

Application Number	16/0560/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	29th March 2016	Officer	Ms Lorna Gilbert
Target Date	24th May 2016		
Ward	East Chesterton		
Site	70 Green End Road Cambridge CB4 1RY		
Proposal	Part demolition of existing mixed dwelling/guesthouse and brick built garage and erection of four residential flats.		
Applicant	Mr Luigi DeSimone 11 St Barnabas Road Cambridge CB1 2BU		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>It is considered the proposal is acceptable in terms of its context and appearance and would not adversely harm residential amenities or highway safety.</p>
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site relates to a detached residential property situated within a rectangular shaped plot, on the north east side of Green End Road.
- 1.2 To the south of the site is 72 Green End Road, a semi-detached residential property separated from the application site with a thick conifer hedge boundary. To the east of the site are Nos. 1 and 1A Nuffield Road which have relatively shallow gardens that share a common boundary with the application site. To the north, 68 Green End Road has been substantially extended with box roof dormers and a rear extension.
- 1.3 The site is not within a Conservation Area.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The application proposes the part demolition of the existing mixed dwelling/guesthouse and garage and the erection of four residential flats. Two x one bedroom flats are proposed on the ground floor and two x one bedroom flats at first floor. The proposal involves a two storey rear and side extension with a hipped roof, the introduction of a porch and two bay windows at the front of the building.
- 2.2 The rear garden includes a cycle shed and communal garden. A bin store is included in the front garden. A hedge and lawn will be introduced on part of the forecourt and one disabled car parking space is proposed.
- 2.3 An amended proposed drawing was received on 10th June 2016 which shows the relocation of the bin store to the front of the property and a new access from the rear of the building into the garden area.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
C/86/0643	Erection of two storey and single storey extension to existing dwelling house. (amended by drawings dated 14/8/86, 12/12/86, 20/07/87 and 05/10/90).	Approved with conditions
C/87/1104	Change of use from single dwelling house to part residential/part bed and breakfast accommodation.	Approved with conditions
C/01/0105	Two storey and single storey rear extension to Guest House providing 3 additional guestrooms.	Refused
C/01/1025	Single storey rear extension to Guest House to provide residential accommodation for the owner/manager; conversion of	Refused; appeal dismissed

	existing building from four guest bedrooms to 7 guest bedrooms.	
C/01/1021	Section 73 application to allow use of 70 Green End Road without compliance with condition 03 of the Planning Permission C/1104/87, namely as a guest house with 7 guest bedrooms rather than 4	Refused; appeal dismissed
12/1431/CLUED	Application for a certificate of lawfulness under Section 191 for use in multiple occupation (sui generis).	Certificate not granted
13/1669/FUL	Part demolition of the existing building and erection of seven residential flats.	Refused
14/1196/FUL	Part demolition of the existing building and erection of proposed four residential flats.	Refused, appeal dismissed

A copy of the Inspector's Decision letter in relation to the appeal (planning reference 14/1196/FUL) is attached.

4.0 PUBLICITY

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

5.0 POLICY

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

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

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

5.3 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> <p>Planning Policy Statement – Green Belt protection and intentional unauthorised development August 2015</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>
Material Considerations	<p><u>City Wide Guidance</u></p> <p>Arboricultural Strategy (2004)</p> <p>Biodiversity Checklist for Land Use Planners in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (March 2001).</p>

	<p>Cambridge Landscape and Character Assessment (2003)</p> <p>Cambridge City Nature Conservation Strategy (2006)</p> <p>Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (November 2010)</p> <p>Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2005)</p> <p>Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan (2011)</p> <p>Cambridge City Council (2011) - Open Space and Recreation Strategy</p> <p>Balanced and Mixed Communities – A Good Practice Guide (2006)</p> <p>Green Infrastructure Strategy for the Cambridgeshire Sub-Region (2006)</p> <p>Cambridge Walking and Cycling Strategy (2002)</p> <p>Cambridgeshire Design Guide For Streets and Public Realm (2007)</p> <p>Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)</p> <p>Air Quality in Cambridge – Developers Guide (2008)</p> <p>Roof Extensions Design Guide (2003)</p>
--	--

5.4 Status of Proposed Submission – Cambridge Local Plan

Planning applications should be determined in accordance with policies in the adopted Development Plan and advice set out in

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

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

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

- 6.1 The proposal seeks to justify a level of parking provision in line with Local Plan Parking Policy, which gives maximum levels of provision based upon size of dwelling unit and location. More recent guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework and the IHT guidance on best practice in car parking provision moves away from maximum levels of provision and advises that parking provision for new residential development is based upon levels of access to a private car for existing residential uses in the surrounding area. It is advised that the applicant reassess the proposed parking provision in regard to the new guidance.
- 6.2 The development may therefore impose additional parking demands upon the on-street parking on the surrounding streets and, whilst this is unlikely to result in any significant adverse impact upon highway safety, there is potentially an impact upon residential amenity which the Planning Authority may wish to consider when assessing this application.

