

Application Number	15/2241/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	3rd December 2015	Officer	Michael Hammond
Target Date	28th January 2016		
Ward	Queen Ediths		
Site	37 Kinnaird Way Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 8SN		
Proposal	Proposed new dwelling to land rear of 37 Kinnaird Way with associated landscaping and access arrangements following demolition of existing garage		
Applicant	Mr & Mrs Justin Lindermann 37 Kinnaird Way Cambridge CB1 8SN		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed subdivision of the existing residential curtilage to create a new residential plot is considered to be acceptable as it would be compatible with existing residential context of the area; <input type="checkbox"/> The design and scale of the proposed dwelling is appropriate for this site. The modern design and form would contrast well with the traditional house types in this area. The scale is considered to be modest and would not appear out of place in this context. <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed dwelling would not have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of the adjoining neighbour or those in the host property.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site is comprised of land to the rear of no.37 Kinnaird Way which is currently occupied by a single-storey pitched roof garage building. Almoners Avenue runs along the side of the site and Queen Ediths Way is situated to the north of the site. The land is currently used in association with the residential garden at no.37 Kinnaird Way.
- 1.2 The surrounding area is residential in character and properties are typically two-storeys in height and designed in brick, although there are some cases of render in the wider area. The majority of properties are either hipped or ridge and the urban grain of the area is that of dwellings situated linear to the pattern of the road.
- 1.3 There are no site constraints.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposal, as amended, seeks planning permission for the erection of a new dwelling on land to the rear of no.37 Kinnaird Way.
- 2.2 The proposed dwelling would be designed with a saw-tooth style roof with one smaller mono-pitched roof element meeting a larger mono-pitched roof element. The roof would measure 6.75m at its highest point and 2.8m at its lowest point. The dwelling would occupy a floor area of roughly 100m² and would be two-storeys in height. The dwelling would be designed in a combination of zinc cladding and through coloured render.
- 2.3 An outdoor garden and patio area of 74m² in area would be positioned to the west of the dwelling. A cycle and bin store would be situated along the northern boundary and one car parking space with access onto Almoners Avenue would be provided.
- 2.4 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:
 1. Design and Access Statement
 2. Drawings
 3. Shadow study

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
C/73/1082	Erection of one detached dwelling house	Approved.
C/73/0559	The erection of one detached dwelling house	Permitted.

- 3.1 Planning permission was granted by the Planning Committee at the meeting of 2nd September 2015 for the erection of a two storey dwelling on land to the rear of 92 Queen Edith's Way (15/1038/FUL). The application site of the dwelling approved by this adjacent permission at 92 Queen Ediths Way (15/1038/FUL) is situated immediately to the north of the application site for this proposed dwelling at 37 Kinnaird Way. The construction of this adjacent permission has not commenced at the time of writing this report.

4.0 PUBLICITY

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

5.0 POLICY

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

PLAN		POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Plan 2006	Local	3/1 3/4 3/7 3/10 3/11 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 – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014 Circular 11/95
Supplementary Planning Guidance	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007) 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 development may 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. Conditions and informatives recommended.

Environmental Health

- 6.2 No objection, subject to conditions.

Streets and Open Spaces Team

- 6.3 No comment received.

Landscape Team

- 6.4 No objection.

Drainage

- 6.5 No objection.
- 6.6 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.

