

<b>Application Number</b>	14/1649/FUL	<b>Agenda Item</b>	
<b>Date Received</b>	20th October 2014	<b>Officer</b>	Michael Hammond
<b>Target Date</b>	15th December 2014		
<b>Ward</b>	Romsey		
<b>Site</b>	Land To R/o 8 Montreal Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3NP		
<b>Proposal</b>	Erection of 4 dwellings together with shared access driveway.		
<b>Applicant</b>	Mr C Rose C/o Taylor Vinters		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The development would not be overbearing or cause any significant loss of amenity in terms of light or privacy to neighbouring properties.</li> <li>- The design of the proposed dwellings would be acceptable and would not harm the character of the area or the wider Conservation Area.</li> <li>- The sites lends itself to subdivision; the acceptable design and layout justifies development of low priority garden land.</li> </ul>
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 two-storey residential property. Adjacent to the south east is number 7 Montreal Road, which is an extended two-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 1 two bedroom and 3 three bedroom houses.
- 2.2 House no.1 is a two bedroom semi-detached house with an eaves height of 2.1m and an overall ridge height of 5m. House no.2 is a three bedroom semi-detached house, which adjoins onto house no.1, with an eaves height of 4.8m and an overall ridge height of 7.9m. House nos. 3 and 4 are distanced 1m to the south of nos.1 and 2 and are identical in design and scale to house no.2.
- 2.3 The houses are traditionally detailed, with buff facing brickwork, slate roofs with a pitched roof design. The shared surface driveway is to be finished with block paving.

### Amended Plans

- 2.4 Amended drawings have been submitted to include roof chimney stacks and re-designed dormers in response to comments from the Conservation Team. Amended drawings have also been submitted to revise the layout of the scheme in respect of comments made by the Landscape Officer regarding the position of cycle storage on site. As a result of this, cycle storage has been moved from the rear gardens of the proposed dwellings to the front of the site, and the car parking spaces and

bins re-configured to provide space for this re-located cycle storage.

### 3.0 SITE HISTORY

#### 3.1

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
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
12/0480/FUL	Erection of four dwellings following demolition of 8 Montreal Road.	Permitted.
13/0145/FUL	Amendments to planning permission 12/0480/FUL to allow for a two storey rear extension and a dormer window to the rear of house 1.	Withdrawn
13/0371/FUL	Amendments to 12/0480/FUL to allow for three velux windows to the rear of House 1.	Withdrawn
13/0977/FUL	Amendment to planning permission 12/0480/FUL to allow for raising ridge height by 600mm, incorporating a pitched rear dormer window, velux window to the front and relocation of front door to house 2.	Refused – Appeal dismissed
14/0195/FUL	Erection of 17 residential units, following demolition of buildings	Permitted.

394, 396, 398 Mill Road and 8  
Montreal Road, together with  
associated infrastructure.

- 3.2 The application **12/0480/FUL** is an extant permission for four dwellings on the site which was approved at East Area Committee. In this scheme, three attached 3 bedroom dwellings were set in the centre of the site and another 3 bedroom detached dwelling was positioned along Montreal Road.
- 3.3 Houses nos.2-4 of the proposed scheme are identical in scale to the houses in the previously approved scheme. House no.1 of the proposed scheme has a lower ridge height of 5m compared to the previously approved scheme. The proposed scheme has been designed as two sets of semi-detached properties set in the centre of the site, as opposed to the previously approved scheme which had a detached house at the front of the site and three attached dwellings. The garden plot sizes of the proposed scheme are identical to that of the previously approved scheme, but the layout of sheds at the end of these gardens has been reconfigured with clear footpaths from the dwellings to these sheds.
- 3.4 The most recent application **13/0977/FUL** to alter the roof form of the development permitted under 12/0480/FUL was dismissed at appeal. In his decision letter the inspector stated:
- “Whilst the proposal would not therefore have any significant effect on living conditions by reason of overlooking, loss of light, noise or disturbance, this would not mitigate the dominating and enclosing effect on the gardens of 380 and 378 Mill Road which I have identified. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have a significant and unacceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of adjoining dwellings. The proposal would thus be contrary to the requirement of Policy 3/4 of the Cambridge City Council Local Plan that developments respond to their context and draw inspiration from the key characteristics of their surroundings, and be contrary to the thrust of Policy 3/14’s requirement that extensions of existing buildings do not unreasonably visually dominate neighbouring properties.”*
- 3.5 Permission was recently granted under **14/0195/FUL** for the erection of 17 residential units following the demolition of nos.394-398 Mill Road and no.8 Montreal Road. These 17

residential units are formed in two new terraces fronting onto Mill Road and Montreal Road with three levels of accommodation. The built form along Mill Road has a ridge height of 9.2m and is traditionally detailed to match the existing adjacent Victorian properties. The terraces fronting Montreal Road have a varied overall ridge height between 8.6m and 9.8m and are designed in a more contemporary fashion with detailed design. There is a large communal garden at the rear of this site with a footpath that connects from the bike store along Montreal Road to land to the rear of no.8 Montreal Road.

