

Application Number	15/2321/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	15th December 2015	Officer	Lorraine Casey
Target Date	15th March 2016		
Ward	East Chesterton		
Site	Eastfield Chesterton Cambridge CB4 1SB		
Proposal	Erection of 50 new affordable houses, following demolition of 26 existing dwellings (Nos 46-60 and 66-75 Eastfield), and associated highway works, landscaping and public open space provision.		
Applicant	Ms Sarah Paxton 51 Scotland Road Cambridge CB4 1QW		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan.</p> <p>The scheme increases the density of development and provides 24 additional houses to meet housing need.</p> <p>The design and layout of the development responds positively to the site context.</p> <p>The development respects the amenity of nearby residents.</p>
RECOMMENDATION	Approval

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

1.1 The application site is located at the north-eastern end of Eastfield and currently accommodates 26 two-storey dwellings. These are predominantly arranged around two separate cul-de-sacs, together with Nos. 45 & 46, which front directly onto Eastfield and adjoin a footpath link through to Warren Road. To the north are two-storey properties located in Warren Road and Chesterfield Road whilst, the east, the site adjoins the rear gardens of properties in Shirley Grove and the grounds of the Chesterton Primary School. To the south-east are houses in Evergreens and to the south two-storey residential dwellings in Eastfields. There are a number of mature trees within the

gardens and within the highway verges. None of these trees are protected.

- 1.2 The site lies outside the Conservation Area and there are no Listed Buildings on the site or in the surrounding area. The site lies outside the Controlled Parking Zone.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposal seeks to demolish 26 existing dwellings (Nos. 45-60 and 66-75 Eastfield) and to erect 50 new dwellings on the site, all of which would be affordable. The application comprises Phases 1 and 2 of proposals by Hundred Houses Society and Icen Homes to redevelop Eastfields to provide 100% affordable housing. Phase 3 (which proposes the erection of 12 houses following the demolition of 8 existing dwellings) is the subject of a separate planning application (reference 15/2322/FUL). The 3 phases would together provide 62 dwellings at an overall density of 42 dwellings per hectare.
- 2.2 The proposed development comprises a range of dwelling types, including two-storey houses, bungalows and flats, together with associated car-ports, parking, cycle and bin stores and landscaping. There will be a mix of semi-detached dwellings, linked semis and terraces of houses and bungalows. Materials would consist of either brick or a mix of brick and render under tiled roofs. The dwellings would be accessed via a single cul-de-sac which would emerge onto Eastfield at the approximate point of the existing northernmost cul-de-sac. The existing junction at this point is extremely wide, thereby encouraging on-street parking and manoeuvring within the bell-mouth. The application proposes to reconfigure this entrance point by reducing the width of the road and providing wide grass verges in order to reduce vehicle speeds and address the problems associated with the existing layout. A 3m wide cycle/pedestrian path is proposed in place of the existing southernmost cul-de-sac, with this pathway exiting onto Eastfields between Nos. 65 and 75.
- 2.3 The proposal includes a new area of public open space towards the southern end of the site which would be accessible for new residents, as well as for existing residents via the proposed pedestrian and cycle path. In addition, existing mature trees that are deemed to be of amenity value have been retained and

incorporated into the proposed development, with additional new street tree planting.

2.4 The following mix is proposed:

Phase 1 – 28 dwellings

- 17 x 2-bed (14 houses & 3 bungalows)
- 4 x 1-bed flats
- 7 x 3-bed houses

Phase 2 – 22 dwellings

- 4 x 1-bed flats
- 13 x 2-bed (13 houses & 1 bungalow)
- 5 x 3-bed houses

Phase 3 (separate application ref 15/2322/FUL) – 12 dwellings

- 6 x 2-bed houses
- 6 x 3-bed houses

Total of Phases 1, 2 and 3 – 62 dwellings

- 8 x 1-bed flats
- 36 x 2-bed (incl 4 bungalows)
- 18 x 3-bed houses

2.5 The tenure for all 3 phases would be a 70%/30% split consisting of 43 social rented units and 19 shared equity units.

2.6 Following consideration of the consultation responses, the following changes have been carried out:

- The parking courts have been replaced with on-plot parking or Flats-over-garages (FOGs) (The housing mix and numbers remain as submitted.)
- Footpath layout revised at junction.
- Layby parking near plots 46-50 omitted
- Square feature added near plots 12-13 and 33-36
- Plots 8-11 changed to semi-detached to remove rear alleys
- Plots 14-21 – plots swapped around, parking court omitted, flat added over car port, and mix adjusted (add 1 x 2-bed, omit 1 x 1-bed)
- Plots 27-30 changed to semis
- Plots 31-32 – parking layout updated and secure garden added adjacent 'Evergreens'
- Plots 33-36 – Mix adjusted and parking added to frontage.

- Plots 37-39 – Parking and cycle store updates.
- Plots 40-50 - Mix adjusted, parking court removed, FOG added, rear alleys removed, garden size increased, private drive added opposite POS.

2.7 The application is accompanied by the following information:

- Design, Planning and Access Statement
- Transport Statement
- Arboricultural Survey and Implications Assessment
- Ecology Survey
- Bat Survey
- Waste Management Plan
- Energy Statement
- Archaeology Strategy
- Flood Risk Assessment
- Preliminary Surface Water Drainage Strategy
- Phase 1 Contamination Assessment

3.0 SITE HISTORY

3.1 There is no relevant planning history.

4.0 PUBLICITY

4.1 Advertisement:	Yes
Adjoining Owners:	Yes
Site Notice Displayed:	Yes

5.0 POLICY

5.1 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN		POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Plan 2006	Local	3/1 3/4 3/7 3/8 3/11 3/12 4/4 4/13 5/1 5/4 5/5 5/10 5/12 5/14 6/1 8/2 8/3 8/4 8/5 8/6 8/10 8/16 8/18

