

<b>Application Number</b>	12/0480/FUL	<b>Agenda Item</b>	
<b>Date Received</b>	24th April 2012	<b>Officer</b>	Mr John Evans
<b>Target Date</b>	19th June 2012		
<b>Ward</b>	Romsey		
<b>Site</b>	8 Montreal Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3NP		
<b>Proposal</b>	Erection of four dwellings following demolition of 8 Montreal Road.		
<b>Applicant</b>	Mr Trezise C/o Agent		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The sites lends itself to subdivision; the acceptable design and layout justifies development of low priority garden land.</li> <li>2. There will not be a significant visual impact for residential properties along Mill Road.</li> <li>3. The revised access serves a layout which could accommodate future residential development to the rear of number 6 Montreal Road.</li> </ol>
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

## 1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site is a backland plot situated on the west side of Montreal Road. The plot is served by an unmade access off Montreal Road to the north of number 8. The site area has varied in size with recent planning history and is currently formed from the rear garden of number 8 Montreal Road and rear sections of numbers 6 and 7.

- 1.2 To the east of the site is number 8 Montreal Road, a detached 2 storey residential property. Adjacent to the south east is number 7 Montreal Road, which is an extended 2 storey semi detached property. It has a relatively deep single storey extension projecting approximately 10m to the west. To the north of the site are terraced residential properties fronting onto Mill Road, which occupy relatively narrow rectangular plots some 15m in depth.
- 1.3 The site is not within, but is adjacent to the Mill Road extended Central Conservation Area. The site is outside of the Controlled Parking Zone, (CPZ). There are no Protected Trees on, or adjacent to the application site.

## **2.0 THE PROPOSAL**

- 2.1 This amended application seeks consent for the demolition of number 8 Montreal Road and the erection of 2 one bedroom and 2 two bedroom houses.
- 2.2 Plot 1 is a 2 storey detached house with an eaves height of 4.8m and an overall ridge height of 7.9m. Plots 2 to 4 form an inner terrace, with plot 4 single storey in height standing 5m.
- 2.3 The houses are traditionally detailed, with buff facing brickwork and slate roofs. The shared surface driveway is to be finished with block paving.
- 2.4 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:
  1. Design and Access Statement
  2. Transport Statement

### Amended Plans

- 2.5 Amended plans have been received reducing the height of plot four to single storey. Neighbouring residential properties have been consulted on this amendment.

### 3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
10/0028/FUL	Erection of chalet bungalow to the rear of 8 Montreal Road and demolition of outbuildings to side of 8 Montreal Road.	Refused
10/0510/FUL	Erection of chalet bungalow to the rear of 8 Montreal Road and demolition of outbuildings to side of 8 Montreal Road.	Refused
11/0116/FUL	Erection of eleven new apartments following demolition of existing house at 8 Montreal Road and land to the rear.	Withdrawn
11/0547/FUL	Erection of two bungalows (following demolition of outbuildings to rear).	Refused

The most recent application **11/0547/FUL** was refused for the following reason:

1. The introduction of the proposed two bungalows into this backland site is unacceptable, because instead of proposing a form that will have a positive impact, it introduces an alien built form, entirely out of keeping with the housing to the west in Mill Road and the housing of Montreal Road, which will detract from the prevailing character and appearance of the area. The proposal has not therefore demonstrated that it has responded to its context or drawn upon key characteristics of the surroundings. For these reasons the proposal constitutes poor design in conflict with policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/10 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and advice in Planning Policy Statement 1(2005).
2. The proposal has not demonstrated that it has adopted a comprehensive design approach to achieve good interrelations between buildings, routes and spaces, but instead prejudices the comprehensive development of the wider area of which the site forms a part. For these reasons the proposal is contrary to policies 3/6, 3/7 and 3/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

3. The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for public open space, community development facilities, waste facilities and monitoring in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/8, 3/12, 5/14, 8/3 and 10/1 Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 policies P6/1 and P9/8 and as detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010 and the Open Space Standards Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation 2010.

#### 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, East of England Plan 2008 policies, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 policies, Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

- 5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
East of England Plan 2008	ENV6 ENV7
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003	P6/1 P9/8 P9/9
Cambridge Local Plan 2006	3/4 3/6 3/7 3/10 3/11 3/12 4/11 4/13 5/1 8/2 8/6 10/1

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework March 2012  Circular 11/95  Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010
Supplementary Planning Documents	Affordable Housing  Planning Obligation Strategy
Material Considerations	<u>Central Government:</u>  Letter from Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (27 May 2010)  Written Ministerial Statement: Planning for Growth (23 March 2011)
	<u>Area Guidelines:</u>  Mill Road Area

## 6.0 CONSULTATIONS

### Cambridgeshire County Council (Transport)

- 6.1 The current proposal proposes an access further south than for previous proposals, and achieves this by demolishing the existing dwelling.

