

Application Number	15/1111/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	10th June 2015	Officer	Mr Toby Williams
Target Date	5th August 2015		
Ward	Cherry Hinton		
Site	Land At 58 Fishers Lane Cambridge CB1 9HR		
Proposal	Proposed erection of eight new dwellings with eight parking spaces and cycle storage (Resubmission of application 14/2027/FUL)		
Applicant	Keystone Residential Limited C/o Agent		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>-The proposed development has adequately addressed the previous reason for refusal given by Committee. The layout of the scheme is considered acceptable.</p>
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The site is situated on the south side of Fisher’s Lane within Cherry Hinton. Opposite and north of the site is the residential development of Wenvoe Close. The site is located due north of the consented Colville Road City Council housing site (application ref: 13/1129/FUL). To the east are the two storey houses of nos. 54-58 Fisher’s lane fronting the road with the 1.5 storey nos. 50-52 located behind. To the west is the two-storey Cherry Hinton Medical Centre and public right of way (footpath) linking Fisher’s Lane to Colville Road.
- 1.2 There is vehicular access to the site from Fisher’s Lane and the majority of the site is open (with hoarding around), formerly used for car parking.
- 1.3 The former Royal British Legion Hall (the Hall) stood on the site and is still listed as an ‘asset of community value’ in Nov 2013

on the Council's register. It was a single storey building which was effectively a Nissen hut. However, it was demolished the week beginning 23 February 2015 following the approval of a prior notification application for its demolition granted on 19 February 2015.

- 1.4 The site is not within a Conservation Area and there are no listed buildings adjacent. It is outside the controlled parking zone.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

2.1 The application seeks permission for the proposed residential development of 8 semi-detached dwellings with 8 car parking spaces and covered cycle storage facilities. They would be arranged as semi-detached properties, four of the properties onto Fishers Lane and four to the rear, with a central access point leading to a landscaped car parking court in the middle of the site. They would all be 3 bedroom properties. They would be constructed from a gault brick with pitched roofs (accommodating rear dormer windows) consisting of grey roof tiles.

2.2 The proposed development is an amended resubmission of application 14/2027/FUL and has sought to address the previous reasons for refusal given by Committee. The quantity of dwellings is the same but the layout, particularly the arrangement of car parking spaces and garden depths, has altered. The main changes are as follows:

- Garden depths for plots 1-4 (at the front of the site) have increased from approx. 5.95m to 7m.
- Garden depths for plots 5-8 (at the rear of the site) have increased and these properties now have a staggered building line. For example, plot 5's garden has increased from 7.8m to 9.35m.
- Landscaped areas have been introduced either side of the vehicular entrance.
- The parking layout has been revised with additional planting separation so that parking spaces relate more closely to the plots.

- Communal cycle stores have been removed from the parking court and placed under sedum covered structures within the rear gardens of the plots.
- Wider side paths to plots 1, 4, 5 and 8 have been provided to make it easier to access the rear gardens, including for bikes and bins.

2.3 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:

1. Design and access statement
2. Landscape design statement
3. Surface water drainage agreement
4. Planning statement
5. Transport statement
6. Site investigations

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
14/2027/FUL	Proposed residential development to erect 8 semi-detached dwellings with 8 car parking spaces and covered cycle storage facilities at Fishers Lane, Cherry Hinton.	Refused (appeal in progress)
06/0495/OUT	Outline application for residential development of 12 two-storey flats.	Refused
15/0139/DEMDET	Prior notification of the demolition of existing dilapidated nissen hut building.	A/C
C/80/0706	Use of existing British Legion Hall for the holding of Saturday Markets	W/d

3.1 The 2014 application was refused at the April Planning Committee of this year, contrary to the officer recommendation of approval. It was refused for the following reason:

‘By virtue of the siting of the proposed units and layout of external space, the proposed development would result

in the provision of poor quality amenity space for future occupants, which would be confined and restricted. It would also result in a poor outlook from the front of the proposed units to car parking spaces and cycle storage at close proximity. As such, the proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site and would be contrary to Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7, 3/11 and 3/12.'