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

Central Government Guidance	<p>National Planning Policy Framework March 2012</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014</p> <p>Circular 11/95</p>
Supplementary Planning Guidance	<p>Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007)</p> <p>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012)</p> <p>Planning Obligation Strategy (March 2010)</p> <p>Public Art (January 2010)</p>
	<p><u>City Wide Guidance</u></p> <p>Arboricultural Strategy (2004)</p> <p>Affordable housing</p> <p>Biodiversity Checklist for Land Use Planners in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (March 2001)</p> <p>Cambridge Walking and Cycling Strategy (2002)</p> <p>Cambridge City Council (2011) - Open Space and Recreation Strategy</p> <p>Cambridgeshire Design Guide For Streets and Public Realm (2007)</p>

	Cycle Parking Guide for New Resident Developments (2010)
--	--

5.3 Status of Proposed Submission – Cambridge Local Plan 2014

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 submitted to the Secretary of State on 28 March 2014 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, the following Policy in the emerging Local Plan is considered to be of relevance.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways)

Comments on original plans

6.1 A dimensioned plan showing access to the parking court is required. Pedestrian visibility splays also need to be shown on the drawing. Any consent will need to be subject to the following conditions:

- No unbound material
- Removal of permitted development rights for gates
- Vehicular access to County specification and retention free of obstruction
- Access drainage
- Provision of visibility splays
- Provision of manoeuvring areas
- Reinstatement of any redundant crossovers
- Traffic management plan

Comments on amended plans

The application now includes additional areas to be stopped up that will need to be carried out prior to commencement of development. The long crossovers of the footway and verge may encourage vehicles to park outside properties obstructing the footway. Conditions are recommended as per previous comments.

Head of Environment

6.2 No objections subject to the following conditions being added to any consent:

- Construction hours
- Collection during construction
- Construction/demolition noise/vibration & piling
- Dust

Enabling and Development Team (Affordable Housing)

Comments on original plans

6.3 The application doesn't comply with the Affordable Housing SPD. The provision of 100% affordable housing is supported. The tenure split of 70% rented and 30% intermediate does not meet the preferred 75%/25% ratio required by the SPD. However, as the scheme is providing 100% affordable units, it exceeds the number of rented units that would be secured from a market-led scheme, and this element would therefore be acceptable.

6.4 The bed space mix does not meet the SPD requirements, and the unit bed numbers do not reflect the needs identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA).

- The proposal provides 16% 1-bed, and 76% 1 & 2-bed units. The SPD states there should be no more than 10% 1-bed, and 50% 1 & 2 bed dwellings.
- The proposal provides 24% 3-bed properties. The SPD seeks to achieve 50% 3 bed or larger but with no less than 20% 3-bed.

- If Phase 3 were taken into account as part of the overall application, this view might alter but, as the applications stand alone, this cannot be considered.

Comments on amended plans

The justification for the mix provided by Iceni is short-term with the need only determined from a small body of consultees. The mix does not reflect the wider need as outlined within the SHMA and is not therefore supported.

Urban Design and Conservation Team

Comments on original plans

- 6.5 As it stands, the application cannot be supported in design terms, mainly due to significant issues associated with the car parking courts. Further details are set out below:

Movement and access

The overall approach to movement and access is acceptable in urban design terms. The sites appear to link well with the existing context. The existing overgrown footway/cycle link from Eastfields into Warren Lane, which provides a key route to Milton Road, will be improved through the proposal. The route will potentially feel much more open and legible, and will benefit from greater levels of natural surveillance from the new properties. Access points into both sites have been designed to ensure the retention of existing mature trees which will allow the character of the area to be maintained.

There appears to be an existing footpath link from the larger site into the rear of Chesterton Primary School. The status of this link needs to be clarified as to whether it is currently used or whether the existing school has a desire to improve this access point. As it stands it is currently unclear whether this link needs to be incorporated into the proposed scheme.

The positioning of the 'adoptable estate road' within the larger application site (15/2322/FUL) appears logical and the creation of a non-defined turning head by way of a shared surface space is supported. So too is the shared cycle/pedestrian only access point at the eastern end of the site, which provides a good

solution to a very constrained part of the site. However, there are significant concerns about the arrangement and detail of some of the spaces beyond the 'estate road', namely car parking courts which are discussed in further detail below.

Scale and massing

The scheme, with the exception of the 4 proposed bungalows, consists mainly of two storey pitch roof dwellings, which is considered to be appropriate to the sites context.

Layout

There are significant concerns about the parking courts. The proposed form and layout of the units within the northern corner (plots 12-21), the central area (plots 40-50) and south-eastern corner (plots 27-36) will create rogue parking within the street and in key spaces such as the non-defined turning head. This is due to the fact that car parking for most of these plots is poorly located for the dwelling it is intended to serve. From experience, parking courts which accommodate remote parking spaces simply do not get used and often lead to obstructed pavements, verge parking and parking displacement. This will not only have a negative impact upon the streetscape, but the risk of rogue parking within the turning head could potentially impede access for refuse trucks and emergency vehicles. Furthermore locating parking within rear parking courts can render front doors useless, affecting the levels of activity onto the street.

The layout of the units within the central area is particularly poor and not supported. Whilst there are no objections to the individual design of the unit types across the proposal as a whole, the arrangement and type of unit proposed within the central area is creating a large parking court to the rear. This area is not only sterile in character but also restricts the depth of rear gardens for plots 40-43. The quality of these rear gardens are further compromised by the location of bike and bin stores which severely limits the amount of useable amenity space within these northerly gardens. The rear parking area will also suffer from poor levels of ground floor natural surveillance, which could compromise the security of the bike stores for plots 47-50 and the rear gardens themselves. The convenience of locating bike stores for 2 bedroom dwellings within a rear parking court is also highly questionable.

A number of rear access 'alleyways' appear convoluted and create potential security and surveillance risks (eg – Plots 10-17 and 34). These should be simplified.

Elevations and materials

The proposed elevations are generally supported but, due to the simple architectural expression, it will be crucial that the detailing of the elevations and materials is of high quality. The following issues should be addressed:

- No information has been provided regarding the design and location of flues and vents. Can they be grouped to minimise clutter on the facades? Roof cowls are suggested.
- Window reveals should be encouraged to add depth to the facades.
- The porches would be costly to construct. A more robust and simpler detail for the porches should be considered.
- There should be a family of materials for the metal work and finishes.
- A grey tile may be more in keeping with the area.
- A clear boundary treatment plan should be provided.
- Bin and bike storage details are also required.

