

Application Number	14/0607/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	23rd April 2014	Officer	Mr Amit Patel
Target Date	18th June 2014		
Ward	Romsey		
Site	Anglia Property Preservation 1 Great Eastern Street Cambridge CB1 3AB		
Proposal	Conversion and extension of existing frontage building from office to 1no. flat and 1 studio flat; and erection of 4 studio flats to the rear (following demolition of existing outbuildings), together with associated infrastructure.		
Applicant	c/o Agent		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>The impact on the neighbours is considered acceptable</p> <p>The impact on the Tree of Heaven is considered acceptable</p> <p>The proposal will not have an impact on highway safety</p>
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

0.0 INTRODUCTION

0.1 This application is brought back before committee following the deferral of a decision at the previous committee because the relevant appeal decision was not available to members. The appeal decision is attached to this agenda.

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

1.1 1 Great Eastern Street is a two-storey, end-of-terrace property, situated on the north-west side of Great Eastern Street, its curtilage extending about 32 metres from the street to the common boundary with the London – Kings Lynn railway line to the west. The site is irregular in shape, encompassing what

would, originally, have been the rear 17 metres of the garden of 3 Great Eastern Street, a dwelling that now stands in a plot that only extends about 15 metres back from the street. As a consequence the north boundary of the site, 1 Great Eastern Street, is a common boundary with both 3 and 5 Great Eastern Street.

- 1.2 The main building on the street frontage (the 'house'), which is currently used as offices for Anglia Property Preservation, has the typical L-shaped footprint of a house of the period, with a subsidiary 2-storey 'wing' at the rear, under a roof pitch 'shared' with the adjacent property; to the rear is a more recent flat roof single storey addition which is matched at the rear of No. 3. Separated away from the 'house', to the rear, there are a number of brick outbuildings, used for storage. These buildings are in a poor condition.
- 1.3 Although the railway line is directly to the west of the site, the surrounding area is primarily a residential hinterland to Mill Road, which is recognised in the Local Plan as a District Centre. Immediately south of the site, in the 25 metres between it and Mill Road, are a children's play area and a public car park.
- 1.4 There are no trees on the site itself, but a number of trees and shrubs on the Council owned site to the south, with some hard up to the boundary. The Root Protection Areas of these trees and shrubs on the boundary extend into the application site. None of the trees are the subject of a Tree Preservation Order (TPO), but all have the protection offered by the Conservation Area.
- 1.5 The site is within the Mill Road area of City of Cambridge Conservation Area 1 (Central)(extended 2011). The site does not fall within the Controlled Parking Zone

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 This application follows the refusal of an earlier scheme (ref. 11/0351/FUL). An appeal against this refusal was dismissed. The inspectors decision, which is a material consideration in the determination of this application. It is attached to this Agenda.

- 2.2 The Inspector ruled that the design of the building then proposed would not harm the character of the Conservation Area, and that the residential amenity of occupiers of no. 5 would not be harmed. However, he considered that the enclosing impact of the building on the garden of no.3, the absence of appropriate amenity space for future occupiers of the scheme, and the impact on the adjacent Tree of Heaven all meant the appeal should be dismissed. He also dismissed the appeal on the associated Conservation Area Consent application saying that in the absence of an acceptable scheme to replace, the loss of the existing outbuildings was not justified, despite the fact that they do not enhance the character of the Conservation Area.
- 2.3 The previous application had 6 units in the out building re-development. This revised scheme reduces the number of flats in the rear by two but maintains the conversion and extension to the house. The total number of units is 6 within this application.
- 2.4 The single-storey, flat roof element at the rear of the main building would be demolished and replaced with an element with a lean to roof which will not project to the rear of the existing extension or the extension to number 3. The main building would then be extended at the side, with a two-storey addition. This extension would sit 0.3m back from the front and rear elevation of the building, projecting out 2.8m from the side of the original building, providing additional accommodation and access to the first floor level. The extended building would be converted into two one-bed flats, with access to the rear courtyard and proposed units to the rear, and the ground floor flat taking access from the side passageway.
- 2.5 To the rear of the original building and connected to it, a covered bicycle and bin store is shown, which would now be set away by 2m from the common boundary with 3 Great Eastern Street.
- 2.6 To the west of the bicycle/bin store, a new, principally two-storey, building is proposed, which would provide two studio flats on each of the two floors. All of these flats would be dual aspect. The building would abut the common boundaries with the car park and 5 Great Eastern Street. Previously there was a single storey element along the common boundary with number 3 which has been omitted as part of this application.

