whereby the property could be built and occupied without its garden land, which is currently part of the host property (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies, 3/4, 3/7, 3/10)

6. Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class 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), no new first floor windows to the houses to the rear (other than those expressly authorised by this permission), shall be constructed without the granting of specific planning permission.

Reason: To protect the amenity of adjoining properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/10 and 3/12).

7. The windows identified as having obscured glass on drawing number 1601 310 Rev H shall be obscure glazed to a minimum level of obscurity to conform to Pilkington Glass level 3 or equivalent prior to commencement of occupation of the houses to the rear and shall have restrictors to ensure that the window cannot be opened more than 45 degrees beyond the plane of the adjacent wall and shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 3/12).

8. Prior to the occupation of the units, details of bike and bin stores, including locations and elevations, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The stores shall be installed in accordance with the approved details prior to occupation of the units and maintained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure adequate bike and bin storage for future occupiers (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7 and 3/10)

9. 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 2006 policy 4/13)

10. There should 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 2006 policy 4/13)

11. In the event of the foundations for the proposed development requiring piling, prior to the development taking place 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 2006 policy 4/13)

12. No demolition or construction works shall commence on site until a traffic management plan has been agreed with the Planning Authority.

Reason: in the interests of residential amenity and highway safety in accordance with policies 4/13 and 8/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006)

13. No development shall take place 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 treatment to be erected. The boundary treatment shall be completed before the building(s) is/are occupied and retained thereafter unless any variation is agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure an appropriate boundary treatment is implemented. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12)

14. No development shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these 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); proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (eg drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines indicating lines, manholes, supports); 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.

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 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12)

15. Prior to the occupation of the building, details of external lighting to the undercroft as shown in Drawing 201 Rev G shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. External lighting shall be installed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: to protect the amenity of surrounding occupiers (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 4/15)

16. 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 2006 policy4/13

17. No building hereby permitted shall be occupied until details of surface water drainage works have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Surface water drainage will be implemented in accordance with these agreed details.

Reason: To ensure the development will not increase flood risk in the area in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

18. Notwithstanding the approved plans, the rooflights to the two houses to the rear hereby approved shall be a minimum of 1.7m above the finished floor level.

Reason: To prevent overlooking of neighbouring gardens (Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12)

INFORMATIVE: The principle areas of concern that should be addressed by the Traffic Management Plan are:

- Movements and control of muck away lorries (wherever possible all loading and unloading should be undertaken off the adopted public highway)
- Contractor parking, for both phases (wherever possible all such parking should be within the curtilage of the site and not on street).
- Movements and control of all deliveries (wherever possible all loading and unloading should be undertaken off the adopted public highway)
- Control of dust, mud and debris, please note it is an offence under the Highways Act 1980 to deposit mud or debris onto the adopted public highway.

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: Before the details of the surface water drainage 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:

i. 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

ii. provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development.

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

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING COMMITTEE

DATE: 1ST AUGUST 2018

Application Number	18/0618/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	20th April 2018	Officer	Charlotte Burton
Target Date	15th June 2018		
Ward	Cherry Hinton		
Site Proposal	Land Adjacent To 22 Mill End Close Proposed development of a pair of semi-detached dwellings: 1no. one bed and 1no. two bed, with associated landscaping, parking, bin and cycle storage.		
Applicant	Mr Franklin c/o PiP Architecture		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The proposal would provide an additional two units within an established residential area;</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The proposal would have an acceptable impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties;</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The proposed design respects the character of the area.</p>
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The site is land adjacent to No. 22 Mill End Road which is an area of vacant land currently fenced off from the curtilage of No. 22.
- 1.2 The site is located at the end of a cul-de-sac which is characterised by semi-detached residential properties.

1.3 To the north are the residential properties along Wedgewood drive. To the west is a detached bungalow in a back-land position accessed from Mill End Road.

1.4 The site is not within a conservation area and is outside the controlled parking zone. There are no relevant site constraints.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

2.1 The proposal is for a pair of semi-detached dwellings comprising one 1-bed unit and one 2-bed unit, with associated landscaping, parking, bin and cycle storage.

2.2 The building would be two storey with single storey rear elements and would be constructed in brick and render with a plain tile hipped roof and green flat roof elements.

2.3 The units would be accessed via a shared driveway which would provide car parking spaces for each of the units. Separate bin and bike stores would be provided.

