

|                           |   |                    |                  |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------|------------------|
| <b>Application Number</b> | 16/0532/FUL   | <b>Agenda Item</b> |                  |
| <b>Date Received</b>      | 3rd May 2016  | <b>Officer</b>     | Charlotte Burton |
| <b>Target Date</b>        | 28th June 2016  |                    |                  |
| <b>Ward</b>               | Cherry Hinton   |                    |                  |
| <b>Site</b>               | 233 Queen Ediths Way Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 8NJ   |                    |                  |
| <b>Proposal</b>           | Two storey side extension and single storey rear extension following the demolition of an existing outbuilding. |                    |                  |
| <b>Applicant</b>          | Mr Daniel Waisberg<br>63 Queen Edith's Way Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 8PL United Kingdom                      |                    |                  |

|                |  |
|----------------|--|
| SUMMARY        | <p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>The scale, massing, form and materials would be appropriate to the existing building and would not harm the character of the area;</p> <p>The extension would not have a significant adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties;</p> <p>The proposal provides adequate amenity for future occupiers, in terms of bin and bike storage and car parking, subject to conditions.</p> |
| RECOMMENDATION | APPROVAL   |

**1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT**

1.1 No. 233 Queen Edith’s Way is a semi-detached property on the north western side of the road. The property is two storey with a hipped roof constructed of red brick. There is a driveway which slopes downwards towards the house, which is set back behind a landscaped front garden. There is a single storey

detached garage at the side, set back from the rear of the house which abuts the boundary.

- 1.2 The property adjoins No. 231 to the west. The neighbouring property to the east is No. 235 which is a detached two storey property with a conservatory at the rear. The boundary with No. 235 is formed by a boundary fence and the garage of No. 233 at the rear, and a hedge at the front. There would be a deck at the rear which would raise the ground level where the garden currently slopes away from the rear of the house.
- 1.3 The site does not fall within a conservation area. The building is not listed or a Building of Local Interest, nor are the neighbouring properties. There are no tree preservation orders on the site. The site falls outside the controlled parking zone.

## **2.0 THE PROPOSAL**

- 2.1 The proposal is for the erection of a two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension, following demolition of the existing garage. The side extension would have an eaves and ridge height, and a hipped roof to match the existing. On the front elevation, the side extension would project forward of the existing building line by 800mm at ground floor level and 300mm at first floor level with a front-facing hipped roof and a canopy above the main entrance at first floor level. The rear extension would project 3000mm and would have a flat roof to a height of 2900mm.
- 2.2 The original drawings submitted showed the proposed two storey east elevation abutting the boundary with No. 235 with the eaves overhanging the neighbouring property. The single storey west elevation was also shown built along the boundary line with a half-brick width extending into No. 231. During the course of the application, the applicant submitted revised plans to amend the position of the side elevations so that all works are situated on land within the applicant's ownership. The main changes were:
  - the east elevation of the two storey extension stepped back 200mm from the boundary so that the edge of the guttering would not overhang No. 235;
  - the west elevation of the single storey rear extension stepped back 200mm from the boundary with No. 231.

2.3 The extensions would be constructed in brick to match the existing and the hipped roof would be in roof tiles to match the existing. A new permeable paving driveway would be laid and a bin store would be located at the front of the property. A cycle store with space for parking two bikes would be integrated into the front elevation. At the rear, a new store is proposed against the east boundary and a raised deck extending level with the internal floor level.

2.4 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:

1. Drawings
2. Design Statement
3. Drawing showing 45 degree rule assessment
4. Drawing showing dimensions of car parking space

### 3.0 SITE HISTORY

3.1 The property has no recent planning history.

### 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<br>Plan 2006 | Local | 3/1 3/4 3/ 3/11 3/14<br>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<br><br>National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014<br><br>Circular 11/95  |
| Supplementary Planning Guidance | Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007)<br><br>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012) |
| Material Considerations         | <u>City Wide Guidance</u><br><br>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 Comments 08.04.2016

The application form states that there is no change in parking provision within the site, but provides no other details of existing or proposed provision. The application removes an existing garage. The applicant must provide information regarding existing and proposed parking arrangements to allow informed comment upon the full impact of the proposals. The applicant must show the dimensions for the proposed car parking spaces, which should measure 2.5m x 5m.