3.2 The officer assessment sets out why it is considered that this reason for refusal has been overcome.

4.0 PUBLICITY

4.1 Advertisement:	No
Adjoining Owners:	Yes
Site Notice Displayed:	No

5.0 POLICY

5.1 See Appendix 1 for full details of Central Government Guidance, Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN		POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Plan 2006	Local	3/4 3/7 3/8 3/11 3/12 5/1 5/11 5/14 8/2 8/4 8/6 8/10 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 2015</p> <p>Circular 11/95</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>Planning Obligation Strategy (March 2010)</p>
	<p><u>City Wide Guidance</u></p> <p>Cambridgeshire Design Guide For Streets and Public Realm (2007)</p> <p>Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)</p>

5.4 Status of Proposed Submission – Cambridge Local Plan

Planning applications should be determined in accordance with policies in the adopted Development Plan and advice set out in the NPPF. However, after consideration of adopted plans and the NPPF, policies in emerging plans can also be given some weight when determining applications. For Cambridge, therefore, the emerging revised Local Plan as published for consultation on 19th 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.

5.5 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 No Objection: The visibility splay to the east is less than the standard set down in Manual for Streets but there is already an existing access to the site which carried a similar level of use. Therefore, overall, the improved width of access and layout is considered acceptable and the proposal should have no significant impact on the public highway, should it gain the benefit of planning permission. Proposed conditions and informatives include: no unbound material at the access point, no gates, detailed access plans, drainage measures, visibility splays, manoeuvring areas, cross-overs, the access width and traffic management during construction.

Refuse and Environment

6.2 No Objection: Recommend conditions/informatives relating to: construction/collection during construction/piling/contamination/waste new houses/waste vehicle movements/road construction.

Urban Design and Conservation team

6.3 Objection: The submitted revised scheme is considered to have made improvements to the proposed amenity space provision and arrangement of cycle and refuse storage. But the urban design team are still not satisfied with the arrangement of units with Plots 5-8 facing the 'back' of Plots 1-4, which are considered to be a concern and fail to secure the rear boundaries of gardens resulting in a disjointed and ambiguous space. These issues cannot be resolved without fundamental changes to the site layout. The submitted scheme contravenes Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/12.

Landscape Team

- 6.4 Objection: The resubmission is unacceptable as the proposal is still an overdevelopment of the site. There is not enough space to create cohesive, useable and pleasant spaces to dwell. The rear gardens are constrained, bins on the patio will be unpleasant for amenity, parking is visually dominant. The proposed changes do not go far enough.

Sustainable Drainage Officer

- 6.5 Not able to comment on the proposed development as additional infiltration testing to BRE 365 and calculations to support viability and size of the soakaway is required. *(Further information has been sent to the drainage officer. Any further response will be reported on the amendment sheet or orally at the meeting.)*

Archaeology

- 6.6 No objection: Recommended condition to secure the implementation of a programme of archaeology works.
- 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 Cllr Ashton has called in the application of the grounds that:

- overdevelopment and traffic concerns

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

Whitlocks, High Street, Trumpington

- 7.3 Object on the grounds of added traffic congestion along Queen Edith's Way/Cherry Hinton high street corridor and that highways improvements are required from the proposal.

Cherry Hinton & Brookfields Medical Centre

- 7.4 Object on the grounds of close proximity of proposed plot 5 to the medical centre will lead to an unacceptable loss of light. Raises 'right to light' issues and that the applicants should have provided a shadow assessment.
- 7.5 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations can be inspected on the application file.