2.4 The units would have private gardens to the rear.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

3.1 The relevant site history comprises:

Reference	Description	Outcome
17/1857/FUL	Construction of a pair of semi-detached, two storey dwellings with associated landscaping, parking and bin & cycle storage.	Withdrawn

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 2006 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies:

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan 2006	3/1 3/3 3/4 3/7 3/10 3/11 3/12 4/13 5/1 8/2 8/6 8/10 10/1

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework March 2012 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014 Circular 11/95 (Annex A) Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard – published by Department of Communities and Local Government March 2015 (material consideration)
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	<u>City Wide Guidance</u> Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (November 2010) Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2005) Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan (2011) Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)

5.4 Status of Proposed Submission – Cambridge Local Plan

Planning applications should be determined in accordance with policies in the adopted Development Plan and advice set out in the NPPF. However, after consideration of adopted plans and the NPPF, policies in emerging plans can also be given some weight when determining applications. For Cambridge, therefore, the emerging revised Local Plan as published for consultation on 19 July 2013 can be taken into account, especially those policies where there are no or limited objections to it. However it is likely, in the vast majority of instances, that the adopted development plan and the NPPF will have considerably more weight than emerging policies in the revised Local Plan.

For the application considered in this report, there are no policies in the emerging Local Plan that should be taken into account.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

6.1 No objection.

Environmental Health

6.2 No objection subject to standard conditions to control construction hours and piling.

Urban Design and Conservation Team

6.3 No objection. The building reads as a suburban house and appears less bulky than previous proposals. The living areas of the dwellings have direct access to amenity space, in what appears as an 'extension' to the main house which is acceptable in design terms. The cycle stores appear to be too small and do not meet the Council's Cycle Parking for New Residential Developments, however there is sufficient amenity space to meet this guidance - this should be updated.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

6.4 No objection. Driveway and parking bay areas should be constructed with permeable paving and recommend that this is clarified prior to determination in order to avoid the use of a hard landscape condition. All soft landscape proposals are acceptable. Recommend standard condition for boundary treatments.

Waste and Recycling Team

6.5 No comment received.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Officer)

6.6 No comment received.

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

- 20 Mill End Close
- 21 Mill End Close
- 31 Wedgewood Drive
- 32 Wedgewood Drive
- The Bike Depot, 140 Cowley Road (Camcycle)

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Angle of building would be out of character
- Proposal for 1 and 2-bed properties would be out of character with the area where all houses have at least three bedrooms.
- Overdevelopment and disproportionate to the site which is out of character
- The site is more suited to a single storey building.
- Overbearing impact on garden of 20 Mill End Close
- Overlooking rear garden of 31 Wedgewood Drive, block out light and encroachment.
- Blocking sunlight to side windows on ground and first floor of 32 Wedgewood Drive
- Noise and disturbance from two new properties
- General feeling of being crowded in
- Lowering value of neighbouring properties.
- Unable to independently access two parked bicycles
- Inadequate access to cycle parking blocked by parked cars
- Two car parking spaces for plot 2 exceeds Council's adopted standards
- Poor cycle parking provision and excess car parking provision will lead to an unacceptable transport impact
- Increased traffic and pressure on car parking with impact on pavement users and safety. Parking controls on Mill End Close would be welcome.
- Impact of contractor's vehicles on access

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. Car and cycle parking
5. Refuse arrangements
6. Highway safety
7. Surface water drainage
8. Third party representations

Principle of Development

8.2 Policy 5/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) supports residential development on windfall sites, subject to the existing land use and compatibility with adjoining uses. The site is already in residential use and is situated within an established residential area, and therefore I consider that additional dwelling units on this site could be supported.

8.3 The site is fenced off from No. 22 however is considered to have formerly formed part of the curtilage. I have therefore reasonably applied policy 3/10 for the sub-division of existing plots. This supports residential development within the garden area or curtilage of existing properties unless it will:

- a. Have a significant adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties through loss of privacy, loss of light, an overbearing sense of enclosure and the generation of unreasonable levels of traffic or noise disturbance;
- b. provide inadequate amenity space, or vehicular access arrangements and parking spaces for the proposed and existing properties;
- c. detract from the prevailing character and appearance of the area;

- d. adversely affect the setting of Listed Buildings, or buildings or gardens of local interest within or close to the site;
 - e. adversely affect trees, wildlife features or architectural features of local importance located within or close to the site; and
 - f. prejudice the comprehensive development of the wider area of which the site forms part.
- 8.4 For the reasons given below, I consider that the proposal has an acceptable impact on neighbouring properties, provides a good level of amenity for the future occupants, is appropriate to the character of the area, and complies with policy 3/10.