- 2.7 The building would fill most of the space between the railway boundary and the front building, leaving a courtyard measuring 6m by 7.2m. The rear building is stepped so that:
- for the westernmost 6m, it is 6m by 6m at first floor and set back 4.5m from the boundary with the play area/car park space but is 10.5m deep at ground floor;
 - for the next 2.4m of the 'frontage' it is 7.9m deep and set back 2.6m from the boundary with the play area/car park space;
 - for the eastern 6.6m of the 'frontage' it extends across the full width of the site to the boundary with the play area/car park space; and
- 2.8 The application proposes that two trees and a shrub, which are situated on the adjacent play area/car park site, very close to the boundary, are removed to facilitate the development. The trees in question are:
- a Plum Tree, T2 which the tree survey advises is almost dead, in poor structural condition and with major deadwood, is considered to be a Category R tree (a category from British Standard 5837 – where trees are in such a condition that any existing value would be lost within 10 years and which should in the current context be removed for reasons of sound arboricultural management);
 - a Wild Cherry Tree, T6 which the tree survey advises is in poor, declining health, ivy covered, poor structural condition and is again considered to be a Category R tree.
- 2.9 This revised application differs from the dismissed appeal scheme:
1. The single-storey element along the common boundary with number 3 Great Eastern Street is removed;
 2. The main two storey rear building is set further away from the common boundary with number 3 by a further 2m, giving a 3m gap rather than the 1.3m gap in the dismissed appeal scheme
 3. The new bin and bike store is set in from the common boundary with number 3 by 2m;
 4. The roof over the existing two-storey wing is increased in height

5. The existing single-storey flat roof is to be a lean-to

2.10 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:

- Planning, Design and Access Statement (Januarys and NRAP)
- Surface and Foul Water Drainage Strategy Statement and Plan (Gawn Associates)
- Foundation arrangement (Gawn Associates)
- Utilities statement
- Contamination Desktop Appraisal (Terragen Environmental).
- Sunlight Assessment (provided by NRAP).
- Noise Assessment (Cass Allen Associates)
- Tree Constraints Plan and Tree Protection Plan (David Brown Landscape Design)
- Site Waste Management Plan (included within the Design and Access Statement)
- Heritage Statement (included within the Design and Access Statement)

2.11 A Development Control Forum was requested, which had 33 signatures. The main issues were:

1. Overdevelopment of the site;
2. Impact on the character of the Conservation Area;
3. Sense of enclosure to the neighbours;
4. Visual impact in the choice of materials

The final minutes from the meeting will be added to the amendment sheet or distributed at Committee.

2.12 Shortly before the last Committee meeting amended plans were received. These plans showed the garden of number 3 Great Eastern Street being extended by 2m into the application site.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
13/1234/CAC	Erection of 2no. flats (to replace frontage building); and 5 studio flats to the rear (following demolition of existing outbuildings), together with	Withdrawn

	associated infrastructure.	
	Conservation Area Consent:	
	Demolition of existing buildings.	
13/1233/FUL	Erection of 1no. flat and 1no. studio flat (to replace frontage building); and 5 studio flats to the rear (following demolition of existing outbuildings), together with associated infrastructure.	Withdrawn
11/0865/CAC	Demolition of existing rear outbuildings.	Appeal Dismissed
11/0351/FUL	Change of use and side extension to the frontage building from an office to create 2no 1 bed flats; and erection of 6 studio apartments at the rear (following demolition of existing rear buildings), together with associated infrastructure.	Non determination – Appeal dismissed

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 3/8 3/12 3/14 4/2 4/4 4/11 4/13 5/1 5/2 8/1 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</p>
Supplementary Planning Guidance	<p>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012)</p> <p>Planning Obligation Strategy (March 2010)</p> <p>Sustainable Design and Construction (2007)</p>
Material Considerations	<p><u>City Wide Guidance</u></p> <p>Cambridge City Council (2011) - Open Space and Recreation Strategy</p> <p>Balanced and Mixed Communities – A Good Practice Guide (2006)</p> <p>Cambridgeshire Design Guide For Streets and Public Realm (2007)</p> <p>Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)</p>
	<p><u>Area Guidelines</u></p> <p>Mill Road Area Conservation Area Appraisal (2011)</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 which are of relevance.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

- 6.1 The proposal proposes no off street car parking. This will not have a significant impact upon highway safety but may do in terms of amenity. The proposal is acceptable subject to condition relating to reinstating the kerb.

Comments on amendment

There is no comment to make on the amendment. Previous comments still stand.

Head of Refuse and Environment

- 6.2 No objection in principle subject to conditions relating to construction hours, deliveries, piling, dust, noise insulation, waste and recycling and contaminated land. It is also recommended that an informative to the dust condition be added.

Comments on amendment

The proposal is still acceptable and the previous comments still stand.

Urban Design and Conservation team

- 6.3 The proposed works would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the use of materials will allow a distinct change between the rear and frontage house. The detailing is important but can be controlled by conditions.

Comments on amendment

The proposed amendments do not alter the previous comments.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

- 6.4 The proposal creates more open space by moving the building and has responded to the issues regarding the Tree of Heaven. However the first floor still appears close to the tree. The proposal is acceptable subject to condition relating to landscaping.