#### 6.2 Comments 10.06.2016 on revised drawings

The Highway Authority does not consider that the additional information supplied provides any additional relevant information upon which to comment.

#### 6.3 Comments 20.06.2016 on additional drawing showing dimensions of car parking space

The development provides one parking space which is practicable to use.

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

## 7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

7.1 Councillor Mark Ashton has commented on this application and has asked for it to be determined by the Planning Committee for the following reasons:

- The gutter of the proposed extension according to the plans will be over hanging the boundary line into the garden of No. 235. It is not clear from the drawings how a drainpipe could be fitted from the gutter that is shown on the drawings if this was built on the boundary line.
- Loss of light.

- The proposed second storey window of bedroom 4 will overlook the conservatory of No. 235.
- The likely loss of a 50 year old beach hedge and loss of privacy/encroaching on No. 235 as a result.

7.2 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations **objecting** to the proposal:

- 235 Queen Edith's Way

7.3 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made **neutral** representations to the proposal:

- 231 Queen Edith's Way

7.4 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Loss of light to No. 235.
- The proposed new extension/porch will affect light coming into the front windows of No. 235 serving a lounge.
- Over-looking from the proposed second storey window on the rear elevation towards the conservatory at the rear of No. 235 if the extension is built on the boundary line.
- Likely loss of 50-year old beech hedge at the front of the property and loss of privacy and encroachment as a result.
- Queen Edith's Way is a green corridor leading to Addenbrooke's and the City. If building continues apace, unchecked, before too long the City will be a mass of concrete and coloured glass with oversized buildings on plots that are too small.
- Other properties in the area retain gaps between side elevation and boundary.
- The gutter would overhang the boundary into No. 235. Not clear how a drainpipe could be fitted if this was built on the boundary line;
- Requirements for access to property from No. 235 during construction;
- There will be no way that the proposed extension can be maintained if it sits on the boundary line. The owners of No. 233 should be able to maintain their property within their boundary line and not expect to encroach on their neighbours' land. At least one metre clearance would be the norm. There has been no attempt to consult No. 235.

- In light of lack of consultation with No. 235, the owners will not be agreeing to a party wall agreement if proposed by the owners of No. 233.
- It is not clear whether the new owners are going to live there or will be looking to let it.
- Larger houses are available for sale in the city without the need to extend No. 233.
- Clarification over the boundary line between Nos. 231 and 233.

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

## **8.0 ASSESSMENT**

8.1 From the consultation responses and 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 heritage assets)
3. Residential amenity
4. Refuse arrangements
5. Highway safety
6. Car and cycle parking
7. Third party representations

### **Principle of Development**

8.2 Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/14 permits extensions to existing buildings in principle, subject to criteria relating to the responding to the context, the amenity of neighbouring and future occupiers, and the impact on the character of the conservation area. These are addressed further in the sections below. In summary, for the reasons set out in this report, in my opinion, the principle of the development is acceptable and in accordance with policy 3/14.