7.1 REPRESENTATIONS

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

- 88 Queen Ediths Way
- 90 Queen Ediths Way
- 92 Queen Ediths Way

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- The boundary line has been drawn incorrectly
- The proposal is overdevelopment and not in keeping with the character of the area.
- Visual enclosure/ dominance
- Loss of light/ overshadowing
- Overlooking
- The height should be reduced.
- Construction noise/ traffic
- Overcrowding
- The proposal will have a negative impact on the residential amenity of the approved dwelling at no.92 Queen Ediths Way (15/1038/FUL) due to its close proximity.
- The proposal is contrary to policies 3/4, 3/10 and 3/12 of the Local Plan (2006).
- The side boundary of the recently approved dwelling has been incorrectly drawn.
- Lack of amenity space for future occupiers.
- Lack of car parking/ impact on on-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 and Impact on Trees
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 The provision of extra housing within the city is supported in the Cambridge Local Plan (2006). As policy 5/1 points out, proposals for housing development on windfall sites will be permitted, subject to the existing land use and compatibility with adjoining uses.
- 8.3 The principle of developing the site for residential purposes is considered acceptable and conforms to the provisions set out in the development plan. However, while residential development is broadly supported, it must comply with considerations such as impact on the appearance of the area and impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties. These, and other relevant issues, are assessed below.
- 8.4 As the proposal is for the subdivision of an existing residential plot, Local Plan policy 3/10 is relevant in assessing the acceptability of the proposal. Policy 3/10 allows for the subdivision of existing plots, subject to compliance with specified criteria. However, in this instance, Section d and f of the policy are not relevant as the proposal would not adversely affect the setting of a listed building (d) and would not prejudice the comprehensive development of the wider area (f).
- 8.5 Residential development within the garden area or curtilage of existing properties will not be permitted if it will:
- a) have a significantly adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties through loss of privacy, loss of light, an overbearing sense of enclosure and generation of unreasonable levels of traffic or noise nuisance;
 - b) provide inadequate amenity space, or access arrangements and parking spaces for the proposed and existing properties;
 - c) detract from the prevailing character and appearance of the area.
 - e) adversely affect trees, wildlife features or architectural features of local importance located within or close to the site.

8.6 I set out below my assessment of the proposal in relation to the above.

a) Residential amenity

Impact on no.90 Queen Ediths Way

8.7 No.90 Queen Ediths Way is comprised of a two-storey detached property with a long rear garden which shares a boundary with the application site and is situated to the north-west of the site.

8.8 The rear windows of no.90 would be over 25m away from the proposed dwelling and so I do not consider the proposal would harmfully enclose, overshadow or overlook these windows.

8.9 The proposed dwelling would be set approximately 1.9m off the garden boundary of this neighbour and so the impact of overshadowing and visual enclosure of this garden needs to be weighed. However, as the proposed dwelling is situated to the east of this boundary and this neighbour benefits from a very long garden, I believe the proposal will not be perceived as visually enclosing from this garden. Furthermore, as the highest part of the dwelling is set 6.9m away from this rear boundary and there is a strong degree of planting along this boundary, I do not deem the level of overshadowing over this garden will be so significant as to warrant refusal.

8.10 The views from the rear (west) facing first-floor bedroom window would allow for limited views across this neighbours garden but the view would be relatively oblique and only cover the latter part of the garden. The en-suite bathroom velux window on the side (north) elevation would be positioned high in the roof slope and would not be used as a main outlook for this proposed dwelling by virtue of the function of the room.

Impact on no.92 Queen Ediths Way

8.11 No.92 Queen Ediths Way is comprised of a two-story detached property with a long rear garden and is situated immediately to the north of the application site.

8.12 The rear windows on no.92 would be over 23m from the proposed dwelling and so I do not consider the proposal would harmfully enclose, overshadow or overlook these windows.

- 8.13 The proposed dwelling would be set 1.9m away from the boundary of this neighbour's garden and so consideration as to the potential visual dominance and loss of light this proposed dwelling could cause on this garden needs to be considered. There is currently a high hedge, approximately two-thirds of the way down this neighbour's garden whilst the latter third (closest to the application site) is comprised of a small area of hardstanding, small green house and a washing line. After visiting the site, I believe the garden land closer to the main property to be of a higher amenity value than the hard standing area closest to the boundary.
- 8.14 A shadow study has been submitted following concerns raised by the occupier of no.92 regarding the loss of light the proposal would cause. The shadow study demonstrates that the proposed dwelling would result in a slight increase in overshadowing over a limited portion of the latter part of this neighbour's garden in the winter months where the sun's path is at its lowest. However, as the overshadowing would be limited to a small portion of the hardstanding area at the end of this neighbour's garden and any noticeable levels of light loss would be limited to the winter months, I do not consider the amenity of this neighbour would be adversely affected by the proposal in terms of overshadowing.
- 8.15 Similar to the assessment of no.92 in paragraph 8.10 of this report, I believe that as the main bulk of the dwelling has been shifted approximately 6.9m away from this boundary and the roof of the smaller element of the dwelling slopes away from the boundary of this neighbour, the proposal will not be perceived as visually dominant from this neighbouring property. The high hedge of no.92 will also help to provide a soft buffer between the proposed dwelling and this neighbour's garden.
- 8.16 It is acknowledged that concerns have been raised from no.92 regarding the views from the first-floor en-suite velux window and the first-floor corner bedroom window and how these would overlook this neighbour. I do not judge that the view from the velux window will harmfully overlook this neighbour due to its position high in the plane of the roof and because of the secondary nature of the room it would serve. With respect to the first-floor corner window, the orientation of this window facing out to the street will naturally draw the eye of future occupiers of