Environmental Health

- 6.3 The development proposed is acceptable subject to the imposition of the conditions/informatives outlined below:

- construction hours
- collection during construction
- piling
- dust condition

Standard Informatives:

- dust condition informative
- contaminated land informative

Environmental Quality

Construction/demolition pollution

- 6.4 Pollution from the demolition and construction phases has the potential to affect the amenity of surrounding properties if not controlled. In the interests of amenity, I therefore recommend the standard construction/demolition/delivery hours, piling and dust conditions.

Plant noise

- 6.5 The application form indicates in section 22 that there will not be any plant, ventilation or air conditioning plant on site. Therefore a plant noise assessment is not required.

Contaminated Land

- 6.6 Historic maps and application documents have been reviewed. Records from the historic aerial photographs suggest that the site is adjacent to a former military depot present in the area during WWII. Please attach the contaminated land informative.

Consultations with Service Managers

I have consulted the following Service Managers regarding potential mitigation measures to address demands for Informal Open Space/PlaySpace, Indoor/Outdoor Sports Facilities and Community Facilities:

Development Manager (Streets and Open Spaces)

Recreation Services Manager

Community Funding Development Manager

They have not requested any mitigation measures.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

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

- 68, 72, 74, 75 Green End Road

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- There is only one car parking space proposed for four residences. There could easily be four or even more vehicles owned by the occupants. Fear they will park on the verge or on the wide pavement as is the common practice on nearby Cam Causeway.
- Do not want the hawthorn tree along the front side wall bordering the application site destroyed. This provides privacy. There is also a large laurel tree in the back next to the neighbour's patio that provides shade and privacy. Neighbour wants the trees protected.
- Previous schemes have been approved. An application was dismissed on appeal for parking reasons because of noise and disturbance to neighbours.
- There is no safe offsite parking outside as we and No.74 can only access our own driveways by a small narrow access road which has Keep Clear markings for this reason. There could at any time be 4+ occupants who own a car and any visitors. Flats like these can have a regular turnover of occupants and number of cars could vary. Is the plan to let these flats only to cyclists?

- To park outside of No.70 would be to park on the cycleway/footpath or small grassed areas along the road. This was done when the property was a guesthouse. There is a busy mini-roundabout to the left and bus stop to the right. If cars park on either of these verges our own view would be compromised going on to the main road. Use of the verge would also result in an unsightly quagmire.
- Concerned that cars parked on verges/outside the property would be dangerous for road users and inconvenient to pedestrians and cyclists. Parking on verges is unsightly and churns up verges.
- A development for flats further up the road has at least 4 car parking spaces in the front garden.
- Concerned that cars could block neighbour's property. Constant access is needed due to working variable hours. In the past No.70 residents have parked wherever suits them and often blocked access route to Nos. 72 and 74.
- Concerned that builders will use the access route as a parking bay. Does the owner have a responsibility regarding this? If not, or they are unwilling, will the Council enforce compliance with the 'Keep Clear' signs?
- Should not presume residents will use bikes instead of cars.
- Suggest remove planting at the front to accommodate more car parking spaces.
- Cambridge News dated 11/6/16 says the city council plan to make the area a safer environment for cyclists and pedestrians so therefore cars parked outside on these areas would be an obstruction to this very heavily used route.
- Original drawings submitted didn't show access from the rear of the building to the garden and distance from house of bin store.
- Unclear of the boundary by neighbours. Existing fence is in poor condition. Request condition to make the boundary secure and fencing put in place from the front-side of a neighbour's garage to the bottom of the garden.
- Neighbour's garden is a lower level – any block paving should not butt up against the neighbour's fence or garage as they have concerns over rainwater.
- The replacement of a single residential property with four flats will have an adverse impact on the character and residential amenity of Green End Road, by increasing the population density. Area remains primarily one household properties.