Sustainable Drainage

- 6.5 The approach is acceptable in principle but there should be a site investigation and calculations for the system requirement and this could be controlled by condition. The design should be sized for a 1 in 30 year event and not 1 in 100 year flooding of buildings.

Arboriculture Team

- 6.6 The proposed scheme is acceptable subject to conditions. The scheme has addressed the concerns of the previous scheme and the conditions will safe guard the Tree of Heaven. The conditions proposed relate to tree protection, excavation and site visit.
- 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:

- 2 Great Eastern Street
- 3 Great Eastern Street
- 5 Great Eastern Street
- 10 Great Eastern Street
- 12 Great Eastern Street
- 30 Great Eastern Street
- 55 Great Eastern Street
- 61 Great Eastern Street
- 74 Great Eastern Street

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Character

- The proposed building is out of character
- The view from the Mill Road bridge will be compromised
- Impact on trees
- The proposal increases the built development coverage of the site and significantly increases the built mass of the site. This is overdevelopment of a constrained site

Residential Amenity

- Noise from construction
- Dust from construction
- Deliveries will cause disturbance and disruption
- On bin collection day the bins block the pavement. The additional bins for the proposed development will exacerbate the situation
- Loss of privacy
- Overbearing sense of enclosure for neighbouring properties
- Loss of light

Traffic and parking

- Off-street car parking spaces should be provided. Parking is already difficult and this will exacerbate the problem
- The Transport Statement does not correlate with residents experience of parking on the street
- All new residents should not be eligible for parking permits

Comments on amendments

Address:

- 12 Great Eastern Street
- 55 Great Eastern Street

Comments:

- Danger to trees.
- The increase in garden space to number 3 does not overcome the problem of increase accommodation.
- The traffic concerns still stand

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

8.0 ASSESSMENT

8.1 From the consultation responses and representations received and from my inspection of the site and the surroundings, I consider that the main issues are:

1. Principle of development
2. Context of site, design and external spaces, and impact on the area
3. Residential amenity
4. Refuse arrangements
5. Car and cycle parking
6. Sustainable Drainage
7. Third party representations
8. Planning Obligation Strategy

Principle of Development

8.2 Policy 5/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) states that proposals for housing on windfall sites will be permitted subject to the existing land use and compatibility with adjoining land uses.

8.3 Policy 5/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) states that the conversion of non-residential buildings into self-contained dwellings will be permitted except where the likely impact on on-

street parking would be unacceptable; the living accommodation provided would be unsatisfactory; the proposal would fail to provide for satisfactory refuse bin storage or cycle parking; and the location of the property or the nature of nearby land uses would not offer a satisfactory level of residential amenity.

- 8.4 The site is within a residential area, and therefore I consider residential use here to be acceptable. In my opinion, the principle of development is acceptable and in accordance with policy 5/1 and part e) of policy 5/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006). The other sections of policy 5/2 of the Local Plan will be discussed later on in this report.

Context of site, design and external spaces and impact on the area

- 8.5 The extension to the side of the original 'house' building would be set back from the Great Eastern Street frontage of the building. This will be similar in size and scale to the existing building except that it will be set back from the front and rear elevation of the frontage building. In my opinion, this will have a positive impact on the immediate area recognizing the 'corner' status of this building and presenting a 'face' towards Mill Road. It will not have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the street or the character of the area and the Council's Conservation Officers are of the opinion that the extension is appropriate in design and scale subject to conditions relating to external materials (2).
- 8.6 There have been third party objections regarding the character and context of the area. The Inspector noted in his decision on the previous scheme that the current buildings had limited value and added that the new building was acceptable as it allowed for the visual interest facing Mill Road and that the use of materials was acceptable as the building was not mimicking the frontage buildings along Great Eastern Street but its historical commercial use. The form and scale of the building have not changed significantly enough in this revised application to cause me to come to a different view. Great Eastern Street is of a relatively uniform character and design comprising mainly two-storey, Victorian, terrace houses. In my view this modern approach to a terrace form, given the rather different context, is appropriate and far from being out of character with the area,

would replace rather tired buildings and make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.