## **Context of site, design and external spaces**

### Response to context

- 8.3 Queen Edith's Way is characterized by a mix of detached and semi-detached properties set back from the road on a relatively consistent building line. The properties are set within generous plots with landscaped front gardens. There are a mix of building styles and some examples of extensions and alterations, although all retain a more traditional building style with features including pitched and hipped roofs. Many of the properties have single storey side garages. The properties display a range of materials, predominantly brick and render, with tiled roofs.
- 8.4 The proposed side extension with a hipped side roof and front-facing hipped roof would be entirely in keeping with the character of the existing house and the other properties along Queen Edith's Way. The hipped side roof would match the hipped roof of the existing house. The front-facing hipped roof would be a similar feature as found on No. 235. The flat roof single storey rear element would be similar to the existing rear extension at no. 231. In my opinion, the overall form of the proposed extensions responds well to the existing property and the character of the area.
- 8.5 Third parties have expressed concern that the side extension extending to the site boundary would be out of keeping with the character of the area as most properties are set back from their boundaries. In my assessment, I have considered the character of the properties on both sides of the road. While I acknowledge that many of the properties are set back from their boundaries, there are also examples of single and two storey side extensions that abut (or are close to) their plot boundaries. In my opinion, the gaps between the properties and their boundaries are not so prevalent as to form an overriding character of the street. Moreover, as the scale and form of the side extension would be in keeping with the property, it would not harm the character of the area.
- 8.6 Third parties have also expressed concern that the proposal would harm the 'green corridor' along Queen Edith's Way leading to Addenbrooke's and the City. The third parties have provided no clarification about what features they consider

contribute to the supposed 'green corridor', however it is assumed this is a reference to the landscaped front gardens. The side extension would be on land that is currently used as driveway and the rear extension would be on an existing patio area. In my view, the scale of the extensions would not have a significant impact on any open or verdant character. While I acknowledge that the front gardens make some contribution to the supposed 'green corridor', this would be retained. There would be a bin and cycle store at the front of the property, however, in my view, there is space to accommodate this without harming the existing landscaping.

### Scale and massing

- 8.7 The eaves and ridge height of the side extension would be the same as existing. The existing front elevation is 6500mm wide and the proposed side extension would extend a further 2000mm and would be set back from the boundary by 200mm. At the front, it would project forward of the existing building line by 800mm at ground floor level and 300mm at first floor level. At the rear, the two storey element would be flush with the existing rear elevation. In my view, the scale and massing is entirely appropriate to the existing building and the character of the area. The impact of the proposed scale and massing on residential amenity is considered below.
- 8.8 The rear extension would project 300mm to the same building line as the existing rear extension of No. 231. The maximum height would be 2900mm. The applicants could construct a rear extension with the same depth and height under permitted development rights, however the part of the rear extension attached to the proposed side extension would not be permitted development. The proposed single storey rear extension would extend across the width of the extended rear elevation, and in my view, the scale and massing would be entirely appropriate to the existing building.

### Elevations and Materials

- 8.9 The extensions would be constructed in brick to match the existing and the hipped roof would be in roof tiles to match the existing. The new windows would have a similar size and proportion to the existing windows. The porch on the front elevation would add interest to the front elevation and would be

in-keeping with the variety of building styles along the road. A cycle store has been integrated into the front of the building which is supported.

### Layout / Movement and Access

- 8.10 The proposed extensions would be at the side and rear and would relate well to the existing building. The car and cycle parking and bin store would be located at the front of the site where it is well located for users. While access from the driveway into the rear garden would be blocked off, as the bin and cycle stores would be provided at the front of the property, in my view this is acceptable and similar to other properties along the road which have been extended to their boundaries.

### Open Space and Landscape

- 8.11 The property would retain a good size rear garden which would provide private amenity space. The area in front of the property would be enhanced by a new permeable paving car parking area. Conditions are recommended for further details of the bin and bike store located at the front of the property. Given the front of the site is lower than the street level, it is considered that a bin and bike store could be located and designed so that it does not have an adverse impact on the appearance of the property or the street scene.
- 8.12 There is an existing beech hedge along the boundary with No. 235. The occupants of this property have expressed concern that this hedge could be lost during construction. While the hedge does make some positive contribution to the overall landscaping on the site, it is not protected in any way. The applicants have not provided details of the proposed boundary treatment. It is considered that, if the hedge is harmed during the construction, suitable replacement landscaping could be planted along the boundary. A condition is recommended for details of the boundaries to be submitted for approval and implemented.
- 8.13 The occupants of No. 235 also expressed concern that the boundary between their properties at the rear would be left open, following demolition of the garage which abuts the boundary. A condition is recommended for details of the boundaries to be submitted for approval and implemented.