- Why has the bin area been changed on the amended drawing? Now there is the plan to have an access door to the rear of the property surely bins of a commercial size are better out of sight? The bins in a wooden shed in the front garden will impede our view to drive out of our garden across the cycle and footway and look unsightly.
- Plans for the rear boundary do not show whether the overgrown conifers are to remain and be trimmed to an acceptable height and maintained, or are they being removed to accommodate the cycle shed. If this is the plan will the broken fence be replaced with a secure boundary fencing of at least 1.9m high to ensure privacy and security.

7.3 Councillor Bird has requested this application be heard at committee if it is recommended for approval for the following reasons:

- My reasons relates to the consultee responses to this application from Highways (dated 7 April 2016 and 10 June 2016) in regard to levels of parking provision for new residential development, i.e. The Local Plan parking policy and the Highway Officer's comment that:

'More recent guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework and the IHT guidance on best practice in car parking provision moves away from maximum levels of provision and advises that parking provision for new residential development is based upon levels of access to a private car for existing residential uses in the surrounding area. It is advised that the applicant reassess the proposed parking provision in regard to the new guidance'.

- I consider that this raises planning issues that would be best discussed and determined at committee.

7.4 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 The provision of additional dwellings in sustainable locations is generally supported by central government advice contained within the National Planning Policy Framework 2012. Policy 5/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 allows for residential development from windfall sites, subject to the existing land use and compatibility with adjoining uses. The immediate surrounding area is predominantly residential and the site has been used as a dwelling as well as a guest house. I consider the use of the building for residential purposes would be compatible with the adjoining uses.

8.3 Local Plan policy 5/2 allows for the conversion of large properties into self-contained accommodation, except where: the residential property has a floorspace of less than 110 square metres; the likely impact upon off street car parking would be unacceptable; the proposal would fail to provide for satisfactory refuse storage or car parking; or the location of the property or the nature of nearby land uses would not offer a satisfactory level of residential amenity. The existing building on this site does not fail the floorspace criterion. An assessment of the car parking provision and impact of the proposal on neighbours is assessed in the following sections.

8.4 The principle of replacing the existing mixed dwelling/guest house with four residential flats has been considered under the

previous planning application reference 14/1196/FUL. The broad principle of development was accepted under this previous application.

Context of site, design and external spaces

- 8.5 A similar scheme was proposed under planning reference 14/1196/FUL for the proposed part demolition of the existing building and erection of four residential flats. This was refused and dismissed on appeal. It was dismissed in relation to noise and disturbance to neighbours and accessibility to amenity space.
- 8.6 The current proposed building is 1m wider and removes the rear parking from the proposal. The two storey rear extension proposed projects out 3.535m from the rear building whereas on the previous application the two storey rear projection extended out 3.5m. The previous permission had a two storey front projection and the property's length at ground floor level was 16.03m. For the current application the proposal has two x two storey projecting bay windows and a single storey porch. At ground floor level it has a total length of 15.9m.
- 8.7 I consider the proposed design and appearance of the proposed scheme in comparison to the previous scheme reference 14/1196/FUL to be reasonably similar. The introduction of two x two storey bay windows and single storey porch area are considered acceptable in terms of their appearance and I consider it would harmonise with the surrounding properties along Green End Road in terms of its scale and design.
- 8.8 The proposal introduces some soft landscaping at the front of the property in the form of a grassed area and hedgerow which helps to break up the hard landscaping area. The rear garden contains a grassed area and hedges. I consider this is acceptable in terms of its appearance. It is unclear what boundary treatment is proposed but I recommend the inclusion of a condition if the application were to be approved.
- 8.9 Full details of the bin and bike stores have not been provided. I recommend a condition be included if the application were to be approved for further details such as of materials and appearance of the stores.