By virtue of this change the proposal achieves vehicle to vehicle visibility in accordance with the standards proposed in Manual for Streets 2.

Whilst this route is used as a rat-run to avoid the signal controlled junction of Brookfields with Brooks Road, it has been satisfactorily demonstrated that vehicular speeds are very low on this route.

Therefore this proposal overcomes the concerns previously raised by the Highway Authority in regard to impact upon highway safety.

The provision of a 5 metre wide shared surface access is considered adequate for the level of use associated with the proposal.

### **Head of Environmental Services**

- 6.2 No objections subject to demolition and construction hours conditions.

### **Historic Environment Manager**

- 6.3 Awaiting comments.

### **Architectural Liaison Officer**

- 6.4 No objections. Layout acceptable in terms of surveillance. Car parking space 1 could be more visible.

### **Sustrans**

- 6.5 Cycle parking must be provided.

### **Cambridgeshire County Council (Archaeology)**

- 6.6 Further site investigations required.

### **Ministry of Defence Safeguarding**

No comments.

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:

### **6 Letters of support**

31 Cramswell Close, 125 Paget Road, 30a Cambridge Road, 10 Mallets Road, 32 Dolphin Close.

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

#### *Principle of development*

- The erection of 4 dwellings would look neat and tidy and make the area look a lot better.
- As a former resident I support the application (125 Paget Road).
- The site has become unsightly and a dumping ground for rubbish.
- The scheme will provide much needed family homes.

### **12 Letters of objection**

1, 3 Hobart Road, 358, 370, 376, 378, 380, 382, 384, 388 Mill Road, 6 Montreal Road, 7, 6 Montreal Square,

7.3 The representations can be summarised as follows:

#### *Principle of Development*

- This is the third occasion that residents have responded robustly to a poorly thought out and opportunistic plan for the site.
- Little has changed with regard to the main issues.
- Any development on this green garden space, now or in the future is unacceptable.
- The site is former garden land, not brownfield, which should not be built upon.
- There is various wildlife on the site which will be adversely affected.

- The plot has been run down over recent years with the felling of trees.
- This is the sixth application in three years.
- The previous applications are material considerations.

#### *Design objections*

- The development is out of character.
- The buildings have no architectural merit.

#### *Amenity concerns*

- Increased noise, overlooking and loss of privacy for number 7 Montreal Road.
- There is the potential for 16 car trips a day going past number 7 Montreal Road.
- The proposed development would overshadow houses on Mill Road.
- The Mill Road gardens are tranquil and offer a retreat from the busy Mill Road.
- The houses would impact on the quality of life for occupants of Mill Road.

#### *Access objections*

- The increased traffic around Montreal Road will create a safety hazard.
- There is limited visibility from the access.
- Montreal Road is heavily used by children from the community college and cars emerging from the inadequate access will cause a danger to them.

#### *Refuse concerns*

- Refuse arrangements unsatisfactory.

#### **A petition has also been received signed by 134 people.**

The petition expresses the following:

- The garden land site is not appropriate for development.
- The land is highly valued by the community as a green space in an otherwise built up area.
- The application does not represent sustainable development.



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. Third party representations
8. Planning Obligation Strategy

### **Principle of Development**

8.2 The provision of additional dwellings on previously developed land, and the provision of higher density housing in sustainable locations is generally supported by central government advice contained in the National Planning Policy Framework 2012. Policy 5/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 allows for residential development from windfall sites, subject to the existing land use and compatibility with adjoining uses, which is discussed in more detail in the amenity section below. The proposal is therefore in compliance with these policy objectives.

8.3 The NPPF declassifies garden land from the definition of brownfield land and such sites are no longer included within the Authority's five year housing land supply. This notwithstanding, Local Plan policy 3/10 sets out the relevant criteria for assessing proposals involving the subdivision of existing plots which remain acceptable in principle, subject to design and the impact on the open character of the area. Policy 3/10 recognises the important part of the character and amenity value gardens contribute to the City.