- 8.7 The existing site, to the west of 1 and 3 contains outbuildings that vary in scale and height. On the common boundary with the railway land, is an outbuilding with north and south facing gables; the building is 4.3m high at the eaves and 5.8m high at the ridge. Attached to this building (by a link which falls from 3.1m on the common boundary with No. 5, to approximately 2.5m within the site), and abutting the common boundary with 5 Great Eastern Street, is a mono-pitched outbuilding, that stands 4.4m high on the common boundary, but falls to a height of approximately 3.9m within the site. Attached to this is a flat-roofed 'garage', approximately 2.2m high which abuts the common boundary with the rear of 3 Great Eastern Street and the common boundary of the 5 Great Eastern Street closest to the house on that property.
- 8.8 Currently, along the boundary with 5 Great Eastern Street there are buildings of between 3.1m and 4.4m in height, for a length of approximately 15.1m, leaving a 5.7m gap between the outbuilding along the boundary and the single-storey element at the rear of No.5. Along the rear boundary of 3 Great Eastern Street there is a building that is 2.2m in height. The building now proposed, like the existing outbuildings, will abut the common boundary with 5 Great Eastern Street, but it has been set off the boundary with number 3 boundary by 3m. In this revised scheme the rear single storey that was abutting the common boundary with number 3 has been omitted and the boundary treatment will be a 1.8m high wall on the southern and western boundaries of the curtilage of no.3.
- 8.9 The proposed building will have a single pitched roof. Along the common boundary with 5 Great Eastern Street, the building has been lowered slightly and would be 5m in height to the eaves rather than 5.2m but still remains 6.2m in height to the highest part, for a length of 6.5m and then tapers down by 100mm for another 2.5m and further reduces in height to 5.7m for 6m. This is a little lower than the northern gable of the existing outbuilding closest to the railway, but higher by about 650mm than the existing structures on this part of the common boundary. Along the garden boundary with number 3 the previous scheme had a proposed bin/bicycle store which was 700mm taller than the existing wall. This has now been omitted

and the scheme will only have a 1.8m high wall here. The amended scheme extends the courtyard boundary by 2m which will open the garden of number 3 up.

- 8.10 As the outbuildings exist, and have been standing there for a very long time, having buildings at the rear of this site is a part of the character of the area, and the view from the Mill Road Bridge. The outbuildings are of limited historical interest and the Conservation team has no objection to their removal if they are replaced with something of appropriate scale that will add to the area. I share the view that replacing these buildings with other buildings of a similar scale, is acceptable in principle and need not have a detrimental impact on the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The new building is separate from the main house and therefore reads as a separate entity rather than as an extension, much as the existing buildings are. The ridge height of the new building would be lower than the ridge of the original 'house', and would not therefore dominate the streetscene of Great Eastern Street or detract from the main building. Set back as the proposal is from Mill Road and behind planting, I do not consider that the modest scale of the building will be intrusive in that street scene, but will make a positive contribution, framing the space.
- 8.11 Bricks will be used on the northern elevation and would also be used for the boundary wall. Additional reclaimed bricks may also be used. The side and rear elevations of 1 Great Eastern Street are painted white and to tie in with this, it is proposed that the southern elevation (the front elevation facing out towards the Mill Road) is also rendered white, framed with brickwork. The roof will be slate. The side extension to the main house will be rendered to match the existing building. To ensure that the materials used are appropriate, I recommend a condition (2) requiring that all brickwork is constructed using reclaimed bricks, and that samples of the render and roofing materials are submitted prior to works above ground level (condition 2).
- 8.12 The Landscape Architects have commented that the proposed amenity area is larger than the previous scheme but have concerns over how the area is to be lit. I agree. A condition to provide this additional information is required (11).
- 8.13 Subject to condition, in my opinion the proposal, in terms of its design and appearance and contextual relationship with

neighbouring buildings and the site, is a good solution which will make a positive contribution to the local area and the Conservation Area of which it is a part. The proposal is therefore compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12 and 4/11 and advice in National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

Residential Amenity

Environmental Health

- 8.14 Concerns have been raised regarding noise and disturbance from construction. The Environmental Health office^{3r} has raised no objection to the proposal subject to conditions relating to construction hours (3), deliveries (4), dust (7), piling (5), noise insulation (8), waste and recycling (9) and contaminated land (10). As the site is within close proximity to other residential occupiers construction activity has the potential to cause disturbance. I agree with the conditions suggested and recommend them. I also recommend condition (6) relating to site set up.

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.15 Due to the scale of the building, its positioning and the orientation of the buildings, it is my opinion that the only neighbouring properties likely to be affected by the physical mass of the proposal are 3 and 5 Great Eastern Street. The Inspector in the appeal decision accepted the shadowing and impact on number 5 Great Eastern Street. The Inspector stated that although the proposal increased in height slightly, the elevation of the rear building was pushed back away from the rear elevation of no.5 and was considered acceptable. The revised proposal is even further back, so the shadowing would be less significant than the appeal scheme and is therefore acceptable.
- 8.16 The new building will stand to the south of 5 Great Eastern Street and to the west of 3 Great Eastern Street, and there is therefore the potential for impact on these neighbours in terms of potential loss of light and outlook from the dwellings and their gardens, overshadowing and enclosure. However, in order to assess whether the new building would have a significant detrimental impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring

occupiers, the impact of this proposed building must be compared with the impact of the existing outbuildings on the site.