- 8.10 The amended drawing submitted provides access from the rear of the property to the rear garden and has moved the bin store to the front garden. These amendments will make it easier to access the bike store from the main house rather than having to walk around from the front of the building. I consider the location of the bin store in the front garden is acceptable in principle.
- 8.11 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/14.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.12 The previous appeal against refusal of application reference 14/1196/FUL was dismissed due to noise and disturbance to neighbours from the proposed car parking arrangement at the rear. It was also dismissed due to accessibility of the occupiers to the outdoor space.
- 8.13 The applicant has sought to overcome these issues with this current planning application and the amended drawing submitted. The car parking area has been removed from the rear of the property and the area to the side of the property reduced in width from 3m to 2m. The Planning Inspector had raised concern in particular with noise and disturbance suffered in the gardens of Nos. 1 and 1a Nuffield Road with the previous application 14/1196/FUL. The 2m wide area to the side of the property makes it practically difficult to gain vehicular access to the rear garden but not impossible. I therefore recommend the inclusion of a condition to prevent such movements should the application be approved. I consider this noise issue has been addressed in this current application and the proposal would not lead to unreasonable levels of noise to neighbours due to the removal of the car parking to the rear.
- 8.14 Policy 5/2 of the Local Plan 2006 explains that the conversion of single residential properties and conversion of non-residential buildings into self-contained dwellings will be permitted if the likely impact upon on-street parking would be unacceptable, the living accommodation would be unsatisfactory and it fails to provide for satisfactory refuse bin storage or cycle parking and

the location of the property or nature of nearby land uses would not offer a satisfactory level of residential amenity.

- 8.15 The proposal provides one on-site car parking space. A number of objections have been raised with respect to the amount of car parking spaces provided for the four flats. Concerns have been raised over vehicles parking along the verge outside the site, on the pavement and cycle path or nearby access road and obstructing visibility for vehicle users.
- 8.16 The comments raised are noted. The flats are designed as one bedroom units and parking demands tend to be lesser for smaller units compared to family properties. However, it is noted that some residents or visitors may wish to use a vehicle. The car parking standards are maximum standards and in this regard the proposal complies. However, if the Planning Committee decides additional car parking should be provided at the front of the property, another space could potentially be accommodated on site providing it is acceptable to the Highway Authority for highway safety reasons. The proposed grassed area and hedgerow could be reconfigured. It would be beneficial to add soft landscaping buffering in front of the front living room windows. A condition could be required for further details of the front of the property to provide additional parking if the Planning Committee feels this to be necessary.
- 8.17 There is some variation to the location of proposed windows at No.70 Green End Road compared to the previous scheme. The kitchen and shower rooms have switched position on the current scheme on the side elevations. Velux sun tunnels have also been added to the roof. Bay windows have been introduced to the front elevation. I do not consider the proposed windows would lead to a loss of privacy to neighbouring properties due to their position.
- 8.18 The current proposed building is 1m wider than the previous scheme towards No.72 Green End Road. A 2m gap is provided between the proposed building and the shared boundary. This neighbouring property is set in 4m from the shared boundary. I consider the proposal would not result in a loss of light or outlook from this neighbouring dwelling which is located south of the proposed building.

- 8.19 The impact of the proposed building on No.68 Green End Road has been considered in the previous planning application (14/1196/FUL). This report states that *'I do not consider that it would cause unreasonable overshadowing to No.68'*. I agree with these comments due to the location of the windows at this neighbouring property and position of the proposed building. I also consider this neighbour would not be harmed in terms of outlook.
- 8.20 Environmental Health has requested the inclusion of a number of construction, piling and dust conditions. I agree with the inclusion of these conditions to ensure neighbours' amenities are protected during the construction phase if planning permission is granted.
- 8.21 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 4/13.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

- 8.22 The appeal for the previous application was partly refused on the accessibility to the outdoor space from the flats. No rear door was provided that linked the flats to the rear garden. Instead they were forced to use the front door of the building to reach the rear outdoor space.
- 8.23 The amended drawing for this current application has provided a door at the rear of the building to the rear garden which all flats are able to use. This makes it easier to reach the outdoor amenity space and bike store. I consider this revision to the current scheme has overcome the Planning Inspector's concerns.
- 8.24 Ground floor flat 2 has a living room at the front of the building and bedroom to the rear. Neither of these rooms have any landscaping buffer area to prevent people walking directly past these windows. I consider a landscaping condition be included if the application were to be approved to ensure details of soft landscaping buffer areas are provided.

8.25 I consider the standard of accommodation and communal garden space to be acceptable for the four x one bedroom flats.

8.26 In my opinion the proposal provides a high-quality living environment and an appropriate standard of residential amenity for future occupiers, and I consider that in this respect it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/14.

Refuse Arrangements

8.27 A bin storage area has been provided at the front of the property. I consider its position to be acceptable for occupants to use. I recommend the inclusion of a condition for details of the bin store if the application were to be approved.