#### 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 Plan 2006	Local	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

<p>Central Government Guidance</p>	<p>National Planning Policy Framework March 2012</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014</p> <p>Circular 11/95</p> <p>Ministerial Statement (1 December 2014) by Brandon Lewis Minister of State for Housing and Planning (Department of Communities and Local Government)</p>
<p>Supplementary Planning Guidance</p>	<p>Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007)</p> <p>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012)</p>
	<p><u>City Wide Guidance</u></p> <p>Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)</p> <p>Roof Extensions Design Guide (2003)</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 are of relevance.

## **6.0 CONSULTATIONS**

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

- 6.1 The proposal should have no significant impact on the public highway, should it gain the benefit of planning permission, subject to the incorporation of the conditions and informatives requested.
- 6.2 Conditions; No unbound material, No gates erected, Vehicular access and public highway, drainage, visibility splays, manoeuvring area, no obstruction, traffic management plan, highways informative.

### **Head of Refuse and Environment**

- 6.3 No objections subject to conditions regarding construction hours, and deliveries/ collections during demolition and construction.

### **Urban Design and Conservation Team**

#### Original comments (18/11/2014)

- 6.4 The proposed layout of the buildings does not reflect the traditional grain of the area and is therefore not supported as it is detrimental to the character and appearance of the adjacent conservation area. In addition, the dormer windows should be redesigned, if the application were to be approved, so that they better reflect the more traditional style that is more appropriate in this area. This application does not conform to policy 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 as it does not preserve or enhance the conservation area as it adversely impacts on views into and out of.

### Second comments (11/12/2014)

- 6.5 The conservation comments regarding the layout of the scheme still stand. However, the revised drawings show better proportioned dormer windows on the rear elevation which are less dominant in the design. The chimney stacks also give some articulation to the roofs which is important in this area which has many traditional buildings with their associated details.

### **Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)**

#### Original comments (14/11/2014)

- 6.6 Landscape considers that this application does not conform to Policy 3/4 Responding to Context; Policy 3/7 Creating Successful Places; Policy 3/10 Sub division of Existing Plots; and 3/11 The Design of External Spaces.

#### Second comments (17/12/2014)

- 6.7 Whilst the amendments are an attempt to react to previous comments regarding the bike stores and awkward access to back gardens, we do not feel that the proposals present an adequate design response. The bike and bin stores clutter the forecourt area while the car parking areas are seemingly slotted in where they fit rather than being designed as part of the scheme. Bringing the bike and bin stores to the front removes valuable green space at the sides needed for buffer planting.

### **Cambridgeshire Constabulary (Architectural Liaison Officer)**

- 6.8 No objection to what is proposed either from a crime reduction or community safety perspective.

### **Ministry of Defence Safeguarding**

- 6.9 No objections.
- 6.10 The above responses are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the consultation responses can be inspected on the application file.



## 7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

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

- No.1 Montreal Road
- No.1a Montreal Road
- No.1b Montreal Road
- No.7 Montreal Road
- No.6 Montreal Square
- No.7 Montreal Square
- No.1 Hobart Road
- No.3 Hobart Road
- Owner of No.5 Hobart Road, resides at no.8 Priory Street
- No.370 Mill Road
- No.378 Mill Road
- No.380 Mill Road
- No.17 Romsey Road

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

### *Principle of Development*

- Overdevelopment.
- Conflicts with policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/10, 3/12 and 4/11 of the Local Plan.
- Development of garden land.
- Principle of development previously considered unacceptable.

### *Residential Amenity*

- Invasion of privacy/ overlooking.
- Increase in noise.
- Sunshading.
- Enclosure.

### *Access objections*

- Increased traffic.
- Loss of car parking for nearby facilities/ shops.
- Inadequate parking provision.

### *Design objections*

- Out of character.
- Not in keeping with the Conservation Area.
- Dormers dominate the rear elevation.
- Poor response to context.

### *Other issues*

- Inaccurate drawings.

