

Application Number	15/1938/FUL	Agenda Item Officer	
Date Received	22nd October 2015		Mr Sav Patel
Target Date	17th December 2015		
Ward	Abbey		
Site	113 Ditton Fields Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB5 8QQ		
Proposal	Two storey side extension to form one 1-bed and one 2-bed maisonette		
Applicant	Mr Mark Morris 74 High Street, HORNINGSEA Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB25 9JG United Kingdom		

SUMMARY	The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons: The proposals would be visually acceptable. The proposals would not have an unacceptable impact on residential amenity.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site comprises an end of terraced property situated to the northern side of Ditton Fields. The site occupies a large corner plot which is widest to the front elevation and then narrows to the rear of the site. The site is located within a residential area characterised by post war housing on spacious plots.
- 1.2 There are no site constraints. The site falls outside of the controlled parking zone.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposal seeks full planning permission for a two storey side extension to form one 1-bed and one 2-bed maisonettes.

- 2.2 The proposals would extend at two and single storey height to the east of the existing dwelling. The two storey element would project to the east (side) by approximately 3.3m and the extension would then step down to a single storey flat roofed element which would be approximately 4.5m wide at the front of the site. This element also ‘wraps round’ to the rear of the site and would provide a two bedroomed unit at ground floor level. The single storey flat roofed element is ‘stepped’ in and reduces in width as it extends back into the site, to respond to the tapered boundary of the site.
- 2.3 The two storey element would mirror the depth of the existing property and 113 Ditton Fields and would also match the existing house in terms of roof form and height.
- 2.4 A total of 4 parking spaces are shown within the site and cycle and bin storage is also provided along the eastern boundary of the site.
- 2.5 This planning application is a resubmission of an earlier application (ref: 15/0661/FUL) which was withdrawn due to concerns with the impact on the character of the area and residential amenity in terms of appearing overbearing and loss of privacy.
- 2.6 In this resubmission application the applicant has proposed to address the concerns by reducing the scale of the development and impact on the residential amenity of the adjacent neighbours.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
07/0169/FUL	Erection of 1 No. three bedroomed house and new access to highway.	REFUSED 30.04.2007
15/0661/FUL	Two storey side extension to form one 1-bed and one 2-bed maisonette.	WITHDRAWN 09.07.2015

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 Local Plan 2006	3/1 3/4 3/7 3/10 3/11 3/14 4/13 4/15 5/1 5/2 8/2 8/6 8/10 10/1

- 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 – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014 Circular 11/95
Supplementary Planning Guidance	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007) Planning Obligation Strategy (March 2010) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012)

Material Considerations	<u>City Wide Guidance</u> Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)
-------------------------	--

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 The allocation of parking within the site is unclear. Please obtain clarification of how spaces will be allocated, if at all.
- 6.2 The applicant must show the dimensions for the proposed car parking spaces, which should measure 2.5m x 5m with a 6m reversing space. Please provide this information to the Highway Authority for comment prior to determination of this application. Unless some of the spaces are to be allocated to the new dwellings, no additional car parking provision is made for the additional residential units. If the existing dwelling is utilising all of its current parking provision, and some is allocated to the new units, then the displaced demand may appear on street.

- 6.3 The development may therefore impose additional parking demands upon the on-street parking on the surrounding streets and, whilst this is unlikely to result in any significant adverse impact upon highway safety, there is potentially an impact upon residential amenity which the Planning Authority may wish to consider when assessing this application.
- 6.4 If, following provision of the above, the Highway Authority is satisfied that the proposal will have no significant adverse effect upon the public highway, the Highway Authority would recommend conditions.

Environmental Health

- 6.5 The proposals are acceptable subject to conditions relating to piling and construction hours.

Health and Safety Executive

- 6.6 No response received.

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:

149 Ditton Fields
115 Ditton Fields

- 7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Residential amenity

- Loud music
- Extra rooms will mean more people and more noise
- There will be an increase in noise from the 9+ tenants and associated guests along with the actual construction work.
- The large French windows at the back of the ground floor 2 bedroom maisonette will move resident noise

closer to the fence line with 115.

- Close proximity of the single storey part of the extension to the fence and location of the bins will increase the noise from the large number of tenants going round the back via this passage along the fence line to smoke, have parties, etc. and enter through the back door into the existing house.

Parking/Highway Safety

- Parking pressure and people parking on grass verge
- Parking will be a major problem with this new development as at least 1 existing space will be lost yet resident numbers will increase by a third. At least 2-3 cars are normally associated with the current residents of 113, with one regularly parked on the verge outside and car numbers could easily increase to 1 per tenant (6) as circumstances change. The addition of 3 more bedrooms increases the number of total tenants to at least 9. Additionally the tenants of each maisonette are extremely likely to have at least 1 car if not 2 for professional couples. Consequently the cars associated with 113 will increase to at least 5 and potentially up to 10+ which is way beyond that sites capacity and will lead to very significant car parking over-spill on to the highway which is already overcrowded.