this room to look out to the east rather than to the north. In any instance, even if future occupiers do decide to look out to the north towards this neighbour's garden, the view of the main garden space would be blocked by the high hedge of no.92 and so I do not consider the view would compromise the privacy of this neighbour.

Impact on no.35 Kinnaird Way

- 8.17 No.35 Kinnaird Way is formed of a large detached property with a sizeable garden situated to the south-west of the application site. In terms of loss of light, I do not consider the proposal would have any significant impact on this neighbour in this respect by virtue of this neighbour's orientation to the south-east of the site. The proposed dwelling is set roughly 6m away from the boundary of this neighbour's garden and there is a dense hedgerow which runs along this boundary and so I am content that the proposal will not visually enclose this neighbour. The roof lights in the side (south) elevation would serve for natural lighting purposes and would not offer any direct views across to this neighbouring property because of their high level in the roof slope which would prevent future occupiers from looking out. The view from the proposed first-floor bedroom window at the rear (west) would allow for views across the latter half of this neighbour's garden. Nevertheless as the views would be limited to the end of the garden and the outlooks to the remainder of the garden would be relatively oblique, I do not regard this overlooking to be harmful to this neighbour's amenity.

Impact on approved dwelling on land to the rear of no.92 Queen Ediths Way (15/1038/FUL)

- 8.18 The recently approved dwelling at no.92 Queen Ediths Way would be situated immediately to the north of the application site with a small garden situated to the south of the dwelling abutting the boundary of the application site.
- 8.19 The shadow study provided by the applicants demonstrates that overshadowing over the garden and south elevation of this adjacent dwelling caused by the proposed dwelling would be limited to a minor increase in the winter months. The levels of light reaching this adjacent dwelling in the spring, summer and autumn months would not be significantly affected by the proposal. Therefore, while I appreciate the levels of light

reaching this neighbouring garden/ windows will be decreased by the proposed development, I do not consider this loss will be so significant as to warrant refusal.

8.20 The height of the wall of the proposed dwelling adjacent to the north boundary would be 2.8m which is not considered to be an oppressive mass when viewed from the garden of the approved dwelling at no.92. The height of this dwelling would gradually increase up to a height of 6.75m as the roof slopes away. This peak height would be situated roughly 13m from the rear living room window of this adjacent approved dwelling. As part of the permission granted for this adjacent dwelling, a row of trees would be planted along the south boundary. As a result, while I understand that the proposed dwelling will likely be visible from the rear windows and terrace of this approved dwelling adjacent, I believe, that as the roof slopes away from the boundary of this neighbour and will be buffered by a degree of planting that, on balance, the proposal will not harmfully enclose this neighbour.

8.21 The main consideration of overlooking is the impact of the first-floor corner bedroom window of the proposed dwelling. For the same reasons as set out in paragraph 8.16 of this report, I do not believe the en-suite velux window will harmfully overlook this neighbour. With respect to the potential overlooking from the first-floor corner bedroom window, I believe that this can be dealt with through an obscure glazing condition, whereby the north facing element is obscure glazed to prevent overlooking to the north whilst still providing an outlook to the east for future occupiers.

Impact on no.37 Kinnaird Way

8.22 No.37 Kinnaird Way is the host dwelling of the application site and the garden would be sub-divided to accommodate the proposed dwelling. In terms of loss of privacy, there would be no direct overlooking opportunities from the proposed dwelling towards this neighbour at first-floor level and so I consider the privacy of this neighbour will be retained. The proposal is also positioned directly to the north of the site and so there will no harmful loss of light experienced at this neighbouring property.