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 Conservation Area
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, as discussed in more detail in the amenity chapter 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 former 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 the design section below) and appropriate justification has been provided for its development. I recognise that the former 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 principle of developing this former garden site was deemed acceptable under the previously approved application for this site (12/0480/FUL). The levels of development of the proposed scheme compared to this previously approved scheme are very similar and consequently I consider the principle of development to be acceptable.
- 8.6 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 and Impact on Conservation Area**

- 8.7 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.
- 8.8 Permission was granted by East Area Committee under 12/0480/FUL (12/0480/FUL) was made for the erection of four dwellings; a one bedroom house fronting onto Montreal Road

and a row of three houses, 1 one bedroom house and 2 two bedroom houses, in a terraced design set back in the centre of the backland site. This scheme was approved on the grounds that it was designed in a form and density which would make an efficient use of the site that successfully integrates with the surrounding context.

- 8.9 This approval is a key material consideration in the assessment of this application as this proposed scheme shares considerable similarities with the previously approved scheme. The position, scale and design of the proposed houses in the centre of the site are very similar to that of the previously approved scheme. The general layout of the forecourt, as well as the size and layout of garden plots is also very similar to the previously approved scheme. The key variation from the previously approved scheme is the deletion of the detached house fronting Mill Road, and the addition of a new house, similar to nos.2 and 3, at the rear of the row of houses in the centre of the site. With this in mind, the general pattern, scale and density of development on the site is very comparable to that of the extant permission on the site.
- 8.10 In light of this re-configuration of the layout of the scheme, it is my view that 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. The orientation of these properties 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 provides room for generous gardens at the rear of the properties. In so doing, the application has drawn positive inspiration from the surrounding area in bringing forward an appropriate design for this sensitive backland site in accordance with local plan policies 3/4 and 3/10.
- 8.11 I do not agree with the Conservation Team's view that the proposal would adversely affect the character of the adjacent conservation area. I consider the grain of the development to be representative of the context of the site, as it is similar to both Montreal Road and Hobart Road adjacent to the application site.
- 8.12 The footprint of the four proposed dwelling is reflective of the development pattern of adjacent buildings, resulting 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.

- 8.13 The scale, massing and detailed design of the four houses draws positive inspiration from the Victorian properties in the vicinity. Amended plans, in response to the Conservation Team comments, have been received to change the design of the dormers to include two narrower dormers to provide a more traditional hierarchy of windows. Chimney stacks have also been included in these amended plans to give more articulation to the roof. This amended scheme has resulted in a more traditional appearance of the houses which results in a more satisfactory contextual relationship with the other houses along Mill Road.
- 8.14 The landscape team has raised concerns regarding the bike and bin stores cluttering the forecourt area and the car parking areas not being designed as part of the scheme. However I do not agree with this advice, particularly given the proposed layout of car parking, bin and bike store are very similar to that of the previously approved scheme. The position of parked cars, bins and bike stores are located a considerable distance from the front of these properties, and as a result I do not consider that the layout of the forecourt would significantly detract from the aesthetical appearance of the proposed dwellings or detrimentally harm the outlook from the future occupiers of these properties. Elevations of the bin and bike stores have since been provided which demonstrate that the structures are relatively small in scale at 2.1m in height and have been designed in timber cladding with facing brickwork to match the houses in materials. As a result I consider that the presence of these parking spaces, bin and bike stores on the forecourt would be in keeping with the overall context of the site and would be in keeping with the character of the area.
- 8.15 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, 3/12 and 4/11.

## **Residential Amenity**

### Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.16 Plots 1 and 2 will create some visual impact and overlooking on no.7 Montreal Road. There is a separation distance from front to rear of approximately 25m between these properties. Given the distances involved, I do not consider the relationship so harmful as to justify refusal. Planting between the two properties would also mitigate against any overlooking.
- 8.17 The access way of the development also passes in close proximity to the flank wall of no.7 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.
- 8.18 The proposed new dwellings will have some impact on number 6 Montreal Road. The lower section of the garden of no.6 has a common boundary with the application site and will experience some overlooking. The overlooking, visual impact and proximity of the turning head mainly affects the end section of the garden which is less sensitive than the main dwelling and there is also planting between the garden of no.6 and the application site. As a result of this, I consider this relationship acceptable and not detrimentally to the residential amenity of this neighbouring property.
- 8.19 It was deemed in the previously approved scheme that the single storey nature and separation distance, of what is now plot no.1, from nos. 378 to 380 Mill Road meant there will not be any significant overshadowing, or adverse visual impact for the occupants of these properties to the north along Mill Road. As the height and separation distance, from nos. 378 to 380 Mill Road, of the proposed dwellings are very similar to that of the previously approved scheme, I consider that the previous assessment of this amenity remains applicable and thus there will be no harm to the amenity of these neighbouring properties as a result of the proposed development.
- 8.20 In regard to concerns raised by neighbouring properties to the south on Montreal Square, I do not consider that the addition of house no.4 to the main plot of the development will cause any

harm to the residential amenity of these properties. House no.4 would be positioned approximately 16.5m away from no.6 Montreal Square and 16m away from no.5 Montreal Square. This separation distance and the absence of any windows overlooking in this direction would mean that the amenity of these neighbouring properties will not be harmed as a result of the addition of house no.4.