Context of site, design and external spaces

- 8.5 Mill End Close is a cul-de-sac characterised by semi-detached properties with hipped roofs. The palette of materials is predominantly red brick on the ground floor and brickwork quoining, with render on the upper floors and plain tiles. The properties are set back from the road on a consistent building line with driveways and front gardens. The end of the cul-de-sac is occupied by a semi-detached pair (including No. 22) which have been extended on both ends. To the north is later residential development on Wedgewood Drive and to the west is a detached bungalow.
- 8.6 The proposed semi-detached units have been designed to have the appearance of a detached dwelling. There would be a single entrance on the front elevation to Plot 1 and the entrance to Plot 2 on the side (east) elevation. There would be a single shared driveway. While the cul-de-sac is characterised by semi-detached properties, in my opinion this approach would not be out of keeping with the character of the area. The proposed building would occupy a corner plot with a narrower street frontage than the traditional semi-detached pairs, which – in visual terms - would be more appropriate for a single dwelling. The proposed building would have the appearance of this and hence would not over-crowd the street scene. In addition, the building would be set back from the road by approximately 12m and behind the building line of the neighbouring properties, so that it would not dominate the corner of the cul-de-sac.

- 8.7 The building has been designed to reflect the character of the neighbouring dwelling, with brickwork and render on the front elevation, brick quoining, a brickwork porch on the front elevation similar to neighbouring properties, a plain tile hipped roof and central chimney stack. The side elevations would be buff brick similar to the neighbouring properties, including No. 20. The single storey elements would be in buff brick with a flat roof, which would have the appearance of a contemporary extension. The Urban Design team supports the proposal and in my opinion, the proposal is a sensitive and creative design which responds positively to its context. I have recommended a condition for brick samples to be submitted for approval to ensure a high quality design.
- 8.8 In terms of landscaping, the space in front of the building would be used for a shared driveway and parking, which would be similar to other properties within the cul-de-sac. This area would be block paved and the landscape officer has requested that this should be permeable paving. Planters have been placed against the front elevation and against the eastern boundary with No. 20. However, in my opinion the large areas of hard surfacing could lead to levels of car parking that exceed the adopted car parking standards (see below) which would be visually dominant within the street scene. Further soft landscaping at the front of the site would break up the hard surfaced area and soften the appearance of the site, which would be more appropriate to the character of other properties within the cul-de-sac. As such, I have recommended a condition for a hard and soft landscaping scheme to be submitted, which would also secure details of the permeable paving. The landscape officer has recommended a condition for details of boundaries to be submitted, however I am satisfied that the information on the proposed plans is sufficient. The plans show the existing fences along the eastern, northern and western boundaries would be retained, as well as the boundary with the garden of No. 22. The fence along the boundary with No. 22 at the front of the site would be lowered to 1.1m.
- 8.9 Subject to the recommended conditions, in my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/10, 3/11 and 3/12 and the guidance on good design within the NPPF.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

8.10 The neighbouring properties are Nos. 20 and 22 Mill End Close, No. 32 Wedgewood Drive and N. 52 Mill End Road. I have assessed the impact on these properties and the wider residential area below. I am not concerned about the impact on any other properties.

No. 22 Mill End Close

8.11 This is a semi-detached two storey property that has a two storey side extension and single storey lean-to elements on the northern elevation. There are no windows on the side elevation facing towards the application site. The proposed two storey element would be set away from No. 22 and would not cut the 45 degree line taken from the centre of the first floor window on the front elevation. The rear elements of the proposal would be single storey. I am satisfied that the proposal would not have a significant enclosing, overbearing or loss of light impact on No. 22. The first floor windows on the rear elevation of the proposal would be angled towards the garden of the neighbouring property but would serve a landing and corridor into the bedroom, and would not have a significant adverse impact in terms of actual or perceived overlooking. The property would retain a good size area of amenity space within the rear garden.

No. 20 Mill End Close

8.12 This is a semi-detached property to the east of the application site, which has a two storey side extension and a rear garden. There are ground and first floor windows on the rear elevation serving a kitchen and bedroom. I have visited this property. The two storey element of the proposal would be orientated at an angle to the shared boundary so that the distance between the two storey side elevation and the rear garden of No. 22 would be between 4-6m. The two storey element would project approximately 5m from the rear elevation of No. 20 which is approximately half the length of the garden, and would angle away from the garden. In my opinion, this relieves the sense of enclosure and overbearing on the neighbouring garden such that it would not have a significant adverse impact on residential amenity. I am not concerned about the impact of the single

storey element. The building would be to the east of No. 20 and would not result in significant overshadowing or loss of light. In terms of overlooking, there would be two first floor windows on the side elevation – one serving a landing and one serving a corridor window into the bedroom. During the course of the application, the plans were amended to reduce the size of the landing window in order to minimise the actual and perceived overlooking, such that this would not harm the residential amenity of No. 22. I am not concerned about the impact of the proposal on the windows on the front elevation as the proposed building would be set back into the site to the north of these windows, and the window on the side elevation is obscure glazed.