Design/Scale/Bulk

- This is a substantial 2 storey development, effectively a completely new house in everything but name, which will loom over the fence and significantly fill in the open spaces specifically built into the design of our estate and consequently breaches the covenants to light and air.
- This new house will require the removal of the overgrown Leylandii which have been a valuable screen between 113 and 115, helping suppress noise, adding to the greenery of the area and are nesting site for a considerable amount of bird life. The owner has offered to discuss planting to re-establish a green outlook but there will clearly not be space down the side of this new development for access, movement of the bins stored there and a new screen of trees or large bushes.

- 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 (2006) states that proposals for housing development on windfall sites will be permitted subject to the existing land use and compatibility with adjoining uses. The surrounding area is residential and the principle of residential development on the site is therefore broadly supported by Policy 5/1.
- 8.3 In my opinion, the principle of the development is acceptable and in accordance with policy 5/1.

Context of site, design and external spaces

- 8.4 Policy 3/10, part C, of the 2006 Local Plan states that residential development within the garden area of existing properties will not be permitted if it will detract from the prevailing character and appearance of the area.
- 8.5 In 2007, an application to extend the existing property in order to create a two-storey house was refused on the grounds that it would introduce a building into an open area, with the development considered to close down the space and create a visually intrusive form that would detract from the prevailing character of the area. These issues were not considered to

have been satisfied within the application submitted last year (15/0661/FUL). Whilst this was 2.5m narrower than the previously refused scheme, it was cut into the ground and incorporated a wider span than the host dwelling. It was therefore still considered to be harmful to the character of the area, and the application was subsequently withdrawn. The current scheme has followed pre-application discussions with Officers.

- 8.6 The proposal is to extend the side of the property with a two storey extension which replicates the existing style, scale and detailing of the dwelling. The two-storey extension would project from the side elevation by approx. 3.8 metres (and set 3.5m – 8m off the boundary) and continue the eaves and ridge of the main dwelling. It would not extend beyond the front or rear elevations and the fenestration arrangement would be articulated to be in keeping with the host dwelling. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed two storey side extension in terms of design and scale is acceptable in this context
- 8.7 The proposal also includes a single storey flat roof extension which would project off the side and rear of the proposed two storey element. This would be stepped off the boundary at three stages and wrap around the side and rear of the two storey extension. There would be enough space along the side boundary to allow access. From the street, the extent of the proposed single storey element would not be prominent due to the existing boundary treatment and the way in which it steps off/narrows along the boundary. Therefore, I am satisfied that the proposed single storey extension is acceptable in terms of its design and scale.
- 8.8 Overall, I am satisfied that the combination of the proposed extensions in terms of scale and appearance would integrate into the site without appearing unduly dominant from the street scene. I am of the opinion that, by setting the two-storey element well away from the boundary, with the remainder being single-storey and flat-roofed, this addresses the first reason for refusal of the 2007 application, and the concerns raised in respect of last year's application that was withdrawn.
- 8.9 In terms of external space, the proposal includes a small garden area to the rear of the single storey extension which would appear to serve the ground floor flat. The proposed 1-bed flat

would not have its own dedicated area but there is space to the side and in front that a future occupier could use. The site is also located within close walking distance of a local park which is to the rear of the dwellings on the opposite side of the road.

- 8.10 The proposed extensions would take up a large area of the side garden of the existing dwelling. Nevertheless, due to the size and corner plot location, the occupiers of the host dwelling would retain a generous rear garden.
- 8.11 The proposal would also include rearrangement of the existing car parking and bin and cycle storage. The existing dwelling would retain two car parking spaces in front with bin and cycle storage along the south-west boundary. The proposal includes two car parking spaces in the north-east corner adjacent to the single storey extension. The bin and cycle storage arrangements would be provided for each residential unit.
- 8.12 I am therefore satisfied that the proposal would retain enough private garden space for the host dwelling and provide reasonable levels of outdoor space for the proposed residential units.
- 8.13 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/10, 3/11 and 3/14.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.14 With regards to the impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers, the 2007 application was refused on the grounds that it would lead to overshadowing and enclosure of the private amenity space associated with No.115 Ditton Fields, and similar concerns were raised within last year's withdrawn application.
- 8.15 There is currently a tall leylandii located adjacent to the northern boundary which screens views of the rear garden of the application site from 115 Ditton Fields. However, the proposal would require the removal of this tree which would open up the boundary. No.115 has a small patio area directly to the rear. In the rear/south-western elevation, are ground floor kitchen and lounge windows, with the lounge also being lit by roof glazing, and first floor bedroom and bathroom windows. The rear lean-to

is located between 2.2 metres and 4.3 metres from the boundary.