8.14 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/14.

### **Residential Amenity**

#### Relationship with No. 235 (east)

8.15 No. 235 is a detached two storey property set back from the boundary with the application site by approximately 1800mm (as shown on the submitted drawings). The western side elevation of No. 235 is two storeys and there is a single storey conservatory with glazed roof at the rear. There are no windows on the western side elevation facing the application site. The front elevation is on the same building line as the existing No. 233. The existing rear elevation of No. 233 is further back than the rear elevation of No. 235 by less than half a metre. The boundary between the properties is formed by a hedge in front of the properties and a fence elsewhere, although there is a gap in fence where the existing garage of No. 233 abuts the boundary. The proposed deck at the rear would be 300mm higher than the patio at the rear of No. 235 (as shown on the submitted drawings).

8.16 The proposed two storey side extension would be separated from the boundary with No. 235 by 200mm (following the revised plans submitted) so that the eaves would not overhang into the neighbouring property. The side extension would project forward of the existing building line of No. 235 by 800mm at ground floor level and 300mm at first floor level. At the rear, the two storey side extension would project beyond the two storey rear elevation of No. 235 but would not exceed the building line of the existing rear elevation of No. 233. The proposed single storey rear extension would not project further back beyond the line of the existing conservatory of No. 235. The existing garage would be demolished and a new store would be erected. The applicants have not provided details of the proposed boundary treatment.

#### Relationship with No. 231 (west)

8.17 No. 231 is the matching semi-detached pair to No. 233. It has been extended at the rear with a 300mm single storey flat-roofed brick element. The proposed single storey rear extension

would have the same depth and height as the existing extension at No. 231. It would be set back from the boundary by 200mm so there would be no overhang. The existing boundary is formed by a hedge. The applicants have not provided details of any changes to the boundary treatment.

Overshadowing/loss of light and Enclosure/loss of outlook

- 8.18 There are no windows on the west elevation of No. 235 facing onto the proposed extension and therefore, although this would be stepped back from the boundary by only 200mm, there would be no direct loss of outlook from any windows of No. 235. While there is a narrow passageway along the western side of No. 235 to provide access to the rear garden, this is already overshadowed and enclosed by the existing two storey elevations of Nos, 233 and 235. In my opinion, the side extension being approximately 2000mm closer to the boundary than existing would not have a significant adverse overbearing impact, given this is not part of the private amenity space of No. 235.
- 8.19 The north east corner of No. 233 would project closer to the rear of No. 235 than the existing house, however given the orientation of No. 233 is to the south west, there is already a high degree of overshadowing at the rear of No. 235. As a result, in my view, the scale of the side extension would not have a significant additional adverse over-shadowing impact on the conservatory or patio of No. 235 compared to the existing situation. The single storey rear extension would not have a significant overbearing or over-shadowing impact compared to the existing situation.
- 8.20 The occupants of No. 235 have expressed concern that the front projection of the side extension and the porch on the front elevation would lead to loss of light to the ground floor window of their lounge on the front elevation and would have an enclosing impact if the beech hedge along the boundary between the two properties is lost during construction. The ground floor front extension would project 800mm from the front elevation which is on the same building line as No. 235. This would not cut across a 45 degree line from the centre of the lounge window. Therefore, I am not concerned about any overbearing impact. Due to the small scale of the front projection, I am not concerned about any over-shadowing

impact on this window compared to the impact that the existing boundary treatment has or any boundary that could be erected under permitted development. There is a window above this on first floor serving a bedroom, however as the first floor front projection would be 300mm, in my opinion, this would not have any overbearing or over-shadowing impact on this window.