□ No. 32 Wedgewood Drive

8.13 This is a two storey semi-detached property to the north of the application site. The front elevation faces eastwards and the property has a rear garden. There are small ground and first floor windows on the side elevation facing towards the application site, which appear to be obscure glazed. The two storey element of the proposal would be between 5.5-7m from the side elevation. The 3.1m high single storey element would be 2m from the side elevation. I appreciate that there would be some visual enclosure on these windows, however I do not consider this would have a significant adverse impact on residential amenity. There is currently a single storey outbuilding on the boundary to the south of these windows which has some degree of enclosure on the ground floor window. The proposed dwelling would be to the south of the windows. However, due to the separation distance, in my opinion this would not result in a significant loss of light or overshadowing. The proposal is likely to overshadow part of the rear garden, however as the two storey element is at least 7m from the garden boundary, this is unlikely to have a significant impact.

□ No. 52 Mill End Road

8.14 This is a detached bungalow to the east of the application site with gardens that wrap around the property. The two storey element of the proposal would be at least 13m from the boundary and I am not concerned about the single storey rear elements of the proposal. The first floor windows on the rear

elevation of the proposed building facing towards this property would not serve habitable spaces. I have visited this property and the area between the dwelling and the boundary is not used as a principle area of the garden for residential amenity. There are no windows serving habitable rooms on the eastern elevation of the bungalow facing towards the application site. For these reasons, I am not concerned about overlooking from the proposal towards this property or enclosure having a significant adverse impact on residential amenity

Wider area

8.15 The Environmental Health team has recommended a condition to control construction hours and piling, which I accept is necessary and reasonable in order to protect the amenity of the wider residential area. I am not concerned about noise and disturbance from the occupation of the proposed two units as this would be a residential use within a residential area. I accept that there would be an increased intensity of use on the site, but this would not be unreasonable.

8.16 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 (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/10 and 3/12.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

8.17 The floor spaces of the proposed units are provided in the table below. The Council has no adopted space standards, however the ‘Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard’ published by Department of Communities and Local Government March 2015 (THS) are a material consideration for assessing the quality of the living accommodation. The proposed units would significantly exceed the THS and would provide a high quality living environment for the future occupants. The units would have private amenity space which would provide a good level of residential amenity.

Unit	Beds (persons)	Floor space (sqm)	THS (sqm)
Plot 1	1-bed (2p)	72	58
Plot 2	2-bed (4p)	88	79

- 8.18 The planter in front of the ground floor bedroom window to Plot 2 provides a buffer to protect the privacy of the occupants from overlooking from the shared driveway. This would be secured through the proposed landscaping condition. The arrangements for bin and bike storage are unsatisfactory as described in more detail below, however I am satisfied that alternative arrangements can be agreed as part of the landscaping condition.
- 8.19 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 (2006) policies 3/7, 3/10 and 3/12.

Car and Cycle Parking

Car parking

- 8.20 The proposed plans show three car parking spaces. This exceeds the Council's adopted maximum car parking standards which seek to promote sustainable transport modes. I have recommended that a revised hard and soft landscaping scheme is required in order to reduce the areas of hard landscaping which would soften the appearance of the site and ensure that it is not dominated by car parking. This would reduce the space available for car parking to levels that comply with the standards. Subject to this, in my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/10.

Cycle parking

- 8.21 The proposal includes individual stores for each of the units, showing two spaces per unit. The store for Plot 1 is shown attached to the southern elevation of the building, and the store for Plot 2 would be adjacent to the northern boundary. These stores are inadequate in my opinion and fail to provide a convenient facility. The store doors open outwards and provide no space to stand in front of the store holding a bike. I am satisfied that there is enough space within the plots for alternative facilities to be provided in accordance with the Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010). For example, a store within the rear garden of Plot 1 or within the area shown as a second car parking space for Plot 2. These

details would be secured through the condition I have recommended for a hard and soft landscaping scheme. Subject to this, in my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/6.

Refuse Arrangements

- 8.22 Bin stores would be provided for each of the units which meet the Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012). Notwithstanding this, as the proposed bin stores have been integrated in to the cycle stores, the applicant may wish to relocate these together. As such, I have allowed details of the bin stores to be submitted under the recommended hard and soft landscaping condition. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

Highway Safety

- 8.23 Vehicle access would be provided via a shared entrance driveway from the cul-de-sac. The Highways Authority has raised no concerns on highway safety grounds to the access arrangements or the impact on the public highway. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Surface Water Drainage

- 8.24 I received no comments from the Sustainable Drainage Engineer on the current application. However, comments on the previously withdrawn application requested evidence that the proposed development can be drained in principle, including a desktop study investigating the percolation ability of the site geology and an agreement in principle from Anglian Water to discharge to the public surface water sewer. This information has not been submitted with the current application. However, in my opinion, it is likely that a surface water drainage scheme can be agreed through conditions, as the proposed site plan includes hard and soft landscaping areas which could be permeable. I have recommended a condition for a surface water drainage scheme.