- 8.16 In terms of the relationship with no.115, the two storey element of the proposed extension would be located 3.6 metres at its nearest point and 8.6 metres at its furthest point from the common boundary. The previous schemes proposed a two-storey 8 metre high gable sited directly adjacent to the boundary with 115. This has now been amended and the two-storey element significantly reduced in size to ensure it is set well away from the boundary. In my view, this level of separation would be acceptable and would not create an adverse sense of enclosure such that it would appear significantly overbearing on the occupiers of 115. The applicant has produced a shadow study which demonstrates that the proposed extension would not cast additional shadowing over the rear garden of 115. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed two storey element would not have a significantly detrimental impact on the residential amenity of the adjacent occupiers in terms of enclosure and overshadowing.
- 8.17 The proposed single storey element would be 2.9 metres in height with a flat roof and set off the boundary with 115 by 1 metre at its nearest point. The boundary is currently defined by a 2 metre high timber fence. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed single storey extension would not have any adverse impact on the residential amenity of the adjoining neighbour due to its height and level of separation.
- 8.18 There are no first floor windows in the side (east) elevation of the two storey extension. Therefore the proposal would not cause any direct overlooking of the rear garden or windows of 115 Ditton Fields. The rear elevation is proposed to contain a first floor window but this would serve a shower room which is expected to be obscure glazed. I have recommended an obscure glazing condition. The rooflight in the rear roofscape would provide light into the kitchen/dining area and would be high-level. In these terms, therefore, I am satisfied that the proposed two storey extension would not cause any loss of privacy issues through overlooking subject to the aforementioned condition on obscure glazing of the shower room.

- 8.19 In my opinion the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and I consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/10.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

- 8.20 The proposed residential units are of a reasonable size. I am satisfied that the proposed level of accommodation is acceptable and would provide future occupiers of good levels of living accommodation.
- 8.21 The proposed 2 bed flat would have access to an outdoor amenity area (6 metres deep and 3 metres wide). This is considered to be appropriate for the size of the flat. The 1 bed flat does not appear to have access to a private amenity space. However, there is land at the front of the site that could be used and the site is located within close proximity to a local park. The site is also located a 7 minute walk from the nearest local centre which is located on Barnwell Road. I am therefore satisfied that the proposal would provide a high quality living environment for future residents.
- 8.22 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 3/14.

Refuse Arrangements

- 8.23 The proposal includes two separate bin stores to serve each residential unit and a bin store for the host dwelling. I am satisfied there is enough space within the site to accommodate suitable bin storage arrangements. The proposed location of the bin stores are within the travel distance (30 metres) contained in the Waste Design Guide. Precise details of the bin storage arrangements will need to be secured by condition.
- 8.24 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

Highway Safety

- 8.25 The car parking spaces shown are 2.5 metres x 5 metres and the two spaces adjacent to the northern boundary would serve the proposed flats. The host dwelling would be provided with two parking spaces. I am satisfied with the proposed arrangements. The County Highways officer has not raised any significant highway safety concerns with the proposal.
- 8.26 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Car and Cycle Parking

Car parking

- 8.27 The proposal includes car parking for each flat and also provision is made for the host dwelling. I am satisfied with the proposed car parking provision on site.

Cycle parking

- 8.28 The proposal includes cycle storage for the host and proposed residential units. However, no specific details have been provided other than the location of these stores. I am satisfied that there is enough space within the site to accommodate cycle storage which is compliant with the Cycle Parking Standards but precise details will need to be secured by condition.
- 8.29 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10.

Third Party Representations

- 8.30 I set out below my response to the concerns raised in the third party representations:

Representations	Response
<u>Residential amenity</u>	
Loud music	It is unlikely that any future residents will cause significant levels of noise over and above that which is already created by the existing occupier.

Extra rooms will mean more people and more noise	As above.
There will be an increase in noise from the 9+ tenants and associated guests along with the actual construction work.	I have recommended a construction hours condition to ensure the disturbance caused during construction is mitigated.
The large French windows at the back of the ground floor 2 bedroom maisonette will move resident noise closer to the fence line with us.	The site is presently in residential use and I do not consider the proposal will cause significant levels of noise disturbance.
Close proximity of the single storey part of the extension to the fence and location of the bins will increase the noise from the large number of tenants going round the back via this passage along the fence line to smoke, have parties, etc. and enter through the back door into the existing house.	The intensification of people using the site would in my view not be significantly different to a family dwelling. I therefore do not consider the level of intensification would cause unreasonable levels of noise disturbance.
<u>Parking/Highway Safety</u>	
Parking pressure and people parking on grass verge	Ditton Fields is largely unrestricted in terms of on street parking and so residents including future residents would be able to park on street regardless of how many spaces are provided off street. The proposal includes two spaces for the proposed units and two for the host dwelling. This is considered to be acceptable, in view of the maximum car parking standards.

