

Application Number	15/1623/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	27th August 2015	Officer	Mr Sav Patel
Target Date	22nd October 2015		
Ward	Queen Ediths		
Site	64 Glebe Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 7SZ		
Proposal	Demolition of single storey dwelling and erection of 5 new dwellings		
Applicant	C/O Agent United Kingdom		

<p>SUMMARY</p>	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed development would make effective and efficient use of previously development land to provide a popular form of housing; - The proposed development is of high quality in terms of design, scale and layout. - The proposed development would integrate into the site without appearing out of character with the existing built environment. - The proposed development would not have a significantly adverse impact on the residential amenity of the surrounding neighbours, particularly the occupiers of the properties to the north and west.
<p>RECOMMENDATION</p>	<p>APPROVAL</p>

0.0 UPDATE

- 0.1 The Planning Committee considered a report on this application at the meeting on 2 December 2015. The decision was deferred pending a revision of the assessment by the planning case officer to take the impact of the development on residential annexes in close proximity to the site into consideration. This update provides that information; the following report is unchanged.
- 0.2 There are two residential annexe buildings close to the site boundaries one to the rear of 62 Glebe Road and one to the rear of 64a Glebe Road. As part of the neighbour notification process letters were sent to separate addresses: Annexe Rear of 62 Glebe Road and Annexe Rear of 64a Glebe Road. A comment was made by the occupiers of 62 Glebe Road and this refers to the impact on the annexe. A separate comment was received from the occupiers of the annexe at 64a Glebe Road.
- 0.3 The comments made by the residents of the annexe buildings are referred to in the Committee Report but the report does not properly address the relationship between the annexes and the proposed development. I apologise for this omission.
- 0.4 It is necessary to visit both annexe buildings to fully assess the impact that the development will have on the occupiers of those buildings. To date it has not been possible for me to do so but both annexes will be visited before the January Committee meeting. I will provide an update on the Amendment Sheet. I have set out my initial thoughts below based on a desk based assessment.

Planning status of annexe buildings

- 0.5 Planning permission is required for change of use of an ancillary outbuilding to a separate and independent planning unit and in both cases an application has not been made. However both annexes have been registered as separate residences for Council tax purposes since April 2008. This means that both are immune from planning enforcement action under the 'four year rule'. The residents of the annexes have been invited to submit applications for Certificates of Lawful Development if they wish to formally regularise the situation. Under the circumstances the occupiers of the annexes should

be afforded the same weight as any other resident of a single dwelling.

Impact on annexe to rear of 62 Glebe Road

- 0.6 This annexe appears to be a single storey building at the southern end of the garden serving 62 Glebe Road. The annexe is accessed via the west side of the garden against the boundary with 64b Glebe Road. The annexe is shown on the block plan of the proposed development and sits parallel to unit 1. It is slightly forward of the front elevation of the new house and relates to the garage space at ground floor and master bedroom on the first floor. There are windows serving the stairwell and a study that face the annexe at second floor level. These windows are 7.5 m from the site boundary and 8m from the annexe. They will overlook the roof of the annexe therefore subject to my site visit I do not think that there will be significant overlooking. Proposed windows in the front elevation of the proposed unit 1 will provide oblique views towards the garden area in front of the annexe however given the separation distance of 8m and existing planting I do not consider this arrangement to be unacceptable in terms of overlooking. The rear facing windows will provide similar oblique views towards the garden to the rear of the annexe.
- 0.7 The shadow study provided in support of the application deals only with the impact of overshadowing on the existing houses/gardens to the west of the site, not to the east where the annexe is located. Subject to my site visit, it appears to me that there will be some overshadowing of the annexe site which may affect the garden areas. However as a result of the proximity of the annexe to the boundary and orientation parallel to the boundary, the overshadowing will be predominately over the roof of the annexe and will not affect the occupiers.
- 0.8 There are mature trees on the boundary between the annexe and the proposed development which are within the garden of 62 Glebe Road. These will be protected during the construction process and will afford additional protection in terms of overlooking and enclosure.

Impact on annexe to rear of 64b Glebe Road

- 0.9 This annexe appears to be close to the southern end of the garden serving 64b Glebe Road. It set off the boundary of the application site by approximately 3m and faces the access road serving the existing boundary. The annexe is shown on the proposed block plan which also shows that two car parking spaces and a landscaped area will sit adjacent the boundary. The passing place on the access road is roughly opposite the location of the annexe.
- 0.10 There are windows in the proposed development which face towards the annexe and the outdoor space associated with it. The garden to 64a is not subdivided. Given the separation distance at 16 m from the annexe and 12 m from the site boundary and the orientation of the annexe I do not think that there will be harmful levels of overlooking.
- 0.11 The Shadow Study does not address this part of the site but from the information available my view is that overshadowing will not be significant despite the location of the annexe to the north of the proposed houses. The separation distance is such that enclosure will not be harmful.
- 0.12 In conclusion I am of the view that the impacts of the development on the amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of both annexes will not be harmful. This view is subject to confirmation following my site visit.

Other issues raised by the applicant/agent

- 0.13 The applicant's agent has drawn attention to the following in the light of the Committee discussion:

Sustainability

- 0.14 Specific reference is made to sustainability issues of design within submitted Design and Access Statement on page 7 of 3.28 - 3.30. The text confirms that the houses are equipped with energy efficient lighting, mechanical ventilation with heat recovery and approximately 4kw of photovoltaic's. Garage roofs will be finished with sedum to provide water attenuation and the driveway and parking areas will be finished in a SUDS type block pavior. High levels of insulation and air tightness form integral parts of the construction and it is the intention of the

development to achieve Building for Life certification under the revised CAGE BFI 12 scheme.