Third Party Representations

8.25 I have addressed the third party representations as follows:

Representation	Response
Angle of building would be out of character	See context assessment above. The proposed building has been orientated to address the street and 'turn the corner' at the end of the cul-de-sac. It would front onto the street in a similar way to neighbouring properties.
Proposal for 1 and 2-bed properties would be out of character with the area where all houses have at least three bedrooms.	I do not agree that the number of bedrooms would harm the character with the area. The building would have the appearance of a single larger dwelling which would be in keeping with the character of the street scene. The smaller units would add to the mix of dwellings within the area.
Overdevelopment and disproportionate to the site which is out of character	See context assessment above. In my opinion the appearance as a single dwelling ensures the proposed units would not have a cramped appearance. I am satisfied that the landscaping can be enhanced with an alternative scheme to be agreed through conditions.
The site is more suited to a single storey building.	I have to assess the proposal that has been submitted. For the reasons given in my report, I consider the two storey semi-detached pair would be acceptable.
Overbearing impact on garden of 20 Mill End Close	I have assessed this in my report.
Overlooking rear garden of 31	I have assessed the impact

Wedgewood Drive, block out light and encroachment.	on No. 31 in my report and I do not consider that the proposal would have a significant impact on No. 31
Blocking sunlight to side windows on ground and first floor of 32 Wedgewood Drive	I have assessed this in my report.
Noise and disturbance from two new properties	I have assessed this in my report.
General feeling of being crowded in.	For the reasons I have previously given, in my opinion the proposal would not have an unacceptable enclosing impact on neighbouring properties and would not appear as a cramped form of development. I consider this to be acceptable.
Lowering value of neighbouring properties.	This is not a planning matter.
Unable to independently access two parked bicycles	I agree that the proposed cycle stores are inadequate and I have recommended that the landscaping condition includes alternative details to be provided for the cycle store.
Inadequate access to cycle parking blocked by parked cars	As above.
Two car parking spaces for plot 2 exceeds Council's adopted standards	The proposed car parking levels exceed the standards. However, an alternative landscaping scheme to reduce the areas of hard landscaping would reduce the area available for parking.
Poor cycle parking provision and excess car parking provision will lead to an unacceptable transport impact	This is addressed in my comments above.
Increased traffic and pressure on car parking with impact on	The Highways Authority has not advised of highway safety

<p>pavement users and safety. Parking controls on Mill End Close would be welcome.</p>	<p>concerns. The level of trips generated from the proposed dwelling would be similar to the other properties within Mill End Close and would not have a significant impact on the public highway network or on-street car parking.</p>
<p>Impact of contractor's vehicles on access</p>	<p>This impact would be temporary. The Highways Authority has not recommended that a construction traffic management plan is required, so in my opinion there are no reasonable grounds on which to request one.</p>

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 In summary, in my opinion the proposal is a high quality design which has carefully responded to the site constraints both in terms of the character of the development and the impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties. I am satisfied that the concerns relating to bin and cycle stores and car parking can be resolved through a landscaping condition. Subject to this, the proposal is acceptable and would provide an additional two units, in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 5/1 and the presumption in favour of sustainable development at the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

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. 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 2006 policy 4/13)

4. In the event of the foundations for the proposed development requiring piling, prior to the development taking place 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 2006 policy 4/13)

5. Prior to commencement of the development hereby permitted, a surface water drainage scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The submitted details shall:

- a) include the results of the 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 associated Guidance. The scheme 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
- b) 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
- c) 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.

Prior to first occupation of the dwellings hereby permitted, the surface water drainage scheme shall be fully implemented in accordance with the agreed details, and managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the agreed management and maintenance plan.

Reason: In the interests of surface water management.

6. Prior to the commencement of external brickwork, samples of the bricks shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure the development respects the character of the area (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/4 and 3/12).

7. Prior to first occupation of the dwellings hereby permitted (or in accordance with an alternative timescale agreed in writing by the local planning authority) and notwithstanding the approved plans, a hard and soft landscaping scheme shall be fully implemented in accordance with details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The hard and soft landscaping plan shall include:
 - a) details of hard and soft landscaping proposals within the site;

- b) details of permeable hard surfacing materials;
- c) car parking layouts including allocation of spaces;
- d) details of the cycle and bin stores for each unit including the elevations and materials;
- e) for the shared entrance driveway and communal areas other than private gardens as shown on the approved plans, a schedule of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate and an implementation programme.