<p>Parking will be a major problem with this new development as at least 1 existing space will be lost yet resident numbers will increase by a third. At least 2-3 cars are normally associated with the current residents of 113, with one regularly parked on the verge outside and car numbers could easily increase to 1 per tenant (6) as circumstances change. The addition of 3 more bedrooms increases the number of total tenants to at least 9. Additionally the tenants of each maisonette are extremely likely to have at least 1 car if not 2 for professional couples. Consequently the cars associated with 113 will increase to at least 5 and potentially up to 10+ which is way beyond that site's capacity and will lead to very significant car parking over-spill on to the highway which is already overcrowded.</p>	<p>As above.</p>
<p><u>Design/Scale/Bulk</u></p> <p>This is a substantial 2 storey development, effectively a completely new house in everything but name, which will loom over the fence and significantly fill in the open spaces specifically built into the design of our estate and consequently</p>	<p>See paras 8.6, 8.8 and 8.16</p>

breaches the covenants to light and air.	
<p>This new house will require the removal of the overgrown Leylandii which have been a valuable screen between 113 and 115, helping suppress noise, adding to the greenery of the area and are nesting site for a considerable amount of bird life. The owner has offered to discuss planting to re-establish a green outlook but there will clearly not be space down the side of this new development for access, movement of the bins stored there and a new screen of trees or large bushes.</p>	<p>The Leylandii is not protected and has limited amenity value. The applicant can therefore choose to remove it at any point. There is enough space along the side boundary to access the rear garden area. The removal of the tree would also improve the living environment of the occupier of 115 by increasing day/sunlight into the garden and dwelling.</p>

Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

8.31 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.

- 8.32 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.
- 8.33 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 two storey and single storey side and rear extensions to create two residential units is considered to be acceptable in terms of its scale, design and relationship with the surrounding occupiers, particularly at 115 Ditton Fields.
- 9.2 The proposed scale and design of the two storey extension is in keeping with the host dwelling. The single storey extension is modest and would appear as an ancillary addition from the street.
- 9.3 The proposed extensions would not have any adverse impact on the residential amenity of the adjacent neighbours such that it would warrant refusal. There would be no windows that would overlook the neighbouring gardens/properties and the scale of the extensions would not appear overbearing.

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. The extension hereby permitted shall be constructed in external materials to match the existing building in type, colour and texture.

Reason: To ensure that the extension is in keeping with the existing building. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 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. 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)

6. No new windows or openings of any kind shall be inserted at and above first floor level in the north-east (side) and north-west (rear) elevation of the two storey extension unless obscure glazed and non-opening up to a minimum height of 1.7 metres above the internal finished first floor level.

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

7. The window on the north-west elevation at first 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 (of the extension) 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 3/14).

8. No development shall commence until details of facilities for the covered, secured parking of bicycles for use in connection with the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The approved facilities shall be provided in accordance with the approved details before use of the development commences.

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

9. Prior to the commencement of development, full details of the on-site storage facilities for waste including waste for recycling shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Such details shall identify the specific positions of where wheeled bins, will be stationed and 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

10. 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.

11. Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 2, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no fences, gates, walls or other means of enclosure forward of the principal elevation shall be erected within the curtilage of the dwellinghouse(s) without the granting of specific planning permission.

Reason: To protect the visual amenity of the neighbourhood and in the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 8/2).

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

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

13. The driveway hereby approved shall be constructed so that its falls and levels are such that no private water from the site drains across or onto the adopted public highway. Once constructed the driveway shall thereafter be retained as such.
Reason: for the safe and effective operation of the highway in accordance with Policy 8/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

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

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

15. No demolition or construction works shall commence on site until a traffic management plan has been submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: in the interests of highway safety

INFORMATIVE: The principle areas of concern that should be addressed in the required traffic management plan 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.

INFORMATIVE: This development involves work to the public highway that will require the approval of the County Council as Highway Authority. It is an OFFENCE to carry out any works within the public highway, which includes a public right of way, without the permission of the Highway Authority. Please note that it is the applicants responsibility to ensure that, in addition to planning permission, any necessary consents or approvals under the Highways Act 1980 and the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 are also obtained from the County Council.

INFORMATIVE: Public Utility apparatus may be affected by this proposal. Contact the appropriate utility service to reach agreement on any necessary alterations, the cost of which must be borne by the applicant.