- 0.15 The homes benefit from built in solar PV arrays on their south facing pitched roofs and have their hot water and space heating provided by pump technology without the need for carbon based fuels – these will be amongst the most energy efficient to be built in Cambridge.

Bins

- 0.16 Amended plans have been submitted showing the point where the bins will be delivered and where collection will take place. The drag distances are greater than those that would normally be permitted but do reflect what already happens on the site. Suggested condition 26 makes provision for the submission of details for the arrangements for the provision of waste.
- 0.17 Regarding the comments about the disabled/elderly and the distances involved to the collection point, Members were reminded about the service that the Council offers in such circumstances in addition, of course, to the assistance that neighbours may offer given the scale of this development .

South facing elevations and lighting

- 0.18 The design and layout of the dwellings exploits the south facing element of the scheme. The lighting of these dwellings at the southern elevation must be seen in the context of the considerable distance between those properties which they face which are those at Holbrook Road which are located some 80 metres away. The properties at Templemore Close are situated at an angle to our proposed development and with existing screening at the rear of the gardens it is not considered that lighting from the new dwellings would be unacceptable.

Highway issues

- 0.19 Councillor Smart questioned whether the access road was capable of accommodating a car passing a person dragging a wheelie bin to the collection point. The highways consultants have confirmed that this is the case.

0.20 The proposed upgraded access drive width is a minimum of 3.7m with passing provision at the entrance from Glebe Road and at a passing place within the site. The minimum width of 3.7m is determined by the need for a fire tender to access the site. Therefore, a car, with a general width of 2.0m allowing for wing mirrors (Figure 6.18 of Manual for Streets) will result in a remaining width of 1.7m clear for a pedestrian, cyclist or person moving a bin, to pass. This remaining width is comparable with the width of a standard footway.

0.21 Regarding concerns raised by Councillor Moore and Councillor Pippas, the highways consultants confirm that reference to the County Council's website shows that there were no recorded road traffic accidents which resulted in personal injury at the proposed site access, or at the road junction opposite, during the five years from 2009 to 2014. A single accident, resulting in a slight injury, was recorded to the east of the site on Glebe Road in 2013 around numbers 20-24 Glebe Road. This is well away from any manoeuvres that might relate to either the existing site access or the junction opposite.

Amendment Sheet items (December Committee)

0.22 There were no changes on the Amendment Sheet.

CONCLUSION OF UPDATE

0.23 Subject to my site visits to the residential annexes at 62 and 64b Glebe Road, I am satisfied that the impacts of the proposed development on the amenities of the occupiers of those annexes are acceptable. My recommendation of approval is unchanged as set out in section 10 below.

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

1.1 The application site is located to the south of Glebe Road and in a backland location to the existing two storey dwellings which are set back from Glebe Road. The general pattern of development in this area is of two storey detached and semidetached dwellings set back from the road and with deep rear gardens.

1.2 The application site is 0.22 hectares in extent and consists of a single storey dwelling within a generous plot. Access to the

dwelling (no.64 Glebe Road) is via a long single width access road of 66 metres in length that runs between no.64a and no.66 Glebe Road.

- 1.3 To the north of the site are the two storey dwellings that face Glebe Road. To south is an allotment site and beyond this are the dwellings in Holbrook Road. To the west are the dwellings in the Temple Close which is a small back land development consisting of 11 large detached dwellings. To the east are the rear gardens of the dwellings facing Glebe Road.
- 1.4 The site is not located within an area of designated development constraint. There are a row of Lime trees with Tree Preservation Orders within close proximity to the north-west boundary.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposal is to demolish the existing dwelling and replace it with five, three storey dwellings; two pairs of linked semi-detached dwellings and a linked detached dwelling. The proposed development would include associated facilities such as bin and cycle storage, car parking and private garden areas.
- 2.2 The proposed development would have a consistent ridge height of 9.6 metres with eaves of 5.6 metres. The semi-detached units would be approx. 13 metres wide (excluding the single storey flat roof link, which would be 2.8 metres in height) and 13 metres in depth. The detached dwelling would be 7.6 metres wide (excluding the attached 1 ½ storey side element which would be 7.95 metres in height and 5.65 metres wide) and 13 metres in depth.
- 2.3 The application includes the following supporting information:
 1. Design and Access Statement;
 2. Planning Statement;
 3. Transport Statement;
 4. Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan;
 5. Shadow Study;
 6. Plans
- 2.4 Additional information has been submitted in respect of refuse arrangements.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
C/77/0410	Erection of one detached single storey dwelling unit and garage.	APPROVED
C/77/0894	Erection of a single storey dwelling (submission of reserved matters)	APPROVED
C/99/0258	Erection of a single storey extension and alterations to existing bungalow.	APPROVED

4.0 PUBLICITY

4.1	Advertisement:	No
	Adjoining Owners:	Yes
	Site Notice Displayed (Wider concern):	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	3/1 3/4 3/7 3/10 3/12 4/4 4/13 5/1 8/2 8/6 8/10

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

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

	<p>Planning Practice Guidance March 2014</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>Material Considerations</p>	<p><u>City Wide Guidance</u></p> <p>Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)</p>

5.4 Status of Proposed Submission – Cambridge Local Plan

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

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

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

- 6.1 No objections. The access-way is not to adoptable standard. Tracking for plot 4 appears to conflict with car parked opposite.