- 8.17 Revised shadow diagrams have been submitted as part of the application, which demonstrate that the existing outbuildings currently overshadow the rear gardens of 3 and 5 Great Eastern Street. On the boundary, at eaves level, the proposed building will be taller than the existing buildings in some places and lower in others. The submitted shadow diagrams show that the proposed building will cast slightly more shadow over the neighbouring gardens than the existing outbuildings, but not significantly more. This suggests that the proposed building will not have a significant detrimental impact on neighbours in terms of overshadowing, when compared with the current situation. The Inspector considered that there would be no detrimental impact to number 5 from the appeal scheme over and beyond the current situation and this scheme is similar so I consider that its impact will not be detrimental to this neighbour.
- 8.18 I do not consider that there will be any increase in loss of privacy to the neighbours as the windows facing these neighbours are at high level or ground floor level where there is an intervening boundary.
- 8.19 Careful assessment is required of the proposed building when seen from the gardens of 3 and 5 Great Eastern Street. Again, this needs to be compared with the current situation. In my opinion, the existing outbuildings are relatively dominant when seen from the neighbours' properties, especially when viewed from the garden of 3 Great Eastern street, which is shallow, most of the original garden having been incorporated into the application site in the past. This revised scheme has now omitted the single-storey cycle storage, increased the depth of this garden by a further 2m and two-storey building is set back further. I appreciate that the two storey form will be wider, and accept that the Inspector in coming to a view about the dismissed scheme felt that the outlook from the garden of number 3 should not be further eroded. I consider that the additional set back to the gable end, removing the bins and bike storage away from the boundary and increasing the size of the garden to number 3 will allow more light into this garden and open up views from the garden to overcome possible enclosing to number 3 and has overcome the concern and in my opinion,

the impact on the neighbours will not be significantly different from what is currently experienced, and not to a degree that would justify refusal of the application.

- 8.20 There is a slight increase on the roof over the existing two-storey element. However this will still remain lower than the existing roof height and any shadows cast will be over the flat roof of the existing extension at no.3. I do not think that this element will create a sense of enclosure to number 3 as this element will be difficult to see over the existing extension and any part you will see is set back from the garden area of number 3.
- 8.21 Concern has been raised about noise and disruption from the residents of the flats. Clearly there will be additional noise as the comings and goings from the site are likely to increase. However, the areas closest to the two neighbouring properties are circulation spaces where noise is likely to be less and where the spaces themselves can act to some degree as a buffer against activity in the rooms which are further away from neighbours. The open space is in a similar position with the garden space of nos. 3 and 5. In my opinion, there is not justifiable reason to refuse planning permission on these grounds.
- 8.22 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

Noise

- 8.23 Concerns about proximity of the railway has resulted in a noise report being submitted with the application. This identifies that the site falls within NEC B in both the daytime and at night. The Environmental Health Officer has explained that this would mean that some noise mitigation would be required. A noise mitigation strategy is requested by condition (condition 7).
- 8.24 However, the new building has been designed in order to mitigate against noise from the railway, which is directly to the west of the site. All of the flats in this building are dual aspect,

with openable windows on the southern elevation only. The noise level is likely to be reduced by the shielding of the building and garden walls, and it is therefore possible that the noise environment immediately outside the southern windows is within NEC A. This would mean that mitigation may not be required. The western elevation does include a window at ground floor and first floor level, which will provide light, but will be sealed shut.

- 8.25 The report does not assess noise in external amenity areas. However, as the amenity area is protected by the building, Environmental Health are confident an acceptable noise level can be achieved here.

Impact of the existing trees on the light entering the proposed building

- 8.26 With respect to the previous scheme the Inspector shared the Council's concerns that the spread of the trees on the boundary is such that they will limit daylight from entering the proposed studios flats in the new building. This might lead to future requests to prune or even fell the trees, which the Council would find it hard to resist if planning permission had been granted. The present scheme has reduced the number of units by two from the appeal scheme and this has allowed the units to have a dual aspect view. I consider that this overcomes the councils' and the Inspector's concerns about the tree. I recommend conditions (14 and 15) to ensure protection of the tree but I still await further comments from the City Council's Arboricultural Team, which will be reported to Committee.
- 8.27 Subject to conditions, 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, 3/12 and 3/14).

Refuse Arrangements

- 8.28 The submitted plans show that three chamberlain bins will be provided, and will be stored in a secure store situated between the converted building and new building. Environmental Health are satisfied that this should be sufficient for the volume of waste that will be generated by the development. However, the

management of the bins, including how they will be taken to the kerbside for collection, will need to be agreed by condition (condition 9).

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

Car and Cycle Parking

- 8.30 Appendix C (Car Parking Standards) states that no more than one car parking space can be provided for each dwelling. Part b) of policy 5/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan explains that the conversion of non-residential buildings into residential use will not be permitted if the impact on on-street parking would be unacceptable. The proposed development is to be car-free, and there are no off-street car parking spaces proposed. The site is not within the Controlled Parking Zone, and competition for on-street parking spaces is high.