Development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/10, 3/11 and 3/12).

PLANNING COMMITTEE

DATE: 1ST AUGUST 2018

Application Number	18/0221/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	16th February 2018	Officer	Rob Brereton
Target Date	13th April 2018		
Ward	West Chesterton		
Site	48 Chesterton Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB4 1EN		
Proposal	Change of use from A1 (Shop) to A3/A5 (Restaurant/hot food takeaway) and installation of an extraction fan exhaust unit to rear elevation following demolition of existing rear lean-to.		
Applicant	Mr Adem Ozkurtulus 2 The Homing Cambridge CB5 8SD		

SUMMARY

The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:

- The principle of the proposed change of use is in line with decisions made by the planning inspectorate.
- The additional information provided indicate that the impact that the impacts of the proposed plat in terms of noise, odour and vibration meet national standards and overcome the previous reason for refusal. Therefore, I consider the impact on neighbouring properties will be acceptable.

RECOMMENDATION APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 No. 48 is located on the southern side of Chesterton Road. It is a two-storey building with a commercial premises on the ground floor and a flat above. The ground floor was previously used as a jewellers (use class A1) and has been vacant for a substantial period of time. The site is adjacent to the boundary of the De

Freville Conservation Area.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 Planning permission is sought for the change of use from A1 (Shop) to A3/A5 (Restaurant/hot food takeaway) and installation of an extraction fan exhaust unit to rear elevation following demolition of existing rear lean-to.
- 2.2 While the application has not been amended since the original scheme was proposed, a substantial amount of further information has been provided officer concerns with the noise and odour emissions from the proposed extraction fan exhaust.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
17/1779/FUL	Change of use from A1 (Shop) to A3/A5 (Restaurant/hot food takeaway) and installation of an extraction fan exhaust unit to rear elevation following demolition of existing rear lean-to.	Refused*
C/90/0620	Extension to shop and flat (garage with bedroom above, to rear	Refused
C/87/0881	Installation of new shopfront.	Approved

* This application was refused for lack of information regarding plant to be used and how noise and odour would be abated.

4. 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 2006 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.
- 5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan 2006	3/1 3/4 3/7 4/11 4/13 6/7 6/10 8/1 8/2 8/6 8/10

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

Central Government National Planning Policy Framework March 2012

National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014

Circular 11/95 (Annex A)

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

Supplementary Planning Guidance Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007)

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012)

Area Guidelines

De Freville Conservation Area Appraisal (2009)

5.4 Status of Proposed Submission – Cambridge Local Plan

Planning applications should be determined in accordance with policies in the adopted Development Plan and advice set out in

the NPPF. However, after consideration of adopted plans and the NPPF, policies in emerging plans can also be given some weight when determining applications. For Cambridge, therefore, the emerging revised Local Plan as published for consultation on 19 July 2013 can be taken into account, especially those policies where there are no or limited objections to it. However it is likely, in the vast majority of instances, that the adopted development plan and the NPPF will have considerably more weight than emerging policies in the revised Local Plan. For the application considered in this report, there are no policies in the emerging Local Plan that should be taken into account.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

- 6.1 The Highway Authority does not consider that this application will have any significant adverse impact upon the operation of the highway network.

Environmental Health

- 6.2 Further information has provided full details of the exact odour abatement system to be installed in accordance with Annex B and C of DEFRA guidance on the control of odour and noise from commercial kitchen exhaust systems prepared by Netcen on behalf of Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) dated January 2005.

Fusion Hot Ltd have submitted a document advising that the following filtration parts will be installed which are considered compliant:

- Carbon PA242424 Model – Purified Air
- UV-100 Unit Model – Purified Air
- Filters – Pleated baffle filter 023 – Purified Air

A compliance condition is recommended to ensure the above filtration is installed, maintained and not altered. The acoustic report by Philip Acoustic Ltd is also considered acceptable and a condition is recommended that this report should be shall be fully implemented, maintained and not altered.

A condition limiting the occupation of the first floor flat to be linked with the proposed A3/A5 use is also recommended to ensure the end user of this flat is not unduly impacted by noise and odour. A condition limiting the hours of use to those specified in the application form is recommended to ensure neighbours amenity.

Conservation Team

- 6.3 It is considered that there are no material Conservation issues with this proposal.