8.23 The proposed dwelling would be situated approximately 16.3m from the rear windows of the main property. However, as the

height of the proposed dwelling adjacent to the rear boundary of no.37 would be 4m and the roof would slope away from this garden before rising to a height of 6.75m, I consider this relationship in terms of visual enclosure to be acceptable. At its highest point, the proposal would be in excess of 20m from the rear windows of no.37 and so the separation distance is considered sufficient so as to not be visually enclosing. The proposal would be situated close to the boundary of the rear garden of no.37, but as the mass would be sloping away from this boundary and there are still reasonable open vistas out to the east and west of no.37's large garden, I am content that the proposal will not be perceived as visually dominant from this garden.

Other residential amenity matters

- 8.24 It is acknowledged that concerns have been raised regarding the overcrowding of the site and the additional noise that the use of this site would cause. I do not consider that the additional dwelling would result in an increase in noise disturbance from future occupiers. The existing site is used as a residential garden and so the proposal will not introduce any new noise issues into this area.
- 8.25 I do not consider the proposal would lead to a significant increase in on-street parking in the surrounding area. The proposal provides one car parking space for future occupiers, which is in accordance with the maximum standards of the Local Plan (2006). The proposal provides sufficient cycle spaces and is within close proximity of bus stops along Queen Ediths Way and so the future occupiers would not be reliant on private car as their only means of transport.
- 8.26 A construction hours and collection/ delivery hours condition has been recommended by the Environmental Health team and so I do not believe the proposal would significantly impact on neighbour amenity in terms of construction.
- 8.27 Conditions to remove permitted development rights relating to Classes A and B of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification) have been recommended to protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

8.28 I am therefore satisfied that the proposed dwelling would not have a significantly adverse impact on the residential amenity of the neighbour occupiers.

b) Amenity space, access and parking

8.29 The proposed subdivision of the plot would result in two defined curtilages. I have recommended a condition (8) to ensure the curtilage of the proposed dwelling is retained. There is a proposed outdoor patio and garden area to the west of the dwelling which would provide 74m² of outdoor amenity space for future occupiers. Whilst this is noticeably smaller than that of the rear gardens of properties along Kinnaird Way and Queen Ediths Way, I still consider this level of private outdoor amenity space to be acceptable for this scale of development. Whilst this sub-division would take up garden land for the host dwelling, the occupier of the host dwelling would still enjoy a relatively generous amount of private amenity space of over 290m².

8.30 Both plots would include off street parking. The host property would maintain the existing off street car parking at the front of the site and the proposed dwelling would have an off-street parking space with access onto Almoners Avenue.

c) Detract from the prevailing character of the area

8.31 The built form of the area is characterised by a mix of house styles and features, particularly on Almoners Avenue. The prevailing feature of the rear is of projecting gables. The proposed dwelling would be orientated facing onto the highway thus reflecting the gable feature in the area. The design of the dwelling, which includes a saw-style roof and use of zinc cladding, although unusual, is not, in itself, considered inappropriate; there is no uniformity amongst existing houses in the vicinity, and there are examples of gables facing the street close by. The proposed external materials of render and zinc cladding are contemporary and unique but I feel it contrasts successfully with the surrounding area. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed dwelling would sympathetically assimilate into the site context and character of the area without appearing as an alien form. A condition has been recommended in relation to the details of the cycle and bin store.

e) Adversely affect trees, wildlife features or architectural features of local importance located within or close to the site.

8.32 The proposal would involve the removal of a small tree on the site. This tree is not protected. There are two larger trees along the footpath of Almoners Avenue which are more visible from the street scene. In my opinion, as the tree proposed to be removed is not of a significant stature and contributes less positively to the street than that of the two trees adjacent along Almoners Avenue, I consider the loss of the tree acceptable and not of any significant importance to the character of the area.

8.33 In my opinion, subject to condition, the principle of the development is acceptable and in accordance with policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/10, 3/11, 3/12, 4/4 and 5/1.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

8.34 As set out in paragraphs 8.8 to 8.24 above. In my opinion the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and I consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 3/7.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

8.35 All habitable rooms would be served by windows and there would be a reasonable sized garden for future occupiers to use. The proposal includes sufficient cycle parking, is well served by public transport links, and is within walking distance of the Wulfstan Way local centre and the Nightingale Avenue recreational grounds.