Visibility splays should be 2 metres by 2 metres rather than 1.5 metres. No explanation on how site will be serviced. Aside from this the Highway Authority is satisfied the proposal will have no significant adverse effect upon the highway subject to the following conditions/informatives:

- No unbound material
- No gates erected
- First use of vehicular access
- Highways drainage
- Visibility Splays
- Manoeuvring area
- Access as shown
- Traffic Management Plan
- Traffic Management Plan Informative
- Highways Informative
- Public utility informative

Landscaping

- 6.2 The proposed development is acceptable subject to conditions on hard and soft landscaping and boundary treatment.

Trees

- 6.3 No comments received to date. I shall report them on the amendment sheet or orally at the meeting.

Environmental Health

- 6.4 No contamination issues and the potential impact from demolition and construction should be controlled. The following conditions are recommended:

- Construction hours
- Collection hours during construction
- Piling
- Dust
- Dust informative

Refuse and Recycling

Original comments:

- 6.5 The proposed development is unacceptable and should be refused as it does not meet the requirement of the Cambridgeshire RECAP 2012 guidance. The future residents should not be expected to pull wheeled bins more than 30 metres to the kerbside.

Second comments:

- 6.6 The revised plan showing the location of bin storage adjacent to the access lane and subject to waste management condition overcomes the objection.

Urban Design and Conservation Team

- 6.7 The submitted scheme is acceptable in design terms. Details of the proposed waste collection arrangements need to be provided. Materials condition is recommended.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Officer)

- 6.8 The proposed development is acceptable subject to surface water drainage condition.

Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Services

- 6.9 No objections subject to adequate provision being made for fire hydrants.
- 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:

Object:

- 60 Glebe Road
- 62 Glebe Road
- 64A Glebe Road
- 68 Glebe Road

- 70 Glebe Road
- 72 Glebe Road
- 1 Templemore Close;
- 3 Templemore Close
- 4 Templemore Close
- 8 Templemore Close
- 41 Holbrook Road
- 63 Holbrook Road
- 39 Hinton Road;
- Flat 12 Brooklands Court, Brooklands Avenue
- Rock Allotment Society, Trading Centre, 21 Baldock Way

Support:

- Green Glade, 64 Glebe Road
- 66 Glebe Road
- 8 Aberdeen Square
- 9 Aberdeen Square
- 5 May Pasture, Great Shelford
- 25 London Road, Great Shelford
- 7 Richard Foster Road
- Flat 1, 164 Coleridge Road

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Objection

Design, scale and layout:

- Development is too large for this plot;
- Density of development at odd with character of area;
- Three storey houses inappropriate in this two storey context;
- Concerned by the height of the proposed properties;
- The proposal would be out of keeping with the character of the area;
- Proposed dwellings should not exceed height of properties in Glebe Road and Holbrook Road;
- Insufficient gardens space;
- Alteration to front boundary no.66 will change the character of the street;

Highway and access:

- Single track access is adequate for heavy plant machinery;

- Increased in vehicle movements will put pressure on traffic along Glebe Road and parking, particularly during peak times;
- Concerns with impact on road safety;
- Bin storage will block pavement verge;
- Access is narrow and close to an accident black spot;
- Access road is inadequate for serve the proposed development;
- Concerns with potential conflict with school children walking along Glebe Road;
- How will access road be maintained to an appropriate standard?

Residential amenity:

- Loss of privacy from overlooking of garden and internal rooms;
- Removal of existing gate would significantly reduce security for properties that back onto the site;
- Noise and disturbance from additional dwellings;
- Affect legal entitlement to quiet enjoyment of property;
- Installation of security lighting will change the environment of our garden at night;
- Artificial light pollution from 5 dwellings;
- Loss of light into garden;
- Disruption during construction work;
- Lack of privacy over for future occupiers;
- No balconies overlook the allotments;
- No detail of boundary treatment along the northern boundary;
- No details of how privacy will be protected;
- The proposed dwellings will enclose existing gardens;
- The proposal will overshadow existing properties;
- Increase in noise and pollution from car fumes;

Other:

- Reduce property value;
- Proposal to maximise site value;
- The proposal would impact the protected tree in front of no.68;
- Impact on local schools and surface drainage;
- No affordable housing;
- Loss of wildlife habitat;

- The proposed development does not comply with Policies 50, 52, and 58 of the draft Local Plan;
- Concerns with access for emergency vehicles
- Material change in view/outlook;

Support:

- Reuse of under-developed site for much needed house;
- Highly sustainable location to local provisions;
- Environmentally friendly proposal;
- Compliant with the objectives of the NPPF;
- Need for family housing within the city instead of greenbelt
- Bespoke scheme which responds to its setting;
- Well designed houses;
- Sympathetic to neighbouring dwellings in terms of open space, scale and massing and residential amenity;
- Desirable type of accommodation
- Developer has a good track record;
- Good provision of off street parking;

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

8.0 ASSESSMENT

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

1. Principle of development
2. Context of site, design and external spaces
3. Residential amenity
4. Refuse arrangements
5. Highway safety
6. Car and cycle parking
7. Third party representations
8. Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

Principle of Development

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

The site is surrounded by residential uses and it is therefore my opinion that the proposed residential development is acceptable in principle, and is in accordance with policy 5/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