Drainage

- 6.4 No comment.
- 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 representations:

- 71 Glisson Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 2HG
- 3 Mitwell Close Caldecote Cambridge CB23 7ZG

- 7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Bringing property at 48 back in use and bringing more employment and life to the area is welcomed.
- There are concerns odour management of cooking pizzas, burgers and kebabs.
- Assurances are sought from the applicant that the proposal would not attract drunken customers into the immediate area.
- The opening times should not be extended past 11pm as this would generate problems in the area.
- The use would create an excessive amount of noise late at night.
- The odours emitted are objected to.
- There are already sufficient food outlets in the area.

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
3. Residential amenity
4. Refuse arrangements
5. Highway safety
6. Car and cycle parking
7. Third party representations

Principle of Development

8.1 Policy 6/7 Shopping Development and Change of Use in District and Local Centres of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 states 'change of use from A1 to A2, A3, A4 or A5 in District and Local Centres will only be permitted provided the percentage of A1 uses does not fall below 60% (measured by number of units). Change of use from A1 to other uses will not be permitted.'

8.2 Planning reference 17/1900/FUL for No. 46 Chesterton Road recently approved a retrospective change of use from A1 to A1 with an associated A3 or A4 use in the alternative. One of the accepted arguments put forward by the agent of this application to try and overcome policy 6/7 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) was that an initial study they undertook of the Mitcham's Corner District Centre revealed that 45% of the units are in an A1 use, which is significantly below the required 60%.

8.3 I also note an appeal case in 2015 (Cambridge City Council reference: 15/0765/FUL and Inspectorate reference: APP/Q0505/W/15/3137889) at 28 Hills Road regarded the change of use of the ground floor from Class A1 to Class A5 (hot food take-away) undermines policy 6/7. Cambridge City Council refused this application, one of the reasons being the proposal contravened Policy 6/7 among other things. The inspectorate dismissed this reason for refusal at appeal. He stated *'this policy*

is now at least 10 years old during which time the landscape for Class A1 retail operations and how people access retail services has changed substantially'. The inspector went on to conclude 'I find Cambridge Local Plan (2006) Policy 6/7 to be dated and as such I share the appellant's view that only little weight should be given to Cambridge Local Plan (2006) Policy 6/7 when considered against the content of paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework'.

- 8.4 The inspector's assessment found a lack of tangible harm to the vitality and viability of a Local Centre when there is a change of A1 use to A2, A3, A4 or A5. He found the economic benefits consistent with the emerging Local Plan Policy 72, and paragraphs 14, 23 and 70 of the NPPF.
- 8.5 Taking the above into account, I consider the proposed change of use is acceptable and would bring back a vacant unit into use that would add to the vitality and viability of this District Centre.
- 8.6 Policy 6/10 Food and Drink Outlets of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 states: Development for Use Classes A3, A4 and A5 (food and drink) will only be permitted:
- A. where the proposal will not give rise to unacceptable environmental problems or nuisance and the individual and cumulative impact of the development is considered acceptable; and
 - B. where it is in an existing centre or is part of a mixed use area in an urban extension or the station area.
- 8.7 The location of the proposal complies with criteria B of policy 6/10 as it is located on a main street within a district centre. Whether it complies with criteria A will be examined in the paragraphs below.

Context of site, design and impact on heritage assets

- 8.8 The only work proposed to the front elevation removes the existing first floor clock. As this is not development it is considered acceptable. To the rear a flue is proposed and demolition of a single storey extension. This lean-to extension appears to be of no particular historic or architectural interest and there is no objection to its demolition. The amended flue design on the rear elevation would extend above the ridge, this is not uncommon in this location. I do not consider this flue

would be overly visible from the streetscene or any public views from the Conservation Area to the south because of its narrow profile. This is also supported by the Conservation Officer. I therefore consider it would have an acceptable impact on the Conservation Area subject to a condition recommended by the Conservation Officer seeking details of the flue's material.

- 8.9 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7 and 4/11.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.10 Environmental Health are now satisfied that the applicant has provided adequate information to assess the noise, odour and vibration impact generated by the proposed use and its associated plant and extraction fan exhaust unit. These impacts do not exceed the relevant national standards. I therefore consider the proposed plants units and the location of the extraction fan exhaust would not unduly impact the occupiers of Nos. 46 and 50 Chesterton Road, Trafalgar Road and Trafalgar Street.
- 8.11 However, the level of impact to the flat above the proposed use would be more significant. Environmental Health state the impact to this first floor flat will only be acceptable if the occupation is linked by condition to the proposed A3/A5 unit. I note the applicant has provided land registry information indicating the entire building is within the applicants ownership and they have stated they would accept such condition, having based their acoustic reports on related occupation. A condition limiting the occupation of this first floor flat is therefore recommended.
- 8.12 Some letters of representation have voiced concerns that this change of use would create a disturbance problem on the surrounding streets. This is a management issue and would be outside of planning control. Third parties have also have concerns late opening hours would add to noise in the area. The applicant wishes this proposed use to be open 12.00 - 23.00 Monday – Friday, 12.00 – 23.00 Saturday and 12.00 – 23.00 Sundays and Bank Holidays 12.00 – 23.00. Whilst the requested opening hours are long, they are in line with the opening hours of nearby public hours and restaurants. I consider they would be

acceptable. Environmental Health has no objection to these opening hours and I have recommended a condition to ensure they would be followed.