8.0 ASSESSMENT

- 8.1 From the consultation responses and representation received and from my inspection of the site and the surroundings, I consider that the main issues are:
1. Principle of Development
 2. Layout and Amenity for Future Occupants
 3. Refuse arrangements
 4. Highway safety
 5. Car and cycle parking
 6. Third Party Representation
 7. Planning Obligation Strategy

Principle of Development

- 8.2 The previous application 14/2027/FUL considered in some detail the policy implications regarding the demolition of the former Hall as a community facility against policy 5/11, NPPF guidance and case law. Members accepted that adopted policy 5/11 could not be applied. It would not be reasonable for Members to revisit those conclusions in the assessment of this application.
- 8.3 The application site could be considered a windfall site under policy 5/1. It would provide housing on a brownfield site. In my view, there is no reason why residential development would not be acceptable.

Layout and Amenity for Future Occupants

- 8.4 In determining the previous planning application, Members of the Committee were mindful of the unresolved objections from

Urban Design and Landscaping Officers. The consultees' objections were reflected in the reason for refusal:

'By virtue of the siting of the proposed units and layout of external space, the proposed development would result in the provision of poor quality amenity space for future occupants, which would be confined and restricted. It would also result in a poor outlook from the front of the proposed units to car parking spaces and cycle storage at close proximity. As such, the proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site and would be contrary to Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7, 3/11 and 3/12.'

8.5 In particular, the harm identified by Members of the Planning Committee amounted to:

1. Poor Quality amenity space for future occupants, being confined and restricted (particularly plots 5-8).
2. Poor outlook to the front of the proposed units facing into the car parking court (plots 5-8).

8.6 The Council has submitted a statement of case in relation to the current appeal which explains the harm identified at bullet point 1 above. This sets out that the previous scheme showed the rear gardens to plots 5-8 would have a direct outlook towards the Colville Road City Council housing development site. Due to the limited depth of plots 5-8 and the fact that the proposed 3 bedroom houses would be likely to be occupied by families, future occupants would have felt hemmed-in and confined. More substantial garden depths or an alternative orientation/layout of garden spaces would alleviate this issue and this has been put to the Inspector.

8.7 The revised scheme has improved the garden depths to plots 5-8 by staggering the building footprints. The garden depths are 9.2m, 7.5m, 6.7m and 7.2m respectively, whereas they previously ranged from between 5.3m and 7m. The Urban Design and Conservation Team state that 'the increased depth is welcomed and has the potential to improve the overall quality and usability of the amenity spaces.' Notwithstanding that the officer recommendation on the previous scheme considered the garden depths to be acceptable, the increased garden depths

for these plots is welcome. Members should note that the Council does not have a garden depth standard in adopted policy.

- 8.8 The Council has submitted a statement of case in relation to the current appeal which explains the harm identified at bullet point 2. This identifies that the previous scheme had a poor outlook from the rearmost plots 5-8 into the central car parking court. Planting beds were narrow and car parking spaces awkwardly located in front of plots that had no association with them, together with communal cycle parking sheds within the space. This gave rise to a poor level of amenity and outlook for future occupants.
- 8.9 The revised scheme has improved the layout of the court by revising the parking so that the spaces relate more closely to the plots and by introducing more planting within it and to either side of the access, softening its feel. The communal cycle stores have also been removed from the parking court and placed under sedum covered structures within the rear gardens. The Urban Design and Conservation Team state that 'this arrangement improves the outlook and relationship of the southernmost parking spaces to Plots 5-8. The parking spaces for Plots 1-4 remain poorly related to their intended units given their location and lack of direct access.' In my view, notwithstanding that the officer recommendation on the previous scheme considered the layout acceptable, the revised layout has improved upon this.
- 8.10 Despite noting these improvements, the Urban Design and Conservation Team still object to the scheme on the basis that it is a front-to-back layout and that the rear boundaries of plots 1-4 are not secure and the parking court is a disjointed and ambiguous space.
- 8.11 My view is that these issues cannot be resolved without fundamental changes to the site layout and that Committee would find it difficult to justify a reason for refusal on these grounds. This is because the use of car parking courts in this manner is not without precedence and the design of this court and arrangement of houses is acceptable.
- 8.12 The current layout has plots 5-8 overlooking the courtyard space, so I consider it to be secure. The rear boundaries of

plots 1-4 are defined by brick walls, which would be an attractive yet robust form of boundary treatment. The additional landscaping has softened the space. The parking spaces relate to the individual units. The surface to the court could be treated with paving blocks or an alternative high quality material.