Context of site, design and external spaces

Response to context

- 8.3 The application site is located in a back land context behind predominantly two storey housing development fronting Glebe Road. To the west of the site is a small back land housing development consists of eleven substantial two and two ½ storey detached dwellings. There are also examples of 2 ½ and 3 storey dwellings in Glebe Road close to the site. No.52 and 64a Glebe Road are good such examples. No.52 a three storey detached dwelling and a relatively recent addition to the street scene. Planning permission (09/1015/FUL) was granted in 2009 for a replacement dwelling. No.64a is a detached 2 ½ storey dwelling which backs onto part of the application site.
- 8.4 In terms of architectural style, there are examples of hipped roofed dwellings, gabled ended and gable fronted dwellings and a contemporary mono-pitched dwelling at no.52 Glebe Road. The area is also characterised by terrace, semi-detached and detached dwellings. It would be reasonable to suggest the built form of the area is mixed.
- 8.5 Therefore in this varied context, my view is that the proposed development of five dwellings, which have been designed to appear two storey in the front elevation and 3 storey in the rear elevation responds appropriately to this site context. The two storey frontage would respond to the predominantly two storey scale of Glebe Road. The proposal includes use of the loft space but this would only be distinguishable by the appearance of rooflights. The south elevation, which would overlook the allotment site, would have a three storey appearance. This juxtaposition between the two elevations has been created by altering the roof pitch from steep to shallow. The shallow roof pitch on the rear enables more head room to allow for a full 2nd floor to be created. This transfiguration, in my view, responds well to the site context.

- 8.6 According to the applicant's front and rear elevation plan (P10 rev G) the ridge height of the proposed dwelling would be lower than the nearest property in Templemore Close. The scale of the proposed dwellings would therefore not appear out of keeping with the existing built form when views from Glebe Road.
- 8.7 In terms of articulation of the fenestration, the front elevation has been arranged in a symmetrical arrangement with modest openings, particularly at first floor. This conservative approach has been liberated on the rear elevation where it would consist of extensive floor to ceiling glazed openings on all three levels which would make the most of the south facing aspect. This detailing in my view shows the scheme is responding to the most sensitive aspect of the site which is to be north.
- 8.8 The conservative arrangement of the front elevation gives it an unfussy appearance. However, the proposed materials which include vertical cedar boarding, slate, brick and powder coated aluminum joinery would in my view bring to life the understated appearance of the front elevation whilst also refining the rear elevation of the proposed dwellings. It is therefore important to ensure the materials are of the highest quality as this will determine how successful the proposal is. I have therefore recommended a materials condition (3) to ensure all the external materials are submitted and agreed.
- 8.9 In terms of external space, the proposed dwellings would be provided with 8 metre deep, south facing rear gardens. The garden size would vary between plots and range from 77m² to 170m². Whilst some concerns have been raised regarding to garden sizes not being in keeping with the existing houses, the proposed development would make efficient use of previously development land and still provide a generous amount of outdoor space for future residents. It would be inappropriate and inefficient use of land to insist on the applicant provides the same level of garden space at existing plots. There is also sufficient space around the dwellings within the site to accommodate soft landscaping. I have recommended a soft and hard landscaping condition (17 including maintenance condition 18), as this will be important to soften the boundaries and setting of the development in this back land context.

- 8.10 In terms of scale and layout, the proposed development has been arranged a three separate blocks with generous spacing in between, particularly plots 1 and 2 and 3 and 4. The gap between these plots would be 6.9 metres. This is comparable with the gap between no.64a and no.66 and more than the spacing between some of the dwellings in Templemore Close. The proposed arrange and spacing would in my view reduce the scale and mass of the proposed development, and avoids it from appearing as a wall of development, particularly from the rear gardens of the properties to in Glebe Road. Consideration has also been given to east and west boundaries. The proposed development is stepped away from the boundaries with a single storey structure adjacent to the western boundary, which forms the rear boundary of no.2 Templemore Close, and a 1 ½ storey structure adjacent to the western boundary. The western boundary appears to be shared with part of the side boundary of no.62.
- 8.11 In my opinion the proposal has sympathetically responded to each side of the site and site context whilst achieving a high quality, cohesive developed which would make a positive contribution to the area without appearing out of character. In these terms therefore, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11 and 3/12.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.12 Concerns have been raised from local residents on the potential impact the proposed development would have on residential amenity in terms of overlooking, enclosure, loss of light, noise and disturbance. I set out below my response to each of these in turn.

Overlooking and loss of privacy

- 8.13 The dwellings at the front of the application site currently enjoy a relatively open outlook save of existing trees. Therefore the proposal to construct three blocks of two storey housing development will have a degree of impact on their outlook and residential amenity. However, it is important to assess the relationship between the proposed and existing form. The main dwellings that directly back onto the application site are

64a, 66, 68, 70 and 72 Glebe Road. The proposed dwelling would contain bedrooms at first floor and in the loft space. The first floor bedrooms would be set back from the rear boundary by between 8 metres (unit 5) and 12 metres (unit 1). The level of separation between the existing dwellings would be:

Dwelling	Distance to main rear elevation
64a Glebe Road	48 metres
66 Glebe Road	54.5 metres
68 Glebe Road	54 metres (51.5 to the extension)
70 Glebe Road	53.5 metres (between 50 and 41.5 to single storey extensions)
72 Glebe Road	53 metres (between 43 and 51 metres to the single storey extensions)