- 8.21 I am not concerned about any overshadowing or enclosure of No. 231 from the single storey rear extension as the applicants could construct an extension of the same depth and height in this location under permitted development rights. Moreover, the rear extension would be single storey and orientated to the north east of No. 231. There are no windows on the side elevation of the rear extension of No. 231 facing No. 233. This precludes any significant impact in terms of overshadowing or enclosure.

#### Overlooking/loss of privacy

- 8.22 No windows are proposed on the east elevation facing towards No. 235. The occupants of No. 235 have expressed concern about overlooking into the glass roof of their conservatory at the rear from the proposed first floor windows on the rear elevation. There would be a new window on the rear elevation serving a bedroom, the nearest side of which would be 1000mm from the boundary with No. 235. In my opinion, this would only afford a very oblique view down into the conservatory when standing very close to the window. Therefore I am not concerned that this would have a significant overlooking impact. Nonetheless, the applicants have offered to obscure glaze the left-hand-most of the three window panes closest to No. 235. In my opinion, it would be reasonable to secure this through a condition in order to address any perceived loss of privacy for the conservatory of No. 235.
- 8.23 The occupants of No. 235 have also expressed concern that the beech hedge along the boundary between the two properties at the front of the site could be lost as a result of construction which would lead to over-looking. I agree that if this was the case, there would be some overlooking between the properties, however, this would not be into their private amenity space. Nonetheless, the recommended condition for details of the boundary treatments to be submitted for approval would address this concern.

8.24 I am not concerned about any overlooking towards No. 231 from the single storey rear extension as there would be no windows on west elevation and, in any case, the extension would not project further than the existing rear extension of No. 231. However, a condition for details of the boundary treatment to be submitted for approval is recommended in order to address any impact that may arise from the loss of the hedge boundary during construction.

#### Noise and disturbance

8.25 The property would remain in use as a single dwelling. While there would be an additional bedroom added, I am not concerned that this would generate additional noise and disturbance so as to affect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

#### Overspill car parking

8.26 There would be one less car parking space than existing, however, given the sustainability of the location within cycling distance of the city centre and Addenbrooke's; and within walking distance of bus stops along Queen Edith's Way and Cherry Hinton Road, I am not concerned that this would lead to overspill parking on the public highway which would affect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

#### Construction activities

8.27 A standard condition is recommended to restrict the construction hours in order to protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

8.28 For these reasons, in my opinion the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and I consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/14.

#### Amenity for future occupiers of the site

8.29 The property would retain a good size garden which would provide adequate private amenity space for a 4-bed property. Bin and cycle storage could be provided to meet the adopted

standards, as discussed below. Therefore, in my opinion, there would be an adequate amenity for future occupiers.

- 8.30 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 3/4, 3/7 and 3/14.

### **Refuse Arrangements**

- 8.31 A bin store is proposed at the front of the site which provides space for three bins to meet the adopted guidance. A condition is recommended for details of the bin store to be submitted for approval. Subject to this condition, in my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/14.

### **Highway Safety**

- 8.32 The proposal would utilise the existing vehicle access. No concerns have been raised by the Highways Authority regarding the safety of the access point and I agree with this assessment. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

### **Car and Cycle Parking**

- 8.33 The property currently has two car parking spaces – one in the garage and the other on the driveway. The proposal involves the demolition of the garage therefore there would be a loss of one car parking space. One parking space would be retained on the driveway. In response to the Highways Authority comments, this would meet the minimum dimensions of 2.5m x 5m. The Highways Authority have commented that the proposed car parking space is practical. Therefore, the proposal complies with the maximum car parking standards and, in my opinion, is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/10.
- 8.34 The proposal includes an integrated cycle store at the front of the property. This would provide two cycle parking spaces. This is one space short of the adopted standards for four-bedroom dwellings, however in my view, there is enough space in front of the property to provide an additional cycle parking space. A

condition is recommended for details of one additional secure cycle parking space to be submitted for approval. The proposed integrated cycle store would have a double-leaf opening from which would meet the minimum 1000mm opening in the adopted guidance. While the depth of the store would be 100mm short of the guidance, the width would be 500mm greater and as such I am content that two cycles could be stored diagonally. Therefore, in my opinion, subject to the recommended condition, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/6.