- 8.13 In considering alternative layout options, I do not think it would be desirable to have parking for plots directly off Fisher's Lane and neither would it be desirable to orientate the dwellings to front the pathway to the west. This would block more of the outlook from the medical centre but also orientate gardens west-east as opposed to a more desirable southerly aspect as presently proposed. For these reasons, I do not consider the continued objection from the Urban Design and Conservation team to retain a force of weight that could be used as a reason for refusal.
- 8.14 I previously concluded that this is a modest housing scheme that would sit comfortably on the site and would work well for its occupants. All of the properties have ample, south facing gardens. The scale, being 2.5 storeys, is entirely in keeping with its surroundings. A gault brick material is considered an acceptable facing material.
- 8.15 The proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11 and 3/12.

Residential Amenity

- 8.16 It is not considered that any of the front four plots would give rise to amenity impacts for adjacent residents. Nearby houses are sufficiently far enough away and the proposed houses are modest in scale and should not give rise to unacceptable impacts in terms of loss of light, enclosure or overlooking.
- 8.17 The rear four plots are set in from the eastern and western edges of the site by 2.2 and 1.6m respectively. No. 50 Fisher's Lane to the east was already enclosed by the footprint and form of the former Hall. The footprint of plot 8 adjacent to no. 50 is further away from the boundary than the Hall was and does not extend as deeply. I consider the relationship acceptable even though the new house would be taller.

- 8.18 Plot 5 to the west would partly enclose outlook from the medical centre, being 5.5m away. Plot 5 is set back from the intervening footway equidistant to that of the medical centre but is not as long. The new house would only partly enclose the medical centre and the pathway. The applicants have not submitted shadow studies and I consider it is likely that early morning sun from the east would be partially blocked by plot 5, but I do not consider this impact would be significant. I am also mindful that this was not a previous reason for refusal on the appealed scheme and the similarity of that scheme to this. Despite the objection, I consider the relationship of built form with the medical centre, in terms of enclosure and sunlight, to be acceptable.
- 8.19 In my view, the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and that it is considered compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/12.

Refuse Arrangements

- 8.20 Space is provided within the individual plots for three bins for the each house. Space is also laid out for a pick-up point for bins closer to Fisher's Lane for the rearmost plots 5-8. I agree with the recommended conditions from the Environmental Health officer.
- 8.21 The proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

Highway Safety

- 8.22 There are no highway safety issues raised by the highway authority who refer to an 'improved width of access and layout'. The advice is made on the basis that the amount of parking from existing to proposed is reduced. I accept this advice and recommend conditions accordingly.
- 8.23 The proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Car and Cycle Parking

8.24 The scheme provides one car parking space per dwelling and 24 cycle parking spaces, all of which would be located within the rear gardens of the properties. The provision accords with the adopted standards. The proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10.

Drainage

8.25 The drainage officer has been provided with additional information regarding infiltration testing. I will report any further comments on the amendment sheet or orally at the meeting.

Third Party representations

8.26 The following objection matters have been raised and I address each matter in turn.

- Added traffic congestion

8.27 I do not consider the proposed development to adversely affect the highway network as the proposed development is for a relatively minor development. The Highways Officer does not raise an objection.

- Close proximity of the proposed dwellings neighbouring the medical centre and loss of light to windows of the medical centre (concerning the impact on height and light).

8.28 This impact has been covered in paragraphs 8.18-8.19. Right to light issues are not material planning issues.

Planning Obligations

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

- (a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- (b) directly related to the development; and

(c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

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

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

8.32 I have consulted the service managers who are responsible for the delivery of projects to offset the impact of development. I set out a summary of the S106 position in the categories of community facilities and informal open space provision below:

Community facilities contribution

8.33 The Cherry Hinton Residents Association (CHRA) has an identified need of £250,000 to deliver substantial and sustainable community benefit, particularly to groups with greatest social need.