Comments on amended plans

The amended plans have taken on board many of the suggestions and significant design changes have been carried out to the layout of the scheme to design out car parking courts that were previously proposed for phases 1 and 2. However, the private amenity space for units 43 and 44 is poorly configured and it would be better to create one larger shared amenity space for these units whereby bike storage is grouped and the bin storage repositioned along the rear elevation of the FOG unit. This could be covered by condition. Conditions are also recommended for details of materials and bike stores. In conclusion, the amendments made have resolved our concerns and the application is now supported in design terms.

Landscape

Comments on original plans

6.6 Further information will be required in order to comment on the proposals. A drawing showing boundary treatments should be provided. There are concerns about 3 of the parking areas within the proposals:

- Central car park – poor functionality
- Eastern car park – placement does not allow for good natural surveillance
- Northern car park – too many units accessed from rear

The retention of trees is welcomed and the open space is adequate in size and location but is lacking detail and interest. The inclusion of a Local Area for Play (LAP) and addition of shrub planting is encouraged. Details regarding the depth of cover of the water attenuation tanks should be provided and feasibility of providing this within root protection zone of trees. The use of rain gardens in the verges is supported.

The team would like to see changes to improve access, parking and open space provision. Any consent should be subject to conditions requiring: hard and soft landscaping; landscape maintenance; and boundary treatment details.

Comments on amended plans

Previous concerns regarding the layout and parking arrangements have been addressed. The central car park has been removed and car parking is mainly returned to on-plot provision. The eastern car park has much better relationships between parking and unit/plot, and changes in the area of the northern car park are greatly improved by the introduction of a FOG and return to on-plot parking for some of the other units. With regard to landscape details, details of the landscape treatment and drainage of the public open space can be dealt with by condition. Clarification should be sought as to whether the previously proposed rain gardens would be retained. In addition, the Cycling and Walking Officer has requested a pedestrian link between the development and primary school, and the Landscape Team would support this in principle should it prove viable.

The development is now acceptable subject to conditions relating to: hard and soft landscaping; landscape works maintenance; and boundary treatments.

Streets and Open Space (Trees Officer)

- 6.7 No comments received. Any comments will be reported on the Amendment Sheet or orally at Committee.

Nature Conservation Officer

- 6.8 No comments received. Any comments will be reported on the Amendment Sheet or orally at Committee.

Waste

- 6.9 No comments received. Any comments will be reported on the Amendment Sheet or orally at Committee.

Sustainability Officer

Comments on original plans

- 6.10 The development fails to meet adopted policy in relation to renewable energy provision and the application cannot therefore be supported. A Sustainability Statement and Checklist in line with requirements of Policy 3/1 are required, and a Renewable Energy Strategy as required by Policy 8/16. An energy strategy has been submitted but no renewable energy provision has been made, with the strategy noting this is due to a desire to reduce maintenance requirements. PV panels require little in the way of maintenance and should be considered.

Comments on amended plans/details

After considering the additional information, the following conditions should be added to any consent. This would give a situation where the scheme is delivering greater levels of carbon reduction than the Code Level 3 referenced in the energy strategy and not far off the Code Level 4 requirements being delivered on other schemes, and provides justification for taking an approach that is different to adopted policy position.

- No development of dwelling to take place until a Predicted Energy Performance Certificate has been submitted demonstrating all dwellings will achieve at least 12% improvement on Part L.
- Prior to occupation, or within 6 months, Final EPC which evidence the 'as built' performance shall be submitted demonstrating that all dwellings have achieved at least a 12% improvement on Part L.

Cycling and Walking Officer

- 6.11 A link to the footpath that connects to the back of Chesterton Primary School should be provided. If the school do not wish for this access to be used, sufficient space should be left to allow for potential future use. The cycle/pedestrian link between Eastfield and Warren Rd is an important strategic cycle link as well as a route to school and should be as wide as possible to accommodate all users. This should be widened to 3.5m, the minimum width for a shared path bounded on both sides. The section of path that then connects to the carriageway should be widened or an additional separate cycle path of 2.5m provided to the junction.

Access to the cycle provision is not acceptable for some of the properties, with very narrow side or back paths. Paths must be at least 1.2m wide. Access to 34 could easily be blocked, Nos. 12, 13, 31, 32 and 35 appear to have no provision, and the location of parking for plots 19/20 is not acceptable.

Comments on the amended plans are currently awaited and will be reported on the Amendment Sheet or orally at Committee.

Sustainable Drainage Engineer

- 6.12 No objections subject to a condition requiring a detailed surface water drainage scheme.

Access Officer

- 6.13 This is a missed opportunity to provide wheelchair accessible housing. All the bungalows and possibly some of the other houses should be built to wheelchair housing standards.

Disability Consultative Panel

- 6.14 This is a good quality, diverse development with a welcome variety in bungalow sizes. It is unclear whether any of the bungalows had been designed to be specialist wheelchair accessible units, but the Panel conclude this may not have been part of the remit. Further consideration should be given to the size and orientation of the ground floor WC's as they appear too small to be usable.

Lead Local Flood Authority

Comments on original plans

- 6.15 Insufficient information submitted to demonstrate the systems will provide the required storage for the site. Object and recommend refusal in the absence of an acceptable surface water drainage strategy/FRA.

Comments on amended plans

The applicant has demonstrated that surface water can be dealt with on site by using rainwater butts, permeable paving, storage tanks and rain gardens. The proposal is acceptable and we wish to remove our objection.

Police Architectural Liaison Officer

- 6.16 The only concern relates to the rear parking courts. They are likely to remain unadopted and should therefore include column-mounted lighting. This should be secured by way of condition.

Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue

- 6.17 No comments received. Any comments will be reported on the Amendment Sheet or orally at Committee.