### Third Party Representations

| <b>Comment</b>  | <b>Response</b>                                  |
|---|--|
| Loss of light to No. 235;   | See paragraphs 8.18 – 8.20                       |
| The proposed new extension/porch will affect light coming into the front windows of No. 235 serving a lounge.   | See paragraph 8.20                               |
| Over-looking from the proposed second storey window on the rear elevation towards the conservatory at the rear of No. 235 if the extension is built on the boundary line;   | See paragraph 8.22                               |
| Likely loss of 50-year old beech hedge at the front of the property and loss of privacy and encroachment as a result;   | See paragraphs 8.20 and 8.23                     |
| Queen Edith's Way is a green corridor leading to Addenbrooke's and the City. If building continues apace, unchecked, before too long the City will be a mass of concrete and coloured glass with oversized buildings on plots that are too small. | See paragraphs 8.3 – 8.6                         |
| Other properties in the area retain gaps between side elevation and boundary.   | See paragraph 8.5                                |
| The gutter would overhang the boundary into No. 235. Not  | These are not planning issues. An informative is |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>clear how a drainpipe could be fitted if this was built on the boundary line;</p>  | <p>recommended to advise the applicants that planning permission does not convey a right of access over neighbouring property for construction or maintenance.</p> |
| <p>Requirements for access to property from No. 235 during construction;</p>  |  |
| <p>There will be no way that the proposed extension can be maintained if it sits on the boundary line. The owners of No. 233 should be able to maintain their property within their boundary line and not expect to encroach on their neighbours' land. At least one metre clearance would be the norm. There has been no attempt to consult No. 235.</p> |  |
| <p>In light of lack of consultation with No. 235, the owners will not be agreeing to a party wall agreement if proposed by the owners of No. 233.</p>   |  |
| <p>It is not clear whether the new owners are going to live there or will be looking to let it.</p>   | <p>This is not a planning issue. The property will remain as a single dwelling which can be lawfully let without planning permission.</p>                          |
| <p>Larger houses are available for sale in the city without the need to extend No. 233.</p>   | <p>This is not a relevant planning matter.</p>   |
| <p>Clarification over the boundary line between Nos. 231 and 233.</p>   | <p>The applicant submitted revised plans to clarify the site boundary and set back the side elevation of the rear extension 200mm from the boundary.</p>           |

## 9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 In summary, in my opinion the scale, form, massing and appearance of the extensions would be in keeping with the character of the property and would not harm the appearance of Queen Edith's Way. The extensions would not have a significant adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties due to their scale and orientation. The proposal provides adequate amenity for future occupiers, in terms of bin and bike storage and car parking, subject to conditions.

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

Reason: To ensure that the extension is in keeping with the existing building. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, and 3/14)

5. No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected. The boundary treatment shall be completed in accordance with a timetable agreed in writing with 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 3/14)

6. No development shall commence until details of facilities for the covered, secure parking of one number of bicycles (in addition to the two spaces shown on the approved plans) for use in connection with the development hereby permitted have been 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 extension commences.

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

7. 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. The approved facilities shall be provided prior to the commencement of the use of the extension 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 3/14 and 4/13.

8. The window identified as having obscured glass on drawing number 233QEW 02 112 PL 16.05.2016 shall be obscure glazed to a minimum level of obscurity to conform to Pilkington Glass level 3 or equivalent prior to commencement of use of the extension and shall have restrictors to ensure that the window cannot be opened more than 45 degrees beyond the plane of the adjacent wall and shall be retained as such thereafter.

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

**INFORMATIVE:** Notwithstanding any consent granted under the relevant planning act/s, the applicant is advised that the approval of planning permission does not grant any right to construct an extension which encroaches onto another property and that they should satisfy themselves that due consideration has been given to any advice or requirements contained within The Party Wall Act 1996.