8.34 CHRA project needs the expansion of the current Library footprint to incorporate modular meeting rooms, toilet facilities, storage, kitchens, a new courtyard, and cafeteria.

8.35 In 2012 Cherry Hinton Residents Association (CHRA) undertook an online and paper-based survey across the ward to assess whether more and better facilities were needed. Of the survey responses (84) 98% thought additional community space was needed. People's top preferences were to see a community café (87%); space to have social interaction with others (44%); a new youth club (57%); additional community meeting space for local groups (55%); for adult education classes (37%); and for space to the provision of support groups/advice sessions such as finance, employment, welfare, etc. (37%). Finally, when residents were asked where their preferred location for a community hub was, the highest proportion (39%) was for an extension to Cherry Hinton Library.

- 8.36 Room bookings for the pilot CHUB facility now stand at about 500 bookings per year and are increasing. Meanwhile, since the pilot was launched, Library annual loans have more than doubled from 25,000 to 62,000. By comparison, the county-wide situation shows a slight decrease in usage and loan activity over a similar period.
- 8.37 As a multi-stakeholder project, the initiative is expected to deliver substantial and sustainable community benefit, particularly to groups with greatest social need. The facility will be of great benefit too in delivering City Council services either directly or via Council partners. Furthermore, the evidence base built via use of the pilot project gives reassurance that the S106 grant will deliver good value for money.
- 8.38 The Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) requires that all new residential developments contribute to community development facilities, programmes and projects and provides a formula for calculating this. This contribution is £1256 for each unit of one or two bedrooms and £1882 for each larger unit.
- 8.39 As a proportion of the overall project cost, I have used this formulae to calculate that a reasonable contribution from the development would be:

Community facilities			
Type of unit	£per unit	Number of such units	Total £
1 bed	1256		
2-bed	1256		
3-bed	1882	8	£15,056
4-bed	1882		
Total			£15,056

- 8.40 My view is that the evidence within Cherry Hinton is that there is demand already being placed on community facilities and that the occupation of this scheme would increase this. A specific project has been identified at the local Library and it is likely that residents of the proposed scheme would benefit from its potential expansion as a community facility. Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure the sought requirements, I am satisfied that the proposal accords with

Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 5/14 and 10/1 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010.

Open space contribution

8.41 I am awaiting further information regarding a possible project at Cherry Hinton Hall regarding landscape and access improvements. However, I have not been provided with any evidence of shortfall of informal open space provision in this part of the City to justify why a contribution would be necessary. I will update the amendment sheet if further information is forthcoming which justifies a requirement for a contribution towards this project.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 The development would provide additional family housing on a brownfield site in a sustainable location. The scale and design of the units is acceptable. The impact on adjacent neighbours is acceptable. Highway safety would not be compromised. The layout has been amended to overcome previous reasons for refusal.

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

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

3. Submission of Preliminary Contamination Assessment:

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

(a) Desk study to include:

-Detailed history of the site uses and surrounding area (including any use of radioactive materials)

-General environmental setting.

-Site investigation strategy based on the information identified in the desk study.

(b) A report setting set out what works/clearance of the site (if any) is required in order to effectively carry out site investigations.

Reason: To adequately categorise the site prior to the design of an appropriate investigation strategy in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 4/13.

4. Submission of site investigation report and remediation strategy:

Prior to the commencement of the development (or phase of) with the exception of works agreed under condition 3 and in accordance with the approved investigation strategy agreed under clause (b) of condition 3, the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:

(a) A site investigation report detailing all works that have been undertaken to determine the nature and extent of any contamination, including the results of the soil, gas and/or water analysis and subsequent risk assessment to any receptors

(b) A proposed remediation strategy detailing the works required in order to render harmless the identified contamination given the proposed end use of the site and surrounding environment including any controlled waters. The strategy shall include a schedule of the proposed remedial works setting out a timetable for all remedial measures that will be implemented.