- 8.31 In terms of the demand for on-street parking, this site is similar to a site on Campbell Street, which is a cul-de-sac almost directly opposite Great Eastern Street, on the opposite side of Mill Road. In March 2010 planning permission was refused for the conversion of 1A Campbell Street from offices to four studio flats (10/0054/FUL). This was a car free development, although there was space for one car to park off-street. The application was refused, as it was the Council's view that the development would provide unsatisfactory living accommodation. The lack of car parking was accepted. The application was taken to appeal and was allowed. In the appeal decision, the Inspector stated that:

It is likely that these units of accommodation will be attractive to residents willing to forego car ownership, and that the difficulties of parking in the area which have been drawn to my attention will reinforce this. I also note that there are facilities, including the City Centre, within walking or cycling distance. I conclude that whilst the concerns expressed are understandable, they do not justify the refusal of planning permission.

- 8.32 Like the Campbell Street site, the application site is close to the City Centre and local shops on Mill Road, and is close to public transport routes, including the railway station. There is a public car park directly to the south of the site, which includes a car

club car. Due to the site's location, and because of this appeal decision on a site close by, it is my opinion, that it would not be reasonable to refuse planning permission due to a lack of off-street car parking spaces.

8.33 Appendix D (Car parking Standards) maintains that at least one secure and covered bicycle parking space must be provided for each bedroom. For this development, this equates to eight spaces. Eight spaces are provided within the store, which meets the standards and is acceptable. The local highway engineer has not raised the issue of car parking as an issue subject to conditions relating to reinstatement of the kerb (11), encroachment (12) and informatives relating to works in highway (17) and utilities (18), which I agree with.

8.34 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10 and part b) of policy 5/2.

Sustainable Drainage

8.35 The Sustainable Drainage officer has commented that the proposal is acceptable in principle but this has to be backed up with site specific data and recommended a condition to require on site investigations, infiltration rates and calculations for the sizing of the soakaways and attenuation required. I agree with the recommendation and recommend a condition (16).

8.36 In my opinion the proposal is acceptable and compliant with the Guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

Third Party Representations

8.37 Most of the issues raised in the representations received have been addressed under the headings above. Those not yet addressed are the neighbour notification period and the belief that works on infrastructure have already commenced.

8.38 Neighbours and consultees were consulted in line with what is statutorily required. If any works have commenced which require planning permission (ie infrastructure works that are considered to be an engineering operation) they are carried out at the developers own risk and may be subject to enforcement action.

Planning Obligation Strategy

Planning Obligations

8.39 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 applicants have indicated their willingness to enter into a S106 planning obligation in accordance with the requirements of the Strategy and relevant Supplementary Planning Documents. The proposed development triggers the requirement for the following community infrastructure:

Open Space

8.40 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.

8.41 The application proposes the erection of 5 studio and 1 one-bedroom flats. A house or flat is assumed to accommodate one person for each bedroom, but one-bedroom flats are assumed to accommodate 1.5 people. Contributions towards provision for

children and teenagers are not required from one-bedroom units. The totals required for the new buildings are calculated as follows:

Outdoor sports facilities					
Type of unit	Persons per unit	£ per person	£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
studio	1	238	238	5	1190
1 bed	1.5	238	357	1	357
2-bed	2	238	476		
3-bed	3	238	714		
4-bed	4	238	952		
Total					1547

Indoor sports facilities					
Type of unit	Persons per unit	£ per person	£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
studio	1	269	269	5	1345
1 bed	1.5	269	403.50	1	403.50
2-bed	2	269	538		
3-bed	3	269	807		
4-bed	4	269	1076		
Total					2151.50

Informal open space					
Type of unit	Persons per unit	£ per person	£ per unit	Number of such units	Total £
studio	1	242	242	5	1210
1 bed	1.5	242	363	1	363
2-bed	2	242	484		
3-bed	3	242	726		
4-bed	4	242	968		
Total					1573

8.42 The applicants have shown their willingness to enter into a S106 and 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 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

8.43 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:

Community facilities			
Type of unit	£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
1 bed	1256	6	7536
2-bed	1256		
3-bed	1882		
4-bed	1882		
Total			7536

8.44 The applicants have shown their willingness to enter in a S106 and 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 Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 5/14 and 10/1 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010.

Waste

8.45 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:

Waste and recycling containers			
Type of unit	£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
House	75		
Flat	150	6	900
Total			900

8.46 The applicants have shown their willingness to enter in a S106 and 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 Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7, 3/12 and 10/1 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010.

Household Recycling Centres

8.47 A network of Household Recycling Centres is operational across the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough area. Continued development will put pressure on the existing facilities and require expansion of the network. Financial contributions are required in accordance with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012). These contributions vary according to the nature and scale of the proposed development and are based on any additional costs for the relevant local authority arising out of the need for additional or improved infrastructure, which is related to the proposed development.