- 8.13 In my opinion therefore 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 (2006) policies 3/4, 4/13 and 6/10(b).

Refuse Storage

- 8.14 Refuse is to be stored and collected from the rear of the premises as there is a laneway to the rear. Again this is common in this location with other public houses and restaurants using this laneway. I consider there is an adequate amount of space to store at the rear, however, a condition is recommended for further details to ensure refuse storage would comply with RECAP waste management design guide 2012.

Highway Safety

- 8.15 There are no envisaged detrimental impacts to highway safety.
- 8.16 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Car and Cycle Parking

- 8.17 The existing units along this section of Chesterton Road have no dedicated car or cycle parking provision but it is noted they are in a well-served, central location, which is easily accessible by bicycle, foot or public transport. There is some limited parking to the rear which can be used by staff. This is common in this location and considered acceptable. There are cycle stands on the pavement to the east of the site on Chesterton Road, outside No. 52 Chesterton Road (Frederick Hairdressers) or outside 62-, 64 Chesterton Road (Pack 'n' Send) and 68 Chesterton Road (Boots). Given that the site abuts the public highway, there are no opportunities to provide further cycle parking within the ownership of the site, but it is considered that there is sufficient public cycle parking to accommodate customers.
- 8.18 In my opinion the proposal, is in these circumstances, compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10.

8.19 Third Party Representations

Concern	Response
Odour	See paragraph 8.10
Clientele	See paragraph 8.12
Noise	See paragraphs 8.10 and 8.11
Proliferation of food outlets	See paragraphs 8.1 to 8.5

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 The proposal with its additional submitted information would have an acceptable impact on the amenity of the occupiers of adjoining properties and no detrimental impacts are envisaged to the streetscene or nearby Conservation Area by the minor works proposed.

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. Prior to commencement the plant, associated equipment and acoustic mitigation as stated within the Philip Acoustic Ltd Acoustic report for a proposed kitchen extract fan system to be installed to serve a change of use class A3/A5 at 48 Chesterton road, Cambridge, CB4 1EN dated February 2018 (report 17271-002 revision A) & subsequent Philip Acoustic Ltd Briefing Note dated March 2018 (17271-003) shall be fully implemented, maintained and not altered.

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

4. Prior to commencement the odour abatement plant listed as the Carbon PA242424 Model - Purified Air, UV-100 Unit Model - Purified Air, Filters - Pleated baffle filter 023 - Purified Air in the document by Fusion Hot Ltd uploaded 23rd May 2018 shall be fully implemented, maintained and not altered.

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

5. The use hereby permitted shall not be open to customers outside the hours of 12:00hrs-23:00hrs daily (including Bank and Public Holidays).

Reason: To protect the amenity of adjoining and adjacent residential premises (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 4/13)

6. Collections from and or deliveries to the premises, shall only take place between the hours of 07:00 and 23:00. This shall include the placing of waste, including bottles, into waste receptacles outside the premises and the emptying of waste receptacles by a waste contractor.

Reason: To protect the amenity of adjoining and adjacent residential premises (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 4/13)

7. Prior to commencement the upper floor flat shall not be independently occupied or let at any time, other than by an employee associated with the class A3/A5 use hereby permitted within the ground floor. Thereafter the upper floor shall be used only in conjunction with the approved Class A3/A5 use.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the occupiers of the first floor flat at No. 48 Chesterton Road. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

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

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 3/14)

9. No development shall commence until details of facilities for the covered, secured storage of bins for use in connection with the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The approved facilities shall be provided in accordance with the approved details before use of the development commences.

Reason: To ensure appropriate provision for the secure storage of refuse. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

INFORMATIVE: As the premises is intended to be run as a food business the applicant is reminded that under the Food Safety Act 1990 (as amended) the premises will need to be registered with Cambridge City Council. In order to avoid additional costs it is recommended that the applicant ensure that the kitchen, food preparation and food storage areas comply with food hygiene legislation, before construction starts. Contact the Commercial Team at Cambridge City Council on telephone number (01223) 457890 for further information.