Reason: To ensure that any contamination of the site is identified and appropriate remediation measures agreed in the interest of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 4/13.

5. Implementation of remediation.

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

Reason: To ensure full mitigation through the agreed remediation measures in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 4/13.

6. Completion report:

Prior to the first occupation of the development (or phase of) hereby approved the following shall be submitted to, and approved by the local planning authority.

(a) A completion report demonstrating that the approved remediation scheme as required by condition 4 and implemented under condition 5 has been undertaken and that the land has been remediated to a standard appropriate for the end use.

(b) Details of any post-remedial sampling and analysis (as defined in the approved material management plan) shall be included in the completion report along with all information concerning materials brought onto, used, and removed from the development. The information provided must demonstrate that the site has met the required clean-up criteria.

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

Reason: To demonstrate that the site is suitable for approved use in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 4/13

7. Material Management Plan:

Prior to importation or reuse of material for the development (or phase of) a Materials Management Plan (MMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The MMP shall:

- a) Include details of the volumes and types of material proposed to be imported or reused on site
- b) Include details of the proposed source(s) of the imported or reused material
- c) Include details of the chemical testing for ALL material to be undertaken before placement onto the site.
- d) Include the results of the chemical testing which must show the material is suitable for use on the development
- e) Include confirmation of the chain of evidence to be kept during the materials movement, including material importation, reuse placement and removal from and to the development.

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

Reason: To ensure that no unsuitable material is brought onto the site in the interest of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13.

8. Unexpected Contamination:

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

Reason: To ensure that any unexpected contamination is rendered harmless in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 4/13.

9. No construction work or demolition work shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours and 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

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

10. 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 2015, (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. 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.

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 redundant vehicle crossover of the footway shall be returned to normal footway and kerb prior to the occupation of the development.

Reason: for the safe and efficient operation of the public highway

17. The access shall be provided as shown on the approved drawings and a width of access of 5 metres provided for a minimum distance of ten metres from the highway boundary and retained free of obstruction.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

18. No demolition or construction works shall commence on site until a traffic management plan has been agreed with the Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority. The principle areas of concern that should be addressed are:
 - i. Movements and control of muck away lorries (all loading and unloading should be undertaken off the adopted public highway)
 - ii. Contractor parking, for both phases all such parking should be within the curtilage of the site and not on street.
 - iii. Movements and control of all deliveries (all loading and unloading should be undertaken off the adopted public highway)
 - iv. Control of dust, mud and debris, please note it is an offence under the Highways Act 1980 to deposit mud or debris onto the adopted public highway.

Reason: in the interests of highway safety

19. Prior to the commencement of development details of surface water drainage and what measures will be implemented must be submitted and agreed in writing by the local planning. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details

Reason: due to the significant increase in impermeable surfacing and lack of information submitted with the application.

20. There should be no collection or deliveries to the site during the demolition and construction stages outside the hours of 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours to 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

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

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

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

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

22. 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 walk distances for residents including the specific arrangements to enable collection from the kerbside or within 5m 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 - To protect the amenities of nearby residents /occupiers and in the interests of visual amenity. Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/12 and 4/13

23. No development shall commence until further details of the circulation route for refuse collection vehicles have been submitted to the local planning authority and approved in writing. The required details shall include a full construction specification for the route, and a plan defining the extent of the area to which that specification will be applied. No dwelling forming part of the development shall be occupied until the refuse vehicle circulation route has been laid out and constructed in accordance with the details thus approved, and thereafter the route shall be maintained in accordance with those details.

Reason - To protect the amenities of nearby residents/occupiers and in the interests of visual amenity. Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/12 and 4/13

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

Reason: to secure the preservation of the archaeological interest of the area either by record or in situ as appropriate. Cambridge Local Plan Policy 4/9