County Archaeology

- 6.18 The site lies in an area of high archaeological potential. It is likely that significant archaeological remains survive in the area and that these would be severely damaged or destroyed by the proposed development. There are no objections, but the site should be subject to a programme of archaeological

investigation, which can be secured by way of planning condition.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

Comments on original plans

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

- 52 Eastfield
- 61 Eastfield
- 22 Evergreens
- 24 Evergreens
- 23 Maitland Avenue
- 320 Milton Road
- 28 Pepys Court
- 5 Ramsden Square
- 7 Shirley Grove
- 8 Shirley Grove
- 30 Warren Road
- 34 Warren Road
- 43 Warren Road

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Access

- There is an opportunity to create alternative access to Chesterton Primary School from Phases 1 & 2 of the development.
- The cycle route from Warren Road to Eastfield is very well used. An opportunity to improve this route is not being taken. The scheme introduces 90 degree corners to what is currently a straight route. Cycle routes in the new development should be made obvious with signage, coloured surfaces and markings on the ground. The cycle and pedestrian route could be improved by widening it.
- Increased risk of conflict between cyclists and pedestrians at the point the path from Warren Road to Eastfield emerges. Switching the locations of the cycle and vehicle access would be safer.

- Blocking Eastfield to motor traffic to the west of the junction with the cycle route to Warren Road would be safer.
- Segregated cycle provision should be provided where possible.
- Disagree that the site has excellent connections to the local cycle network.

Residential Amenity

- It is understood close-boarded fencing is proposed to the boundaries. This should be added to the plans.
- The balcony to plots 31-32 overlooks gardens of properties in Evergreens (Nos. 22 & 24). It should have a screen at the south-east end to preserve privacy.
- The landscaping around the car park near plots 31-34 is inadequate. This should be deeper and higher to protect the privacy and security of neighbours.
- The car park at plots 31-34 has little surveillance and would result in noise disturbance to adjacent residents.
- The bin storage location in the plots 31-34 car park is unacceptable. This should be in gardens.
- Proximity of bins to adjacent gardens would result in noise disturbance to residents of 34 Warren Road, 22 & 24 Evergreens, and 7 & 8 Shirley Grove. The bin locations would also result in nuisance in terms of smell and vermin.
- Plots 31-32 have no windows overlooking 22 Evergreens at present. The plans should not be altered to include any windows here.
- Plots 18-25 would overlook gardens in Shirley Grove, accentuated by the height difference (the new houses are approximately 1m higher than houses in Shirley Grove), the increase in the number of houses adjoining the garden and by coming around 7m closer than the existing dwellings. The number of windows overlooking No.8 Shirley Grove should

be reduced. Reducing the number and height of dwellings should also be considered.

- The above plots would also cause significant overshadowing and loss of light, especially as they are to the south, and be overbearing and dominate the outlook from properties in Shirley Grove.
- The car park and cycle stores for plots 18-20 are too close to 8 Shirley Grove. The bins for these plots also have to be moved to a collection point, resulting in noise and disturbance to neighbours.
- The car park serving plots 18-20 has no buffer to the fence.
- Security associated with cycle stores in the north-west corner, as people could climb onto these and over the fence into neighbouring gardens. This is also the case for the sheds for Plots 19-20.

Parking

- The development would make the existing parking situation even worse.
- The new layout restricts parking outside 61-65 Eastfield

Trees

- The tree adjacent 34 Warren Road is dangerous and should be removed, as should the eucalyptus further back.
- Willow tree has been retained to parking area. This area is unlikely to be used as a result.

Other

- The public consultation undertaken by the developers was not sent to people regularly using the route.
- Hedgehogs are present in the area on which it is proposed to site Plots 14-26. The hedgehogs should be safely relocated.

- 7.3 Councillor Manning supports the detailed objections raised by local residents of properties in Shirley Grove and Evergreens in particular. The cycle access from Warren Road should be a straight line and should not have to cross the road entrance. It should also have right of way over oncoming traffic.

Comments on amended plans

- 7.4 The following residents have commented on the amended plans:

- 53 Chesterfield Road
- 22 Evergreens
- 24 Evergreens
- 320 Milton Road
- Councillor Manning, 28 Pepys Court
- 5 Ramsden Square
- 7 Shirley Grove
- 8 Shirley Grove
- 43 Warren Road

- 7.5 The concerns raised are as follows:

- The replacement of the shared use cycle/pedestrian path between Eastfield and Warren Road with a footpath exacerbates the concerns raised in the original objection. The application should be rejected as it results in the loss of a key cycle route.
- Councillor Manning states that the alteration to the cycle route from Warren Road contravenes Policy 8/4.
- The pedestrian/cycle link should be widened to 3.5m.
- The plans still include bricks/block paving on roads that may be adopted.
- There is still no attempt to preserve the access through to the primary school. If the school do not wish for this access to be used now, sufficient space should be left for potential future use.
- Removal of the rear access paths will make the development feel safer.

- The changes near Evergreens are a huge improvement, with reduced car parking and better siting for bins, and address most of the concerns raised by 22 and 24 about security, noise and privacy. The construction of a 2m fence is very reassuring. However, plots 31 and 32 are closer to Evergreens, resulting in potential overlooking and a loss of privacy especially from the balcony. The rules for separation between these properties and adjacent properties in Evergreens should be checked.
- Plots 14-21 create a new concern for 7 Shirley Grove. The internal layout should be modified so that the sitting/dining room swaps position with the kitchen.
- The application should include a shadow fall analysis that assesses the impact on properties in Shirley Grove.
- The amendments fail to address the objections raised by No.8 Shirley Grove. The continuous building line of plots 17-25, including plots 19-20 being placed closer to the boundary than originally proposed, and increased number of plots abutting the garden, would result in a significant loss of privacy, loss of light, and an overbearing sense of enclosure. The impact would be exacerbated by the fact the proposed houses are around 1m taller than properties in Shirley Grove. It would also result in an unreasonable level of noise and nuisance due to the high number of new properties, cars and bins close to the boundary.
- The boundary between plots 9-13 and the adjacent property at 53 Chesterfield Road is not clearly defined on the plans. However, there are objections to the bin stores for plots 14-16 which are next to the side wall and garden fence, kitchen and patio of No. 53. The increased noise, smell and vermin is unacceptable. The bins should be sited next to the properties they relate to. The associated footpath would also create security issues and noise disturbance, as would the cycle stores. FOG 1b would have a major impact in terms of security, privacy and noise, and result in overlooking of two side windows.