- 8.4 The contribution that the existing garden land makes to the character of the area, the comparative density of the development and the visual impact of the new dwellings on the prevailing character of the area are all important considerations in assessing whether the proposed development is acceptable. The density, design and layout are in my view appropriate in this context (discussed in design section below) and appropriate justification has been provided for its development. I recognise that the garden site contributes to openness of the area, but given the acceptable design and contribution to the housing stock, I consider this an appropriate plot subdivision in principle. There is therefore adequate justification for development of a low-priority site.
- 8.5 The development of this backland site demonstrates that due consideration has been given to safeguarding appropriate development in the future on the adjacent plot to the west, in accordance with Local Plan policy 3/6. The layout of the site includes a turning head which could be extended through to serve the adjacent plots. In my view the current site dimensions and proposed layout would satisfactorily integrate with possible future development. The principle of development in this form is therefore deemed acceptable, in accordance with policies 3/4, 3/6, 3/7 and 3/10.

### **Context of site, design and external spaces**

- 8.6 The acceptability of this scheme in terms of design, turns on the detailed design and appearance of the new buildings in relation to the surrounding context and the adjacent Conservation Area. I discuss below how this revised scheme addresses the previous reasons for refusal.
- 8.7 The 2 previous applications proposed a chalet style bungalow within a smaller overall plot. Committee found this design out of character and unacceptable, which formed the basis of reason for refusal number 1 of applications 10/0028/FUL and 10/0510/FUL.
- 8.8 Application 11/0547/FUL proposed 2 bungalows arranged at right angles, within a larger overall plot. The application failed to demonstrate that it had adopted a comprehensive design approach. The scheme did not make efficient use of the site area, with the ad hoc siting of the two bungalows, and failed to

adequately demonstrate integration with the possible future development of adjacent plots.

- 8.9 In contrast, the current scheme proposes a form and density of development which makes an efficient use of the site which successfully integrates with the surrounding context. This is because the plot layout reflects the surrounding layout along Hobart Road and Montreal Road with an east/west pattern, and is of a relatively low density (33 dwellings per hectare), which allows for generous gardens. In so doing, the application has drawn positive inspiration in bringing forward an appropriate design for this sensitive backland site in accordance with local plan policies 3/4 and 3/10.
- 8.10 The footprint of the two bungalows proposed in 11/0547/FUL was disproportionately large in relation to the site boundaries, resulting in a cramped layout, despite the low density of the development. The footprint of the four dwellings in the application proposal closely reflects the development pattern of adjacent buildings, which results in a large proportion of the site remaining as private garden land. In my opinion, this revised scheme would have a positive impact on its setting and would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area, including the adjacent Conservation Area.
- 8.11 The scale, massing and detailed design of the four houses draws positive inspiration from the Victorian properties in the vicinity. This is in contrast to the anomalous bungalow designs previously proposed. In my view the proportions of the site lend itself to subdivision in this manner. Amended plans have been received reducing plot four to single storey, which results in a more satisfactory contextual relationship with the terraced houses along Mill Road. In my opinion the overall design approach of this revised scheme address reason for refusal 1 of 11/0547/FUL.
- 8.12 The previous scheme 11/0547/FUL proposed to retain the existing side access to the site adjacent to 8 Montreal Road. The width of the access was not considered suitable for a more intensive use in the future. As such the proposal failed to ensure coordinated development contrary to Local Plan policy 3/6. This revised scheme proposes a new repositioned access which achieves improved sightlines and overall width. In my view this would adequately serve the proposed development

and any future development to the rear of number 6 Montreal Road in the future. As such, reason for refusal 2 of 11/0547FUL has been adequately addressed.

- 8.13 In my opinion the application proposes an acceptable plot subdivision, which, given the acceptable design, justifies the development of low priority garden land. As such the scheme is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/10, 3/11 and 3/12.

### **Residential Amenity**

#### Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.14 Plots 2 and 3 will create some visual impact and overlooking on number 7 Montreal Road. There is now a front to rear distance of approximately 25m. Given the distances involved, I do not consider the relationship so harmful as to justify refusal. Planting between the 2 properties would also mitigate against any overlooking.
- 8.15 The accessway of the development also passes in close proximity to the flank wall of number 7 Montreal Road and the replacement dwelling at 8 Montreal Road. The comings and goings from this development would create some disturbance for the occupiers of this property, but I do not feel the overall levels of vehicle and pedestrian movements to be significantly harmful as to justify refusal of the application.
- 8.16 The proposed new inner terrace will have some impact upon number 6 Montreal Road. The lower section of the garden of number 6 has a common boundary with the application site and will experience some overlooking. Given the overlooking, visual impact and proximity of the turning head affects mainly the end section of the garden which is less sensitive, I consider this relationship acceptable.
- 8.17 It is the impact upon the neighbouring residential properties to the north along Mill Road, which Committee felt was previously unacceptable in the determination of the proposed chalet bungalow applications 10/0028/FUL and 10/0510/FUL. The current application has been amended to provide a single storey dwelling to the south of numbers 378 to 380 Mill Road. Given the rear to flank separation of 17m, the overall height and

position of the new single storey dwelling, there will not be any significant overshadowing, or adverse visual impact for the occupants of residential properties along Mill Road.