- 8.21 I recognize 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 formed from any of the rear gardens of Mill Road. I recognize that the applicant's site plans do not accurately show the footprints of houses facing Mill Road. I have examined the context of the site carefully and noted the actual position of more recent rear extensions to Mill Road houses. Even taking these extensions into account, the rear gardens of Mill Road are relatively deep and I do not consider that the outlook, seclusion and privacy of these rooms will be significantly curtailed. The land to the rear of number 6, 7 and 8 Montreal Road is anomalous in size and shape, and I consider additional residential development here to be appropriate.
- 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

- 8.23 The application provides four 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 and 3/12 (or 3/14).

#### **Refuse Arrangements**

- 8.24 The scheme provides adequate refuse storage provision within the proposed forecourt area in front of the dwellings. 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.

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

### **Highway Safety**

8.26 The highway authority is satisfied with the visibility from the proposed junction adjacent to no.8 Montreal road. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

### **Car and Cycle Parking**

8.27 The application provides adequate cycle parking within outbuildings on the proposed forecourt. 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**

8.28 The majority of the issues raised in the representations received have been considered in the above report.

The following issues have also been raised:

*The area is overdeveloped*

I do not consider the development of this site to cause any overdevelopment that would affect the amenity of neighbouring properties or significantly detract from the character of the area. The previous approval is an indication that this level of development on this site is acceptable.

*The distance of separation between house no.1 and the back of no.380 Mill Road is not correct.*

I have visited No.380 mill Road and measured the length of the rear garden. This distance is 13.55m and not 17.5m as shown on the plan. This difference is because extensions to various properties on Mill Road, including no.380, are not shown on the location plan. I have taken into account the actual configuration of no.380 and other nearby buildings in making my assessment.



## *Access objections*

With regard to the objections around the pressure on car parking in the surrounding area, it is my view that adequate provision has been provided on site, in accordance with the Councils parking standards. I do not consider it likely that car ownership levels amongst future occupiers of the development will exceed the level provided for. The existing pressure on on-street car parking space will in itself be a disincentive to such additional car ownership.

## **Planning Obligation Strategy**

- 8.29 As a result of the Ministerial Statement (1 December 2014) by Brandon Lewis Minister of State for Housing and Planning (Department of Communities and Local Government) tariff style developer contributions on small-scale developers, for sites of 10-units or less, and which have a maximum combined gross floor space of 1,000 square meters should not be sought. The proposed development falls below this threshold, and therefore it is not possible to seek planning obligations to secure community infrastructure in this case.

## **9.0 CONCLUSION**

- 9.1 The design and layout of this revised scheme reflects the characteristics of the site, which adequately justifies 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 or the amenities of neighbours. Approval is recommended.

## **10.0 RECOMMENDATION**

**APPROVE** subject to the following conditions:

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

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

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

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

3. No development 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 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 written agreement of the local planning authority, 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. 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 those shown in the approved drawings or 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)

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

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

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

9. Prior to commencement until a programme of measures to minimise the spread of airborne dust from the site during the demolition / construction period has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties.

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

Reason: To avoid displacement of loose material onto the highway in the interests of highway safety

11. Notwithstanding the provision of Class A of Schedule 2, Part 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, (or any order revoking, amending or re-enacting that order) no gates shall be erected across the approved access unless details have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

12. Prior to the commencement of the first use the vehicular access where it crosses the public highway shall be laid out and constructed in accordance with the Cambridgeshire County Council construction specification.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to ensure satisfactory access into the site.

13. The access shall be constructed with adequate drainage measures to prevent surface water run-off onto the adjacent public highway, in accordance with a scheme submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with the Highway Authority.

Reason: To prevent surface water discharging to the highway.

14. Two 2.0 x 2.0 metres visibility splays shall be provided as shown on the drawings. The splays are to be included within the curtilage of the new dwelling. One visibility splay is required on each side of the access, measured to either side of the access, with a set-back of two metres from the highway boundary along each side of the access. This area shall be kept clear of all planting, fencing, walls and the like exceeding 600mm high.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

15. The manoeuvring area shall be provided as shown on the drawings and retained free of obstruction.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

16. The access shall be provided as shown on the approved drawings and retained free of obstruction.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

**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).