8.48 The adoption of the Waste Management Design Guide SPD requires a contribution to be made in relation to all new development where four or more new residential units are created. Policy CS16 of the adopted Minerals and Waste Core Strategy requires new development to contribute towards Household Recycling Centres (HRCs) consistent with the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide SPD.

8.49 For new development in Cambridge the relevant HRC is located at Milton. The following table sets out how the contribution per new dwelling has been calculated for the Milton HRC.

Notes for Milton	Infrastructure/households	Source
4 sites at £5.5 million	£22 million	Cost per site sourced from Mouchel Parkman indicative costs 2009
Total catchment (households)	115,793	WMT Recycling Centre catchment tables CCC mid 2009 dwelling figures
New households	24,273	CCC housing trajectory to 2025 as of December 2010
<u>Infrastructure costs</u> Total number of households in catchment x New households in catchment in		
$\frac{\text{£22 million}}{115,793} \times 24,273 = \text{£4,611,730}$		
Total Developer Contribution per household = £190		

The net gain is 6 therefore the necessary contribution towards HRC is £1140.

8.50 The applicants have shown their willingness to enter in a S106 and subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure the requirements of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012), I am satisfied that the proposal accords with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Development Plan (Core Strategy Development Plan Document July 2011) policy CS16.

Education

- 8.51 Upon adoption of the Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) the Council resolved that the Education section in the 2004 Planning Obligations Strategy continues to apply until it is replaced by a revised section that will form part of the Planning Obligations Strategy 2010. It forms an annex to the Planning Obligations Strategy (2010) and is a formal part of that document. Commuted payments are required towards education facilities where four or more additional residential units are created and where it has been established that there is insufficient capacity to meet demands for educational facilities.
- 8.52 In this case, 6 additional residential units are created and the County Council have confirmed that there is insufficient capacity to meet demand for lifelong learning. Contributions are not required for pre-school education, primary education and secondary education for one-bedroom units. Contributions are therefore required on the following basis.

Life-long learning					
Type of unit	Persons per unit		£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
1 bed	1.5		160	6	960
2+-beds	2		160		
Total					960

- 8.53 The applicants have shown their willingness to enter in a S106 and 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 Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 5/14 and 10/1 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010.

Monitoring

- 8.54 The Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) requires that all new residential developments contribute to the costs of monitoring the implementation of planning obligations. It was agreed at Development Plans Scrutiny Sub-Committee on 25 March 2014 that from 1 April 2014 monitoring fees for all financial and

non-financial planning obligations will be 5% of the total value of those financial contributions (up to a maximum of £50,000) with the exception of large scale developments when monitoring costs will be agreed by negotiation. The County Council also requires a monitoring charge to be paid for County obligations in accordance with current County policy

- 8.55 For this application a monitoring fee of **£685.38** is required to cover monitoring of City Council obligations plus the County Council monitoring fee.

Planning Obligations Conclusion

- 8.56 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

The proposal is a revised scheme which reduces the number of units in the rear part from 6 to 4. The main issues raised by the previous scheme, dismissed at appeal: the impact on the Conservation Area, the Tree of Heaven and the amenity of occupiers at 3 Great eastern Street have been overcome in this application as the main rear two-storey building has been pushed back, the single-storey section adjacent to the number 3 has been removed and the foundation design seeks to protect the Tree of Heaven. Taking all this into account I consider the proposal is acceptable, subject to conditions and I recommend APPROVAL.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to completion of the s106 Agreement and 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. Reclaimed bricks shall be used for all brickwork (other than rendered brickwork) unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No above ground works shall commence until samples of all other materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted, including but not limited to, window details and surround, roof covering, metal work 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, 3/14 and 4/11)

3. Except with the prior written agreement of the local planning authority 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)

4. 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 on Mondays - Fridays between the hours of 0700 hrs and 0900 hrs or between the hours of 1600hrs and 1800hrs. On Saturdays 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. 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 to protect the amenity of these residential properties throughout the redevelopment. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/13)

5. 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 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.

Reason: Due to the proximity of residential properties to this premises and to protect the amenity of these residential properties throughout the redevelopment. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/13)

6. Before the development hereby permitted is commenced details of the following matters shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing.
 - i) contractors access arrangements for vehicles, plant and personnel,
 - ii) contractors site storage area/compound,
 - iii) the means of moving, storing and stacking all building materials, plant and equipment around and adjacent to the site,
 - iv) the arrangements for parking of contractors vehicles and contractors personnel vehicles.

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

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

7. No demolition / development shall commence until a programme of measures to minimise the spread of airborne dust from the site during the construction period has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Works shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details unless the Local Planning Authority agrees to the variation of any details in advance and in writing.

Reason: To minimise the spread of dust in the interests of health and safety. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/13)

8. 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 not be altered without prior approval.