- 8.18 I recognise the general level of concern relating to the development of this site for residential purposes, and the impact this will have on the secluded character of the area. The site is not however formed from any of the rear gardens of Mill Road. The rear gardens of Mill Road are relatively deep and I do not consider that their rear outlook, seclusion and privacy will be significantly curtailed. The land to the rear of number 6, 7 and 8 Montreal Road is anomalous in size and shape, and given its private ownership, lends itself to residential development.
- 8.19 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

- 8.20 The application provides four desirable homes suitable for family occupation, with generous gardens. 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.

#### **Refuse Arrangements**

- 8.21 The scheme provides adequate refuse storage provision within the proposed generous rear gardens. A refuse collection point has been provided close to the entrance of the site for convenient collection. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

#### **Highway Safety**

- 8.22 The County Highways Authority is satisfied with the visibility from the proposed junction adjacent to number 8 Montreal Road. The previous application was not refused on the basis of its impact upon highway safety. The revised access would serve both the application proposal, and be suitable for a more intensive use should the adjacent plot at number 6 Montreal

Road be developed in the future. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

### **Car and Cycle Parking**

- 8.23 The application provides adequate cycle parking within rear outbuildings. The 1 car parking space per dwelling does not exceed the Council's maximum standards. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10.

### **Third Party Representations**

- 8.24 The issues raised in the representations received have been considered in the above report.

The following issues have also been raised:

*There is limited visibility from the access.*

The County Highways Officer has inspected the proposed access and sightlines and concludes that it will not create a hazard to highway safety.

*The site has become unsightly and a dumping ground for rubbish.*

Implementation of this proposal would eliminate any problems caused by dumping and neglect.

*Refuse arrangements unsatisfactory.*

The proposed generous rear gardens provide ample storage for bins. The proposed collection point is acceptable to the Council's Streets and Open Spaces Team.

### **Planning Obligation Strategy**

#### **Planning Obligations**

- 8.25 The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 have introduced the requirement for all local authorities to make an assessment of any planning obligation in relation to three tests.

If the planning obligation does not pass the tests then it is unlawful. The tests are that the planning obligation must be:

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

In bringing forward my recommendations in relation to the Planning Obligation for this development I have considered these requirements. The Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) provides a framework for expenditure of financial contributions collected through planning obligations. The proposed development triggers the requirement for the following community infrastructure:

### Open Space

8.26 The Planning Obligation Strategy requires that all new residential developments contribute to the provision or improvement of public open space, either through provision on site as part of the development or through a financial contribution for use across the city. The proposed development requires a contribution to be made towards open space, comprising outdoor sports facilities, indoor sports facilities, informal open space and provision for children and teenagers. The total contribution sought has been calculated as follows.

<b>Outdoor sports facilities</b>					
Type of unit	Persons per unit	£ per person	£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
studio	1	238	238		
1 bed	1.5	238	357	2	714
2-bed	2	238	476	1 net (minus existing)	476
3-bed	3	238	714		
4-bed	4	238	952		
<b>Total</b>					<b>1190</b>

<b>Indoor sports facilities</b>					
Type of unit	Persons per unit	£ per person	£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
studio	1	269	269		
1 bed	1.5	269	403.50	2	807
2-bed	2	269	538	1 net (minus existing)	538
3-bed	3	269	807		
4-bed	4	269	1076		
<b>Total</b>					<b>1345</b>

<b>Informal open space</b>					
Type of unit	Persons per unit	£ per person	£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
studio	1	242	242		
1 bed	1.5	242	363	2	726
2-bed	2	242	484	1 net (minus existing)	484
3-bed	3	242	726		
4-bed	4	242	968		
<b>Total</b>					<b>1210</b>

<b>Provision for children and teenagers</b>					
Type of unit	Persons per unit	£ per person	£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
studio	1	0	0		0
1 bed	1.5	0	0		0
2-bed	2	316	632	1 net (minus existing)	632
3-bed	3	316	948		
4-bed	4	316	1264		
<b>Total</b>					<b>632</b>



8.27 Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure the requirements of the Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) and the Cambridge City Council Open Space Standards Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation (2010), I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003) policies P6/1 and P9/8, Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/8 and 10/1 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010 and the Cambridge City Council Open Space Standards Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation (2010)

Community Development

8.28 The Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) requires that all new residential developments contribute to community development facilities, programmes and projects. This contribution is £1256 for each unit of one or two bedrooms and £1882 for each larger unit. The total contribution sought has been calculated as follows:

<b>Community facilities</b>			
Type of unit	£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
1 bed	1256	2	2512
2-bed	1256	1 net (minus existing)	1256
3-bed	1882		
4-bed	1882		
<b>Total</b>			<b>3768</b>

8.29 Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure the requirements of the Planning Obligation Strategy (2010), I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003) policies P6/1 and P9/8, Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 5/14 and 10/1 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010.