8.36 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.

Refuse Arrangements

- 8.37 The proposed plan indicates that the bins (3 receptacles) would be stored adjacent to the northern boundary with two of the three bins being within the shared cycle and bin store. However, no details of the type of enclosure of this cycle and bin store has been provided. Therefore whilst I am satisfied that there is sufficient space within the plot to accommodate bins, I have recommended a condition so that details of the type of enclosure is provided for our consideration. Subject to the submission of details, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.
- 8.38 In my opinion, subject to condition, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

Highway Safety

- 8.39 The Highway Authority has not raised any objection to the proposal on the grounds of highway safety, subject to condition, and I agree with this advice.
- 8.40 In my opinion, subject to conditions, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Car and Cycle Parking

- 8.41 The proposal provides one off-street car parking space which is in accordance with the maximum standards of the Local Plan (2006). The existing off-street car parking space at the front of no.37 Kinnaird Way would be retained.
- 8.42 The proposal includes three cycle parking spaces which is in accordance with the minimum levels of the Local Plan (2006). An enclosed cycle store would be provided, although details of the height of this structure have not been provided. A condition has been recommended to provide details of this store, prior to commencement of the development.
- 8.43 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10.

Third Party Representations

- 8.44 The majority of the third party representations raised have been addressed in the main body of this report.
- 8.45 A revised proposed site plan (drawing no. PI(90) 01 Rev P1) has been submitted to clarify the edge of the boundary following the concerns raised by the occupier of no.90 Queen Ediths Way. The concrete posts and fence of no.90 are now outside of the red-line of this plan.
- 8.46 The concern regarding the inaccuracy of the side boundary of the approved dwelling at no.92 Queen Ediths Way on the section drawing does not impact on the validity of the application. This recently approved drawing has been drawn on for indicative purposes and it is only required that the proposed dwelling which is subject of this application is drawn accurately and to scale.

Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

- 8.47 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.

- 8.48 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.

8.49 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 residential development of this ancillary rear garden site is considered acceptable in principle. The design and scale of the proposed dwelling would sympathetically assimilate into the site and street scene without appearing as an alien form. The scheme is considered to provide a high-quality living environment and an acceptable standard of residential amenity for future occupiers and its neighbours. The proposal would also make efficient use of garden land for additional housing. As such, I recommend the application be approved.

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 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)

4. 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)

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 unbound material shall be used in the surface finish of the driveway within 6 metres of the highway boundary of the site.

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

7. 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.

8. 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.

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

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

10. 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 vehicular access unless details have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

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

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

12. Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, 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), the enlargement, improvement or other alteration of the dwellinghouse(s) shall not be allowed without the granting of specific planning permission.

Reason: To protect the amenity of adjoining properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/10 and 3/12).

13. Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class B 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 new windows or dormer windows (other than those expressly authorised by this permission), shall be constructed without the granting of specific planning permission.

Reason: To protect the amenity of adjoining properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/10 and 3/12).

14. The north facing side of the first-floor window identified as serving "Bed 2" on drawing no.PL(21)01 Rev P2 shall be obscure glazed to a minimum level of obscurity to conform to Pilkington Glass level 3 or equivalent prior to occupation of the dwelling 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).

15. No development shall commence until details of facilities for the covered, secured cycle/ bin store 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 the development commences and shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure appropriate provision for the secure storage of waste and bicycles. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/12 and 8/6)

16. The curtilage (garden) of the proposed property as approved shall be fully laid out and finished in accordance with the approved plans prior to the occupation of the proposed dwelling or in accordance with a timetable otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter remain for the benefit of the occupants of the proposed property.

Reason: To avoid a scenario whereby the property could be built and occupied without its garden land, which is currently part of the host property (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies, 3/4, 3/7, 3/10)

INFORMATIVE: Notwithstanding any consent granted under the relevant planning act/s, the applicant is advised that before any works are carried out on any footway, carriageway, verge or other land forming part of the public highway the express consent of Cambridgeshire County Council as the Local Highway Authority will be required. All costs associated with any construction works will be borne by the developer.

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.