7.6 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. Affordable housing
3. Context of the site design and external spaces
4. Landscape and trees
5. Residential amenity
6. Highway safety
7. Car and cycle parking
8. Refuse arrangements
9. Renewable energy and sustainability
10. Flooding and surface water drainage
11. Biodiversity
12. Disabled access
13. Third party representations
14. Planning Obligation Strategy

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 site lies in a residential area and, in my opinion, the principle of demolishing the existing dwellings and erecting a greater number of properties in their place is acceptable.

8.3 Policy 5/4 resists the loss of housing unless the lost accommodation is replaced by at least an equivalent amount of new residential floorspace. As the development proposes to increase the number of dwellings, the requirements of this policy would be satisfied.

8.4 Local Plan Policy 5/5 requires the provision of 40% affordable housing on sites proposing 15 or more dwellings. This application, which has been submitted on behalf of Hundred

Houses Society Ltd, proposes 100% affordable housing and therefore accords with the requirements of this policy.

- 8.5 In my opinion, the principle of the development is acceptable and is in accordance with policies 5/1, 5/4 and 5/5 of the Cambridge Local Plan.

Affordable housing

- 8.6 The scheme would provide 100% affordable housing and this would exceed the policy requirements. However, the Enabling & Development (Affordable Homes) team has objected to the proposal on the basis that the bed-space mix does not meet the Affordable Housing SPD requirements and does not reflect the wider need outlined within the Strategic Housing Market Assessment.
- 8.7 Whilst I appreciate the concerns raised in the above comments, consideration should be given to the fact that the scheme is providing 100% affordable housing which far exceeds the policy requirements for 40% provision. In my opinion, the standards can only reasonably be applied to 40% of the scheme rather than to the entire development. In addition, the Housing Association has made it clear that the housing mix proposed within the application has been designed to enable the existing residents (within 11 of the properties) to relocate to the new development, thereby ensuring that those that wish to do so, have the opportunity to stay within the local community. The mix also takes account of the changing needs of existing residents and is designed to enable elderly residents to downsize, and families to relocate into similarly sized properties. The remaining houses would be available for others on the list with a Housing Need and shared owners.
- 8.8 Taking the above into consideration, in my opinion the proposal is acceptable subject to the prior completion of a S106 Legal Agreement to secure the provision of 100% affordable housing.

Context of site, design and external spaces

- 8.9 The site lies within an established residential area, with existing properties mostly dating from the 1930's and consisting of 2-storey semi-detached forms and short runs of terraces that occupy generous plots with sizeable back gardens. The existing

layout predominantly comprises dwellings arranged around two separate cul-de-sacs.

- 8.10 The proposal seeks to use the site more efficiently by increasing the number of units from 26 dwellings (existing) to 50 (proposed), a density almost double that of the existing. This has been achieved by removing the two cul-de-sacs and having a single vehicular access point at the northern end of the site with the southern access point (running between 65 and 75 Eastfield) being altered to a 3m wide pedestrian and cycle link.
- 8.11 The Urban Design Team has advised that the overall approach to movement and access is acceptable and links well with the existing context. Some concern was initially raised regarding what appears to be a footpath link to the school at the eastern side of the site and, subject to clarification of its status, whether a link should be included within the scheme. A number of local residents have also raised concerns about the lack of such a link within the scheme. The applicant's agent has since clarified that this link is overgrown and has not been used for some time. In discussions with the school, they did not wish to see it reinstated, preferring to see a single secure access point to the front of the school. The Landscape Design Officer has queried whether such a link could be provided at the south-eastern corner, which would come in at the front of the school. Whilst this could be achievable, my concern is that this would give rise to amenity and security problems to the adjacent properties in Evergreens. It would also probably be necessary to reduce the number of dwellings in order to accommodate such a link, and the applicant's agent has made it clear that any reduction in numbers would compromise the overall viability of the scheme.
- 8.12 The scheme predominantly comprises two-storey pitched roof dwellings with brick and brick/render finishes, whilst four bungalows are proposed at the north-western and south-eastern corners of the site (Plots 1, 2, 3 and 39). The existing houses that would be demolished are semi-detached and the surrounding area is characterised by a mix of semi-detached properties, terraces and bungalows. The proposed scheme includes a mix of semi-detached houses, linked semis, terraced houses, bungalows and flats. In my opinion, the scale, design and mix of the proposed dwellings would be in-keeping with the character of the area and appropriate to the context of the site.

- 8.13 With regard to the layout of the development, there were significant shortcomings with the original scheme mainly arising from the three parking courts in the centre and corners of the site. These issues have been addressed within the amended scheme, within which the layout has been significantly altered to design out the car parking courts. The most notable changes are in the centre of the site, where the parking is now proposed to be provided to the front/on-plot, and in the north-western corner where flats are proposed above garages (FOGs) in order to introduce a greater level of surveillance to the corners of the site.
- 8.14 The Urban Design Team considers the proposal is now largely acceptable. I have requested a minor amendment to alter the amenity space to Plots 43-44 to address the single outstanding comment that cannot be satisfactorily resolved by way of planning condition. I will report further on this amendment on the Amendment sheet or orally at the meeting.
- 8.15 In my opinion the design of the scheme, as amended, is acceptable and the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12 and 5/2.