Waste

8.30 The Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) requires that all new residential developments contribute to the provision of household waste and recycling receptacles on a per dwelling

basis. As the type of waste and recycling containers provided by the City Council for houses are different from those for flats, this contribution is £75 for each house and £150 for each flat. The total contribution sought has been calculated as follows:

<b>Waste and recycling containers</b>			
Type of unit	£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
House	75	3 (net)	225
Flat	150		
<b>Total</b>			<b>225</b>

8.31 Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure the requirements of the Planning Obligation Strategy (2010), I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003) policies P6/1 and P9/8, Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7, 3/12 and 10/1 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010.

#### Monitoring

8.32 The Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) requires that all new residential developments contribute to the costs of monitoring the implementation of planning obligations. The costs are calculated according to the heads of terms in the agreement. The contribution sought will be calculated as £150 per financial head of term, £300 per non-financial head of term. Contributions are therefore required on that basis.

#### Planning Obligations Conclusion

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

## **9.0 CONCLUSION**

- 9.1 The design and layout of this revised scheme reflects the characteristics of the site, which adequately reflects the development of low priority garden land. In my view, the loss of the secluded nature of the former garden land will not create significant harm to the character of the area of the amenities of neighbours. APPROVAL is recommended.

## **10.0 RECOMMENDATION**

### **1. APPROVE subject to the satisfactory completion of the s106 agreement by 1 December 2012 and subject to the following conditions and reasons for approval:**

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

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

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

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

3. 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 by the applicant 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)

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

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

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

Reason: Due to the proximity of residential properties to this premises and that extensive refurbishment will be required, the above conditions are recommended to protect the amenity of these residential properties throughout the redevelopment in accordance with policies 4/13 and 6/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006)

6. 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. (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV7 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12)

7. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or with any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modifications) no windows or dormer windows shall be constructed 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)

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

### **Reasons for Approval**

1. This development has been approved, conditionally, because subject to those requirements it is considered to conform to the Development Plan as a whole, particularly the following policies:

East of England plan 2008: ENV6, ENV7

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/4, 3/6, 3/7, 3/10, 3/12, 4/11, 4/13, 5/1, 8/2, 8/6, 10/1

2. The decision has been made having had regard to all other material planning considerations, none of which was considered to have been of such significance as to justify doing other than grant planning permission.

These reasons for approval can be a summary of the reasons for grant of planning permission only. For further details on the decision please see the officer report online at [www.cambridge.gov.uk/planningpublicaccess](http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/planningpublicaccess) or visit our Customer Service Centre, Mandela House, 4 Regent Street, Cambridge, CB2 1BY between 8am to 6pm Monday to Friday.

**2. Unless prior agreement has been obtained from the Head of Planning, in consultation with the Chair and Spokesperson of this Committee to extend the period for completion of the Planning Obligation required in connection with this development, if the Obligation has not been completed by 1 December 2012, or if Committee determine that the application be refused against officer recommendation of approval, it is recommended that the application be refused for the following reason(s):**

**The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for public open space, community development facilities, waste storage, waste management facilities and monitoring in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 3/8, 3/12, and 10/1 Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 policies P6/1 and P9/8 and as detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010, the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide SPD 2012, and the Open Space Standards Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation 2010**

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

## **LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985**

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

1. The planning application and plans;
2. Any explanatory or accompanying letter or document from the applicant;
3. Comments of Council departments on the application;

4. Comments or representations by third parties on the application as referred to in the report plus any additional comments received before the meeting at which the application is considered; unless (in each case) the document discloses 'exempt or confidential information'
5. Any Structure Plan, Local Plan or Council Policy Document referred to in individual reports.

These papers may be inspected on the City Council website at:  
[www.cambridge.gov.uk/planningpublicaccess](http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/planningpublicaccess)  
or by visiting the Customer Service Centre at Mandela House.



PLAN GROUND LEVEL TIME: MID DAY