8.14 As a general rule of thumb, in an urban context such as this an acceptable window to window distance would be 20 metres. The window to window separation between the proposed and existing would be significantly more than this. There are also opportunities with the site to introduce tree planting, which the applicant has shown on the site layout plan which would assist in mitigate the impact from overlooking. However, at this distance I do not consider the proposal would result in harmful levels of overlooking such that it would have a significantly adverse impact on the residential amenity of the existing residents. As for the level of separation between the dwellings in Holbrook Road, this would be over 80 metres. It would therefore be difficult to argue the proposed development would cause any harmful overlooking at this distance. I am therefore satisfied that the impact from overlooking on the properties to the north and south would not have a significantly harmful impact on the residential amenity of the existing residents such that it would warrant refusal of this application.

8.15 In terms of the impact from overlooking to the east and west of the site, the rear gardens of the properties in Glebe Road are to the east and Templemore Close development is to the west. The east elevation of unit 1 would contain three windows at second floor level which would serve a bedroom, landing and en-suite. These windows would be set off the side boundary by

7.4 metres and have an outlook over the rear most section of gardens serving the properties in Glebe Road. At this depth, I do not consider these windows would cause loss of privacy or directly overlook the private amenity space of existing dwellings such that it would have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of existing residents. Unit 1 also proposed to have roof terraces serving the main dwelling and 1 ½ storey side structure. As these terraces would allow more flexibility in terms of viewing angle, I have recommended a condition (25) so that the sides of the terraces (east and west) are fixed with 1.7 metres high screen the type of which are to be submitted and agreed. This also applies to unit 5 in order to prevent overlooking of the rear gardens of the dwellings in Templemore Close. Unit 5 would also have a landing window at first and second floor level and a bedroom window in the west elevation. I have recommended a condition (24) to have the first and second floor windows obscure glazed with any openings restricted to 45 degrees. The proposed development would associate more to the Templemore Close due to proximity and so the impact of the proposed development is likely to be felt more the occupiers of the existing dwellings. However, in my view, whilst the proposed development would change the outlook from the rear gardens, I do not consider it would create a significantly adverse relationship. The windows in the rear elevation of the proposed dwellings, particularly unit 5 would face southwards but would allow oblique views towards the rear gardens of the dwellings, in Templemore Close, particularly no.2. However, in this urban context and backland location, it would be difficult to completely avoid any overlooking issues. This is why I have recommended conditions such as obscuring windows and screening the side of the roof terrace to mitigate any obviously potential for overlooking.

8.17 Therefore, in terms of overlooking from the proposed development on the surrounding area, I am satisfied that the proposed development subject to conditions, would not have a significantly adverse impact on the residential amenity of the residents to east and west of the site.

Enclosure

8.18 I do not consider the proposed development would have an overbearing impact on the surrounding residents, particularly to the north and south due to the level of separation and layout.

The proposed development would be between 48 and 54.5 metres from the properties to the north and over 80 metres from the properties to the south. The spacing between each block (6.9 metres) would, in my view, help to break up the mass of the proposed development and enables views through. The two storey scale of the front elevation also mitigates the dominance of the proposed development.

- 8.19 In terms of the impact on the properties to the west, in Templemore Close, the proposed development would be much closer and the degree of impact greater. The side elevation of unit 5 would be approx. 19.8 metres from the rear elevation of no.2 Templemore Close, which is the closest property to the application site. The applicant's Shadow Study which focuses on the relationship with the properties in Templemore Close demonstrates the proposed development would not have any significant adverse overshadowing impact over the rear gardens of the properties that back onto the application site. The 25 degree rule also demonstrates that the side elevation of unit 5 would not conflict with this due to the level of separation.

Noise and disturbance

- 8.20 The existing site is defined by a timber fence with planting in behind. In order to reduce the impact caused by the potential increase in comings and goings and general intensification of the use of the land, I have recommended a boundary treatment condition to ensure the site is defined by a robust boundary. I have also recommended a soft and hard landscape condition (17). These conditions would also help to attenuate noise pollution/overspill from the intensification of the site. The existing access road is defined by a timber fence on either side. Part of the side with no.66 is defined by a brick wall. The proposal would include widening a section of the access to create a passing place and to improve visibility at the junction.
- 8.21 Whilst the proposed development would increase activity within the site and movement to and from, I do not consider the level of intensification would have a significant adverse impact on the residential amenity of adjacent neighbours. I have also recommended conditions to protect the residential amenity of adjacent residents during construction stage by restricting the working hours, collections to the site and dust control.

8.22 In my opinion, subject to conditions, 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 proposed development would provide high quality living accommodation within a well laid out site. The proposed dwelling would provide a generous amount of internal living space and also a suitable amount of outdoor space. Whilst the outdoor space would not be comparable to existing properties in Glebe Road they would be similar to those in Templemore Close.

8.24 The proposed garden sizes for each unit would be:

Unit no.	Garden size	Garden m ² per bedroom
Unit 1 – 5bed	170m ²	34m ²
Unit 2 – 4bed	77m ²	19.25m ²
Unit 3 – 4bed	77m ²	19.25m ²
Unit 4 – 4bed	77m ²	19.25m ²
Unit 5 - 4bed	160m ²	40m ²

(The above table does not include the 2nd floor terraces that are proposed for each unit)

8.25 The rear gardens depth would be a consistent 8 metres for each unit but vary in width. Units 1 and 5 are the widest and would also benefit from space to the side. I am satisfied that the proposed development would provide adequate levels of outdoor space for the size of dwellings proposed.