Landscape and Trees

- 8.16 The Landscape Officer raised some concerns regarding the original layout, most notably in respect of the shared parking courts, and these objections have been sufficiently addressed in the amended drawings that any outstanding issues can be dealt with by way of planning condition.
- 8.17 There are a number of mature trees within the existing garden areas and also within the highway verges, the latter of which contribute to the character of the area. The proposal has sought to retain as many of the existing trees of amenity value as possible. 43 trees are proposed for removal in phases 1 and 2, which are argued within the accompanying arboricultural impact assessment as being of poor quality and/or low amenity value.
- 8.18 No comments have been received to date from the Council's Trees Officer. However, the application was submitted following extensive pre-application discussions between the applicants and the Trees Officer, and my understanding is that there are no objections to the loss of the trees identified for removal within

the application. This will be confirmed on the Amendment sheet (or orally at the meeting) once the Trees Officer's comments have been received. Subject to this confirmation, my opinion is that the proposal is compliant with Policy 4/4 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

Residential Amenity

Amenities of adjacent residents

- 8.19 The site is bounded by the gardens of 34 and 53 Warren Road, and 53 Chesterfield Road to the north; 7 & 8 Shirley Grove to the east; 22 & 24 Evergreens to the south-east, 22-28 Ashfield Road to the south; and 61-65 & 75-78 Eastfields to the west. The key concerns regarding the residential amenity impacts of the development have been raised by the occupiers of Nos. 7 & 8 Shirley Grove, 22 & 24 Evergreens, and 53 Chesterfield Road, and I agree that these are the dwellings that will be most affected by the development.
- 8.20 The application proposes to redevelop the site at a higher density than the existing estate and, as a result, properties are generally sited closer to the boundaries with neighbouring dwellings than at present. On the whole, the properties have been designed with minimum 9-10m deep rear gardens. Plots 1-3 and 39 have significantly smaller gardens but these plots are occupied by bungalows and development of these plots would not therefore give rise to overlooking or overshadowing of adjacent properties (53 Warren Road and 28 Ashfield Road). Plots 35-38 are two-storey dwellings with shorter rear gardens than the 9-10m referred to above. However, these dwellings overlook the bottom section of long rear gardens of Nos. 24-28 Ashfield Road and, in my opinion, would not result in a significant loss of amenity to neighbouring occupiers. Plots 27-32 in the south-eastern corner also have a very limited rear garden depth but these plots are sited adjacent to the Primary School and do not overlook adjacent residential properties.
- 8.21 Nos. 22 & 24 Evergreens are two-storey dwellings located beyond the south-eastern corner of the site. The residents of these properties raised strong concerns to the original layout due to the proximity of the car parking court and bin storage to their boundaries. Both have commented that the revised scheme, which sets the parking and bin storage areas much

further from the boundary, addresses these concerns but have questioned whether re-siting the dwellings on plots 31-32 closer to their garden boundaries gives rise to any harmful overshadowing or overlooking issues. In my opinion, at a distance of approximately 18m away, the development would be sited sufficiently far from windows in the rear elevations of the adjacent properties to avoid any harmful impact by reason of loss of enclosure or outlook. I concur with their concerns that the balcony proposed to the front elevation has the potential to overlook their private gardens and, with this in mind, I recommend that a condition be added to any consent requiring a solid minimum 1.8m high screen to be included on the southern side of the balcony prior to occupation of the applicable dwelling and retained as such thereafter.

8.22 Nos. 7 & 8 Shirley Grove are a semi-detached pair of properties located beyond the eastern boundary of the site that have long gardens extending to the west and east respectively. The occupiers of No.8 Shirley Grove have raised significant concerns about the impact of the development on the grounds of overlooking, overbearing, loss of light and noise. This property currently has a two-storey semi-detached dwelling sited approximately 27m away. The proposed scheme would result in two houses directly to the rear as well as a row of dwellings extending along the length of the garden area. Although the proposed dwellings (plots 18-20) would be closer to No.8 than the existing property, the rear gardens would be around 9-10m in depth and there would be a distance of 19-20m between opposing windows. I consider this distance to be sufficient to prevent significant adverse harm by reason of overlooking and overshadowing. On this basis, I do not consider there would be justification for requiring non-habitable rooms only to this elevation.

8.23 The dwellings on plots 14-18 are sited a similar distance away from No.7 Shirley Grove and, again, I consider this separation to be sufficient to avoid significant adverse harm by reason of overshadowing or overbearing. I note that the owner of this dwelling has expressed a preference for the internal layout to be revised. Whilst I cannot insist on such a change for the same reasons as cited in the preceding paragraph, I have raised this with the applicant's agent and queried whether they would be amenable to altering the plans accordingly. I will report further on this on the amendment sheet or orally at Committee.

8.24 The occupiers of No.53 Chesterfield Road to the north have raised concerns regarding the revised layout and problems arising from the proximity of plots 14-16 to their boundary. I do have some sympathy regarding their concerns about the proximity of the bin stores to their main private garden. Whilst I consider the impact could be mitigated through the construction of a suitable boundary fence/wall (which could be secured by way of planning condition), I have asked the applicant's agent to consider amending the location to ameliorate this impact. The footpath at the side of plots 14-16 and cycle stores to the rear adjoin a single-storey garage element of No.53 and pass close to the side and front rather than the private garden space and I do not therefore consider this impact is unacceptable. The owners of this adjacent property have also expressed concern that the flat over the garage on plot 14 overlooks their side windows. The nearest front elevation window in plot 14 is a rooflight serving a kitchen which, in my opinion, would not give a direct view into No.53's side windows.

8.25 The dwellings on plots 6-13 are two-storey dwellings with 9.5+m deep back gardens. Given the separation between these properties and No.34 Warren Road and 53 Chesterfield Road, I consider they would not give rise to significant adverse overlooking of their gardens.

8.26 Nos. 61-65 Eastfields to the west have approximately 12m deep rear gardens. In my opinion this separation is sufficient to ensure the occupiers would not suffer an unacceptable level of overshadowing or overbearing from the dwellings on plots 40 and 50.

8.27 In my opinion the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and constraints of the site and I consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) Policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/12 and 5/2.

Highway Safety

8.28 The layout and design of the proposed development takes into account the highways engineer's requirements, which have been discussed in detail at pre-application stage with the Highways Authority. The design of the existing cul-de-sacs does not meet current standards in terms of width, circulation and

turning space, and the lack of off-street parking results in parking on highway verges. The proposed highway design includes a 5-metre wide adoptable road, in the form of a single cul-de-sac, with 2m wide footways on each side and some grassed verge areas (with the latter also incorporating 'rain gardens' as part of the overall surface-water drainage strategy for the site).

8.29 The Highways Authority has advised that the development is acceptable from a highway safety perspective subject to the inclusion of a number of planning conditions and informatives.