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

9. Prior to the commencement of development, full details of the on-site storage facilities for waste including waste for recycling shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Such details shall identify the specific positions of where wheeled bins, will be stationed and the specific arrangements to enable collection from within 10m of the kerbside of the adopted highway/ refuse collection vehicle access point. The approved facilities shall be provided prior to the commencement of the use hereby permitted and shall be retained thereafter unless alternative arrangements are agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 3/7)

10. No development approved by this permission shall be COMMENCED prior to a contaminated land assessment and associated remedial strategy, being submitted to the LPA and receipt of approval of the document/documents from the LPA. This applies to paragraphs a), b) and c). This is an iterative process and the results of each stage will help decide if the following stage is necessary.

(a) The contaminated land assessment shall include a desk study to be submitted to the LPA for approval. The desk study shall detail the history of the site uses and propose a site investigation strategy based on the relevant information discovered by the desk study. The strategy shall be approved by the LPA prior to investigations commencing on site.

(b) The site investigation, including relevant soil, soil gas, surface and groundwater sampling, shall be carried out by a suitable qualified and accredited consultant/contractor in accordance with a quality assured sampling and analysis methodology.

(c) A site investigation report detailing all investigative works and sampling on site, together with the results of the analysis, risk assessment to any receptors and a proposed remediation strategy shall be submitted to the LPA. The LPA shall approve such remedial works as required prior to any remediation commencing on site. The works shall be of such a nature as to render harmless the identified contamination given the proposed end use of the site and surrounding environment including any controlled waters.

No development approved by this permission shall be OCCUPIED prior to the completion of any remedial works and a validation report/s being submitted to the LPA and receipt of approval of the document/documents from the LPA. This applies to paragraphs d), e) and f).

(d) 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.

(e) If, during the works contamination is encountered which has not previously been identified then the additional contamination shall be fully assessed and an appropriate remediation scheme agreed with the LPA.

(f) Upon completion of the works, this condition shall not be discharged until a closure report has been submitted to and approved by the LPA. The closure report shall include details of the proposed remediation works and quality assurance certificates to show that the works have been carried out in full in accordance with the approved methodology. Details of any post-remedial sampling and analysis to show the site has reached the required clean-up criteria shall be included in the closure report together with the necessary documentation detailing what waste materials have been removed from site.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the occupiers. (Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/14).

11. 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 (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)

12. The existing vehicular access shall, at no expense to the Highway Authority, be returned to normal footway with a full-faced kerb laid out and constructed in accordance with the Cambridgeshire County Council construction specification.

Reason: In the interests of the safe and efficient operation of the public highway. (Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2).

13. 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.

Reason: In the interest of Highway Safety. (Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2).

14. In this condition retained tree means an existing tree which is to be retained in accordance with the approved plans and particulars; and paragraphs (a) and (b) below shall have effect until the expiration of two years from the date of the occupation of the building for its permitted use.

(a) No retained tree shall be cut down, uprooted or destroyed, nor shall any retained tree be topped or lopped other than in accordance with the approved plans and particulars, without the written approval of the local planning authority. Any topping or lopping approved shall be carried out in accordance with British Standard 3998 (Tree Work).

(b) If any retained tree is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree shall be planted at the same place and that tree shall be of such size and species, and shall be planted at such time, as may be specified in writing by the local planning authority.

(c) The erection of fencing for the protection of any retained tree shall be undertaken in accordance with British Standard 5837 and the approved plans and particulars before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought onto the site for the purposes of the development, and shall be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area fenced in accordance with this condition and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered, nor shall any excavation be made, without the written consent of the local planning authority.

Reason: To protect the visual amenity of the area and to ensure the retention of trees on site. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11, 3/12 and 4/4)

15. Details of 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 submitted to the local planning authority for its written approval, and implemented in accordance with that approval 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 protect the visual amenity of the area and to ensure the retention of the trees on the site. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11, 3/12 and 4/4)

16. Prior to the commencement of development full details of the sustainable drainage design including site investigations, infiltration rates and calculations for the sizing of the soakaways and attenuation shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall then be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interest of flooding to the neighbouring occupiers. (National Planning Policy Framework (2012)).

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 applicants 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.

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

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

'Control of dust and emissions from construction and demolition - Best Practice Guidance produced by the London Councils:

http://www.london.gov.uk/thelondonplan/guides/bpg/bpg_04.jsp

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).

INFORMATIVE: The applicant is reminded that the proposal may need Building Control application and recommend that you contact the Cambridge City Council Building Control on 01223 457200.

INFORMATIVE: The applicant is reminded that Party Wall agreement may be required for the works.

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 26th September 2014, 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, education and life-long learning facilities, waste facilities, waste management and monitoring in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 3/8, 3/12, 5/5, 5/14, 8/3 and 10/1 and as detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010, the Open Space Standards Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation 2010, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012

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