8.26 The rear garden of unit 5 would be overlooked by no.2 Templemore Close. The rear garden of no.2 is 11 metres in depth and current overlooks the existing site. Therefore, with appropriate landscaping along the western boundary, I believe the level of overlooking would be mitigated to an acceptable level. Furthermore, in this urban context it would be difficult to eliminate any overlook issues from being created.

8.27 The main concern with the amenity of future occupiers is the refuse arrangement, particularly the bin drag distance to the collection point. As the County Highway Authority will not adopt

the access road, refuse bins are collected from the road side. The existing occupier has to drag their bins over 65 to the collection point. For the future occupiers of plots 4 and 5 the drag distance would increase to nearer 80 metres. The proposed refuse arrangement would also conflict with the recommended drag distance of 30 metres, as set out in the Waste Design Guide. This situation is also an issue that the existing resident has had to deal with and I do not consider having four (net) additional dwellings would significantly exacerbate the problem. I also do not consider the refuse arrangement should frustrate the redevelopment of this site. Nevertheless, following discussions with the Waste and Recycling Officer over how best to address the restrictive refuse arrangement, the applicant has submitted a plan to show a bin storage area at the end of the access lane. The Waste and Recycling Officer is satisfied with the location of a dedicated bin storage area for collection and has recommended a waste management condition so that details of the waste management are submitted for agreement. The applicant has agreed to this condition. Therefore, in light of the refuse constraints, I recommend a waste management condition (26) so that details of how the refuse arrangement for future residents will be managed can be submitted for agreement.

- 8.28 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.

Highway Safety

- 8.29 The Highway Authority does not consider the proposal will have any adverse impact on highway safety subject to conditions. I agree with the recommended conditions.
- 8.30 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Car and Cycle Parking

Car parking

8.31 The proposed dwellings have integral garages; unit 1 and 5 would benefit from double integral garages. Five car parking spaces are also proposed within the site to accommodate additional vehicles. There is also space in front of the integral garages to accommodate vehicles without obstructing the access. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed development make suitable provision for car parking so as to not increase the pressure on existing on street parking along Glebe Road. The proposed development would be self-sufficient in this regard.
Cycle parking

8.32 The proposed dwellings make provision for four cycle parking space in a safe and convenient location. The proposed level of cycle spaces is compliant with the cycle parking guide.

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

Third Party Representations

8.34 I have responded to some of the issues raised by third party representation in the above sections of my report. I set below my response to the objections that I have not directly responded to:

Representation	Response
<u>Design, scale and layout</u>	
Development is too large for this plot;	The proposed development would make effective and efficient use of previous developed land without appearing cramped.
Density of development at odd with character of area;	The density of development would be 23 dwellings per hectare. This is considered to be acceptable for this site in this location.
Three storey houses inappropriate in this two storey context;	See para 8.3 to 8.6
Concerned by the height of the proposed properties;	See para 8.3 to 8.6
The proposal would be out of keeping with the character of	See para 8.3 to 8.6

the area;	
Proposed dwellings should not exceed height of properties in Glebe Road and Holbrook Road;	The height of dwellings in Glebe Road are varied. The height between the proposed dwellings and existing properties in Glebe Road and Holbrook Road would not be distinguishable due to the level of separation. The dwellings in Templemore Close would have a higher ridge. I therefore do not consider the height of the proposed dwelling is unacceptable.
Insufficient gardens space;	See para 8.9 and 8.22
Alteration to front boundary no.66 will change the character of the street;	The alteration to the frontage of no.66 would not be significant such that it would have a detrimental impact on the character of the street. The alteration to the front boundary would allow for the access to be widened to improve visibility.
<u>Highway and access</u>	
Single track access is adequate for heavy plant machinery;	The applicant will need to ensure there is suitable provision for allow construction vehicles to access the site. This is not a material planning consideration.
Increased in vehicle movements will put pressure on traffic along Glebe Road and parking, particularly during peak times;	In my view, the increase in vehicle movements would not be significant enough to have a materially adverse impact on existing traffic along Glebe Road.
Concerns with impact on road safety;	The County Highway Authority has not raised any concerns with the proposal in terms of highway safety.
Bin storage will block pavement verge;	Bins are currently stored on the highway for collection and

	cause temporary obstruction. I have recommended a waste management condition to ensure the storage arrangement during collection does not cause obstruction at this point.
Access is narrow and close to an accident black spot;	The access is of suitable dimension to allow vehicles to travel along. The proposal includes provision for a pass space and alteration to the frontage to increase visibility at the junction. The highway authority does not consider the proposal would have an adverse impact on highway safety.
Access road is inadequate for serve the proposed development;	As above.
Concerns with potential conflict with school children walking along Glebe Road;	As above
How will access road be maintained to an appropriate standard?	The access would be a private road and would need to be maintained by the future residents either by themselves or through a management company.
<u>Residential amenity</u>	
Loss of privacy from overlooking of garden and internal rooms;	See para 8.13 to 8.15
Removal of existing gate would significantly reduce security for properties that back onto the site;	This is not a material planning issue.
Noise and disturbance from additional dwellings;	In this residential and urban context, I do not consider an additional five dwellings would cause significantly adverse noise levels that it would