8.30 A number of concerns have been raised by local residents on the basis that the scheme does not include improvements to the existing link between Warren Road and Eastfields. This concern has been echoed by the Cycling and Walking Officer who has requested that this link be increased to 3.5m in width. Concerns have also been raised by residents and users of this through-route to the revisions to the highways layout at the point at which the cycle/pedestrian route from Warren Road meets Eastfield.

8.31 In my opinion, the scale of the proposed development, which is for 24 additional dwellings on Phases 1 & 2, and 4 additional properties in Phase 3, is not significant enough that improvements to this route could be argued to be necessitated by the scheme. I note that the proposed highways layout at this point does introduce two 90 degree bends that need to be negotiated. However, this would have the effect of slowing vehicle and cycle speeds compared to the existing layout which would be to the benefit of the safety of all users of the highway. Whilst a straighter route may be desired by cyclists, the Highways Authority has considered the proposal and deemed it acceptable from a highway safety perspective.

8.32 In my opinion the proposal is acceptable and compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Car and Cycle Parking

8.33 With regard to car parking requirements, the site lies outside the Controlled Parking Zone. Based on the mix of dwellings proposed within the application, the development requires the provision of a maximum of 74 car parking spaces. 68 are

proposed, with the parking provided at a ratio of 1 space per 1 & 2 bed property and 2 spaces per 3-bed dwelling, together with 6 visitor spaces. In the schemes discussed at pre-application stage, the applicants sought to provide a higher ratio of car parking that far exceeded the maximum standards. In order to improve the layout and ensure compliance with the maximum standards, Officers advised that the number of spaces would need to be reduced and that a significant proportion of the units should be provided with just one space. The submitted scheme has addressed these comments.

8.34 Whilst the parking provision is 6 fewer than the maximum standard, experience suggests that car ownership amongst occupiers of affordable housing schemes tends to be relatively low. In addition, the site is in a sustainable location that offers excellent access by walking, cycling and public transport to local facilities and services and the City Centre. I therefore consider the level of parking provided is acceptable in this location.

8.35 Cycle storage is provided for each proposed dwelling in accordance with the standards set out in the adopted Local Plan. The storage includes a mix of in-built stores to the front, sheds in rear gardens and cycle lockers for the flats. The Cycling and Walking Officer raised concerns regarding access to the cycle provision in the originally proposed layout. I am currently awaiting a further response in respect of the amended layout and these comments will be reported on the Amendment sheet or orally at the meeting.

8.36 In my opinion, subject to confirmation from the Cycling and Walking Officer that the revised layout is acceptable, the proposal would be compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10.

Refuse Arrangements

8.37 The proposal includes storage for three refuse/recycling wheeled bins per property, either in the front or rear gardens. The level of storage provided accords with the RECAP Waste Management Design Guidance. With regard to the location and accessibility of the storage, no confirmation has been received to date from the Council's Waste Team that the details are acceptable. These comments will either be reported on the

Amendment sheet or orally at the meeting. Subject to this confirmation, the proposal would be compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

Renewable energy and sustainability

- 8.38 Policy 8/16 of the Local Plan requires at least 10% of the development's total predicted energy requirements to be obtained from renewable energy sources. The application does not propose any renewable energy provision. This is partly due to a desire to minimise maintenance costs and partly because the Housing Association are unable to claim any Feed in Tariff. As a result, the application proposes a fabric-first approach with the aim of achieving a 10% reduction in energy consumption across the whole development.
- 8.39 The Council's Sustainability Officer initially objected to the proposal in view of the absence of any renewable energy proposals. Further information has been provided by the applicant's agent seeking to demonstrate that the dwellings would achieve a 10% reduction in energy consumption. In response, the Sustainability Officer has advised that this approach would be acceptable subject to a condition requiring the dwellings to achieve at least a 12% improvement on Part L of the Building Regulations. This would result in the scheme delivering greater levels of carbon reduction than Code Level 3 and almost to Code Level 4 standards.
- 8.40 In my opinion, subject to the condition recommended, the proposal is in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan Policy 8/16 and the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2007.

Flooding and surface water

- 8.41 The site lies in Flood Zone 1 but there are known surface-water drainage issues in the area and, as a result, a flood risk and surface-water drainage report has been submitted with the application. The County Council (Lead Local Flood Authority) initially objected to the proposal, stating that insufficient information had been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed surface-water approach would provide the required amount of storage for the site. Further information has since been provided by the applicant's agent demonstrating that surface water can be dealt with on site by using rainwater butts,

permeable paving, storage tanks and rain gardens. On this basis, the County Council has removed its holding objection and the Council's Sustainable Drainage Engineer has raised no objections subject to the inclusion of a standard surface-water drainage condition.

Biodiversity

8.42 An ecological evaluation and impact assessment has been submitted with the application, and this concludes that the ecological value of the site is negligible. A separate bat report concludes that the site has a low but significant probability that the site supports bat roosts.

8.43 A local resident has commented that hedgehogs are present in part of the site and has expressed concern that these would be disrupted as a result of the proposals.

8.44 I am presently awaiting comments from the Council's Nature Conservation Officer and these will be reported on the Amendment sheet or orally at the meeting.

Disabled Access

8.45 The Council's Access Officer has commented that there is a missed opportunity to provide wheelchair accessible housing. However, the information in the Design and Access Statement confirms that the internal layout of the dwellings will be designed to comply with Building Regulations, with all new internal doors at ground level designed to enable full wheelchair access.

Third Party Representations

8.46 I have addressed the issues raised in representations within the body of this report.

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 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.

8.49 I am in the process of liaising with service managers to establish whether there are deficiencies in the provision of sports, open space and community facilities in the area, and whether there are grounds for seeking commuted payments to secure improvements to these facilities.

8.50 Notwithstanding the above, the Design and Access Statement explains that a separate (confidential) report has been prepared on the economic viability of the proposals and the essential need to provide at least 62 new dwellings to ensure the funding requirements and existing tenants' re-housing needs are met.