	warrant refusing this application.
Affect legal entitlement to quiet enjoyment of property;	Not a material planning consideration.
Installation of security lighting will change the environment of our garden at night;	The level of separation between the proposed and existing dwellings would minimise any adverse impact on security lights.
Artificial light pollution from 5 dwellings;	The openings in the front elevation have been kept to a minimum, particularly at first floor and in the roof. Therefore, in conjunction with the level of separation, I do not consider the impact from artificial light would be significant.
Loss of light into garden;	The shadow study demonstrate that the proposed dwelling would not cast significant shadows over the amenity space of neighbouring gardens such that it would have an adverse impact on the residential amenity of existing occupiers.
Disruption during construction work;	I have recommended conditions to mitigate the impact.
Lack of privacy over for future occupiers;	The proposed development would provide future residents with high quality living environment.
No balconies overlook the allotments;	The allotments are protected from being overlooked and whilst there are no balconies that overlook the allotments there are windows.
No detail of boundary treatment along the northern boundary;	I have recommended a boundary treatment condition
No details of how privacy will	I have recommended obscure

be protected;	glazing condition and for the balconies of unit 1 and 5 to have side screens to protect privacy of neighbouring occupiers.
The proposed dwellings will enclose existing gardens;	The proposed development would make effective and efficient use of previous developed land without appearing cramped.
The proposal will overshadow existing properties;	The proposed development would not cause adverse levels of overshadowing.
Increase in noise and pollution from car fumes;	The noise and pollution from vehicles serving the proposed development would not be significant enough to cause an adverse impact.
<u>Other issues</u>	
Reduce property value;	This is not a material planning consideration.
Proposal to maximum site value;	This is not a material planning consideration.
The proposal would impact the protected tree in front of no.68;	The proposed alterations to the site frontage would not have any adverse impact on the existing tree in front of no.68. None of the protected trees that are located adjacent to the site boundary would be adversely impacted by the proposed development.
Impact on local schools and surface drainage;	
No affordable housing;	The proposal would not trigger affordable housing requirement.
Loss of wildlife habitat;	The site has been well maintained with landscaped garden and so is unlikely to be used as a wildlife habitat of significant importance.
The proposed development	See para 5.4

does not comply with Policies 50, 52, and 58 of the draft Local Plan;	
Concerns with access for emergency vehicles	The proposal includes alterations to the existing access to enable better visibility at the junction and a pass place. Therefore, the access would be suitable for emergency vehicles to serve the proposed dwellings.
Material change in view/outlook;	The proposal will materially change the outlook and view from the rear gardens of surrounding residents. However, the outlook/view would be of high quality housing development.

Planning Obligations

8.35 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.

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

8.36 This application was received prior to the High Court ruling on 31 July 2015, which quashed the ministerial statement from the Department of Communities and Local Government in late November 2014 that S106 contributions should not be sought from developments of fewer than 11 homes. Whilst this means that new S106 contributions can once again be considered for

housing developments of 10 homes or less, the implications of the S106 pooling constraints, which came into effect from 6 April 2015, also need to be taken into account.

- 8.37 Given the Council's previous approach to S106 contributions (based on broad infrastructure types within the City of Cambridge), the pooling constraints mean that:
- S106 contributions have to be for projects at specific places/facilities.
 - The amount of S106 contributions secured has to relate to the costs of the project for mitigating the development in the context of the capacity of existing facilities serving the development.
 - Councils can no longer sign up to any more than five new S106 contributions (since 6 April 2015) for particular projects to mitigate the impact of development.
- 8.38 The Council is, therefore, now seeking S106 contributions for specific projects wherever practicable, but this does not mean that it will be possible to seek the same number or amount of contributions as before. In this case, for example, there has not been enough time, since the High Court ruling, to identify suitable specific on-site projects. Council services are currently reviewing and updating their evidence bases to enable more S106 contributions for specific projects to be recommended in future. More details on the council's approach to developer contributions can be found at www.cambridge.gov.uk/s106.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The proposed redevelopment of the existing site to provide five semi-detached and linked detached dwelling including alterations to the access road would result in a high quality form of development in this back land location. The proposed development responds to the site context by reading as a two storey dwelling to address the Glebe Road setting and taking advantage of the views over the allotment to the south by reading as a three storey dwelling.
- 9.2 The proposed dwellings have been set off the east and west boundary to minimise the impact on the neighbours, particularly those in Templemore Close. Windows are proposed in the flank elevations of units 1 and 5 but I have recommended an obscure glazing condition to prevent overlooking. The proposed development would not appear dominant or create an adverse

sense of enclosure on the occupier of the properties in Templemore Close due to the level of separation. The proposal would also comply with the 25 degree rule and the applicant's shadow study demonstrates there would be no significant levels of overshadowing.

- 9.3 The level of separation between the properties in Glebe Road and Holbrook Road are considered to mitigate any adverse impact in terms of overlooking, loss of privacy and creating a sense of enclosure.
- 9.4 The proposed development would result in a high quality form of development that would also provide high quality living accommodation for future residents in a high quality environment.

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 until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

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

4. 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)

5. 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)

6. 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)

7. No development shall commence until a programme of measures to minimise the spread of airborne dust from the site during the demolition / construction period has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy4/13

8. The driveway hereby approved shall be constructed using a bound material for the first 6m from the back of the adopted public highway, to prevent debris spreading onto the adopted public highway. Once constructed the driveway shall thereafter be retained as such.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy 8/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

9. 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.

10. 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.

11. The access shall be constructed with adequate drainage measures to prevent surface water runoff 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.

12. Prior to occupation of the dwellings hereby approved, 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 setback 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 in accordance with Policy 8/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

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

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy 8/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

14. The access shall be provided as shown on the approved drawing no.P00 rev G (Proposed Site Access) 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 in accordance with Policy 8/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

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

The principle areas of concern that should be addressed are:

- i. Movements and control of muck away lorries (wherever possible all loading and unloading should be undertaken off the adopted public highway)
- ii. Contractor parking, for both phases (wherever possible all such parking should be within the curtilage of the site and not on street).
- iii. Movements and control of all deliveries (wherever possible 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.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy 8/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

16. Prior to the commencement of the development a scheme for the provision of fire hydrants serving that phase shall be submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved scheme shall be fully operational prior to the first occupation of the development, or as agreed in writing with the local planning authority. No development shall take place otherwise than in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To ensure the provision of adequate water supply infrastructure to protect the safe living and working environment for all users and visitors
(Cambridge Local Plan 2006 saved policies 3/7, 3/12 and 8/18).

17. No development shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include proposed finished levels or contours; means of enclosure; car parking layouts, other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials; minor artefacts and structures (eg furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting); proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (eg drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines indicating lines, manholes, supports); retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant. Soft Landscape works shall include planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate and an implementation programme.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that suitable hard and soft landscape is provided as part of the development. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12)

18. All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details, and to a reasonable standard in accordance with the relevant recommendation of the appropriate British Standard or other recognised code of good practice. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with the programme agreed by the local planning authority in writing. The maintenance shall be carried out in accordance with the approved schedule. Any trees or plants that, within a period of five years after planting, are removed, die or become in the opinion of the local planning authority, seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced as soon as is reasonably practicable with others of species, size and number as originally approved, unless the local planning authority gives its written consent to any variation.

Reason: To ensure provision, establishment and maintenance of a reasonable standard of landscaping in accordance with the approved design. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12)

19. No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected. The boundary treatment shall be completed before the building(s) is/are occupied and retained thereafter unless any variation is agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

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

20. 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)

21. If within a period of five years from the date of the planting of any tree or shrub, that tree or shrub, or any tree or shrub planted as a replacement for it, is removed, uprooted, destroyed or dies or becomes, in the opinion of the local planning authority, seriously damaged or defective, another tree or shrub of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place, unless the local planning authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: To ensure the provision of amenity afforded by the proper maintenance of existing and/or new landscape features. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 3/11)

22. No works or development shall take place until full details of all proposed tree planting, and the proposed times of planting, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, and all tree planting shall be carried out in accordance with those details and at those times.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory implementation of tree planting in the interests of visual amenity. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11, 3/12 and 4/4)

23. No building hereby permitted shall be occupied until surface water drainage works have been implemented in accordance with details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Before these details are submitted an assessment shall be carried out of the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system in accordance with the principles set out in The National Planning Policy Framework and associated Guidance, and the results of the assessment provided to the local planning authority. The system should be designed such that there is no surcharging for a 1 in 30 year event and no internal property flooding for a 1 in 100 year event + 30% an allowance for climate change. The submitted details shall:
- o provide information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters; and
 - o provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development.
 - o The surface water drainage scheme shall be managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the agreed management and maintenance plan.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure appropriate surface water drainage. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/16)

24. The windows in the eastern elevation of unit 1 and western elevation of unit 5 at first and second floor level shall be obscure glazed to a minimum level of obscurity to conform to Pilkington Glass level 3 or equivalent prior to commencement of use and shall have restrictors to ensure that the window cannot be opened more than 45 degrees beyond the plane of the adjacent wall and shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 3/12 or 3/14).

25. Prior to occupation of unit 1 and 5 details of the type of screen on the east and west side of the roof terraces (at first and second floor) shall be submitted to and approved in writing. The screens shall be a minimum of 1.7 metres in height and project the full depth of the terraces. The screens shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 3/12 or 3/14).

26. Prior to the commencement of the use hereby permitted, the arrangements for the disposal of waste detailed on the approved plans shall be provided including details of the enclosure for storage during collection and information shall also be provided on the management arrangements for the receptacles to facilitate their collection from a kerbside collection point and return to the dwellings. The approved arrangements 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

27. Prior to occupation of the development hereby approved, the car parking spaces identified on the approved plans shall be implemented and shall not thereafter be used for any other purpose than the parking of vehicles.

Reason: To avoid obstruction of the surrounding streets and in the interests of highway safety and convenience. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 8/2 and 8/10)

28. Prior to occupation of the development hereby approved, the cycle parking spaces identified on the approved plans shall be installed and shall not thereafter be used for any other purpose than the parking of cycles.

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

INFORMATIVE: Dust condition informative

To satisfy the condition requiring the submission of a program of measures to control airborne dust above, the applicant should have regard to:

-Council's Supplementary Planning Document - "Sustainable Design and Construction 2007":

<http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/docs/sustainable-design-and-construction-spd.pdf>

-Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction

http://iaqm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/guidance/iaqm_guidance_report_draft1.4.pdf

-Control of dust and emissions during construction and demolition - supplementary planning guidance

https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Dust%20and%20Emissions%20SPG%208%20July%202014_0.pdf

INFORMATIVE: 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: 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.

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.