8.51 A Development Appraisal Tool has been submitted that seeks to demonstrate that policy requirements could render the scheme economically unviable. The proposal includes the provision of an area of public open space that, at 575m² in area, is below the amount that would be required by planning policy (936m²). The supporting statement explains that providing a policy compliant level of open space would reduce the number of dwellings that could be achieved, thereby compromising the viability of the scheme. It is also argued that any commuted sum payment would also make the scheme economically unviable.

8.52 In view of the information provided within the confidential report, I am minded to support the scheme in its existing form but I will provide further clarity on the Amendment sheet.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 In conclusion, I consider the proposed scheme represents a suitable redevelopment of the existing site at a higher density, and achieves this in a way that is in keeping with the character of the area and avoids undue harm to the amenities of local residents and highway/pedestrian/cycle safety.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to completion of a s106 Agreement to secure the provision of affordable housing and the following conditions:

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

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

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

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

3. Prior to commencement of development, samples and details of the colour of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the buildings, which includes external features such as windows, doors, porch details, timber cladding, dormer windows, garage doors, external metal work and coping shall be 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, and 3/12)

4. 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)

5. No development shall take place until a schedule of landscape maintenance for a minimum period of five years has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The schedule shall include details of the arrangements for its implementation. 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 that the landscaped areas are maintained in a healthy condition in the interests of visual amenity. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12)

6. 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)

7. No unbound material shall be used in the surface finish of the driveways 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. (Policy 8/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006).

8. Notwithstanding the provision of Class A of Schedule 2, Part 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, (or any order revoking, amending or re-enacting that order) no gates shall be erected across the approved vehicular accesses unless details have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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

9. Prior to the first occupation of any of the dwellings, hereby permitted, the vehicular accesses where they cross the public highway shall be laid out and constructed in accordance with the approved drawings and to Cambridgeshire County Council construction specification. The accesses shall thereafter be retained free of obstruction.

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

10. The accesses shall be constructed with adequate drainage measures to prevent surface water run-off onto the adjacent public highway, in accordance with a scheme that has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To prevent surface water discharging to the highway in accordance with Policy 8/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

11. 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 each 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, in accordance with Policy 8/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

12. Prior to the first occupation of the dwellings, hereby permitted, 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.

13. Prior to the first occupation of the dwellings, hereby permitted, any redundant vehicle crossover of the footway must be returned to normal footway and kerb.

Reason: For the safe and efficient operation of the public highway, in accordance with Policy 8/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

14. No demolition or construction works shall commence on site until a traffic management plan has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall be implemented 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.

15. No development of a residential dwelling shall take place until a Predicted Energy Performance Certificates have been submitted to the local planning authority demonstrating that all proposed dwellings will achieve at least a 12% improvement on Part L (2013). Within six months of first occupation of the dwellings, Final Energy Performance Certificates which evidence the 'as built' performance shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, demonstrating that all proposed dwellings have achieved at least a 12% improvement on Part L (2013).

Reason: In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions and promoting principles of sustainable construction and efficient use of buildings (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/16 and Supplementary Planning Document 'Sustainable Design & Construction' 2007)."

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

Reason: To ensure that an appropriate archaeological investigation of the site has been implemented before development commences. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/9)

17. 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)

18. The south-east side elevation of the balcony at the front of plots 31-32 shall be fitted with a minimum 1.8 metre high solid screen in accordance with details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The screen shall be fitted prior to the occupation of these dwellings and shall be maintained in accordance with these details thereafter.

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

19. Prior to the commencement of development a scheme for surface water drainage works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details shall include an assessment 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 the National Planning Policy 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 + an allowance for climate change. The submitted details shall include the following:

- 1) 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;

- 2) A management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.

The approved details shall be fully implemented on site prior to the first use/occupation and shall be retained thereafter.

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

20. 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

21. 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)

22. 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)

23. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved (including any pre-construction, demolition, enabling works or piling), the applicant shall submit a report in writing, regarding the demolition / construction noise and vibration impact associated with this development, for approval by the local authority. The report shall be in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228:2009 Code of Practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites and include full details of any piling and mitigation measures to be taken to protect local residents from noise and or vibration. 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 nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

24. 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 policy 4/13

25. Prior to the commencement of development, excluding the demolition of the existing buildings on the site, a scheme for the provision of fire hydrants shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be fully operational prior to occupation of any dwelling, or as agreed in writing with the local planning authority. No development shall take place other than in accordance with the approved scheme.

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

INFORMATIVE: With regard to condition 14, the principal 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.

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 applicant's 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.

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: The noise and vibration report should include:

a) An assessment of the significance of the noise impact due to the demolition/construction works and suitable methods for this are to be found in BS 5228:2009 Part 1 Annex E - Significance of noise effects. It is recommended that the ABC method detailed in E.3.2 be used unless works are likely to continue longer than a month then the 2-5 dB (A) change method should be used.

b) An assessment of the significance of the vibration impact due to the demolition/construction works and suitable methods for this are to be found in BS 5228:2009 Part 2 Annex B - Significance of vibration effects.

If piling is to be undertaken then full details of the proposed method to be used is required and this should be included in the noise and vibration reports detailed above.

Following the production of the above reports a monitoring protocol should be proposed for agreement with the Local Planning Authority. It will be expected that as a minimum spot checks to be undertaken on a regular basis at site boundaries nearest noise sensitive premises and longer term monitoring to be undertaken when:-

- Agreed target levels are likely to exceeded
- Upon the receipt of substantiated complaints
- At the request of the Local Planning Authority / Environmental Health following any justified complaints.

Guidance on noise monitoring is given in BS 5228:2009 Part 1 Section 8.4 - Noise Control Targets and in Annex G - noise monitoring.

A procedure for seeking approval from the Local Planning Authority (LPA) in circumstances when demolition/construction works need to be carried out at time outside the permitted hours. This should incorporate a minimum notice period of 10 working days to the Local Planning Authority and 5 working days to neighbours to allow the Local Planning Authority to consider the application as necessary. For emergencies the Local Planning Authority should be notified but where this is not possible the Council's Out of Hours Noise service should be notified on 0300 303 3839.

Contact details for monitoring personnel, site manager including out of hours emergency telephone number should be provided.

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.