8.28 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

Highway Safety

8.29 The Highway Authority states that the *'development may therefore impose additional parking demands upon the on-street parking on the surrounding streets and, whilst this is unlikely to result in any significant adverse impact upon highway safety, there is potentially an impact upon residential amenity which the Planning Authority may wish to consider'*

8.30 The proposed site plan shows sufficient space for a car to reverse on site before exiting and avoids a vehicle having to reverse out on to the highway. I consider the car parking arrangement would not impinge on highway safety.

8.31 A neighbour has raised concern over the height and location of the bin store and that it would harm visibility when they exit the site by vehicle. I recommend details of the bin store are dealt with by way of condition and the Highways Authority be consulted.

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

Car parking:

- 8.33 The Highways Authority has not objected to the proposal. However it has highlighted the recent guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework and the Institution of Highways and Transportation (IHT) guidance on best practice in car parking provision.
- 8.34 The National Planning Policy Framework 2012 states that ‘if setting local parking standards for residential and non-residential development, local planning authorities should take into account:
- The accessibility of the development*
 - The type, mix and use of the development*
 - The availability of and opportunities for public transport*
 - Local car ownership levels and*
 - An overall need to reduce the use of high-emission vehicles’*
- 8.35 The National Planning Policy Framework refers to setting parking standards as set out in the paragraph above. The application proposes one bedroom flats and therefore not family units. There is public transport available within walking distance from the site and cycle storage is provided on site to try to encourage cycling. It is noted many residents nearby own cars, with many properties having an on-site parking provision. The limited car parking available on site could potentially discourage vehicle ownership and therefore emissions level although it is recognised this may not be the case.
- 8.36 The IHT guidance is a technical guidance note but is not adopted planning policy and does not carry the same weight as the Local Plan 2006.
- 8.37 Appendix C (Car Parking Standards) of the Local Plan 2006 says *‘the standards set out in this document define the maximum levels of car parking that Cambridge City Council, as a Local Planning Authority, will permit. These levels should not be exceeded but may be reduced where lower car use can reasonably be expected.’*
- 8.38 The provision of one bedroom flats in close proximity to public transport options is unlikely to generate high demands for on-site car parking and therefore the provision of one car parking

space is considered acceptable for the site. However, paragraph 8.16 does highlight that a condition could be included to reconfigure the front garden area if the Planning Committee would prefer to see additional car parking on site.

- 8.39 Comments have been made regarding the potential for vehicles and construction vehicles to park on the verge, cycleway, path and access road. If vehicles park in these areas this can be enforced by the Police.
- 8.40 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10.

Third Party Representations

- 8.41 Most of the third party representations have been addressed above, particularly regarding the level and detail of car parking proposed and highway safety.
- 8.42 A neighbour is concerned that trees at their property could be harmed during construction. The application site and neighbouring properties are not within a conservation area and the trees are not subject to tree preservation orders. The proposed extensions to the house are set in at least 0.3m from the boundary with the neighbours. As the trees referred to are not protected I do not consider it appropriate to require a tree protection condition for this proposal.
- 8.43 A neighbour is concerned that block paving is proposed up to the boundary with their property. The application proposes permeable paving and therefore I do not consider this would adversely impact on neighbours in terms of surface water run-off.

Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

- 8.44 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.

8.45 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.

8.46 I have consulted the service managers who are responsible for the delivery of projects to offset the impact of development. They have not requested any contributions for this scheme.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 I consider the proposal overcomes the issues raised in the previous appeal dismissed under reference 14/1196/FUL. I also consider the on-site car parking provision to be acceptable as in my opinion it would satisfy the requirements of the Local Plan 2006.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. No construction work or demolition work shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours and 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

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

5. There should be no collection or deliveries to the site during the demolition and construction stages outside the hours of 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours to 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

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

6. In the event of the foundations for the proposed development requiring piling, prior to the development taking place the applicant shall provide the local authority with a report / method statement for approval detailing the type of piling and mitigation measures to be taken to protect local residents from noise and/or vibration. Potential noise and vibration levels at the nearest noise sensitive locations shall be predicted in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228-1&2:2009 Code of Practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Due to the proximity of this site to existing residential premises and other noise sensitive premises, impact pile driving is not recommended.

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

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

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

8. 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 3/12)

9. No development shall take place until full details of 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. Details are required of the soft landscaping proposed by the front lounge/dining room and rear bedroom windows.

Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity and to ensure that suitable hard and soft landscape is provided as part of the development. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11 and 3/12)

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

Reason: To ensure appropriate provision for the secure storage of bicycles and bin storage and to ensure the stores complement the site and street in terms of their appearance. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/4, 3/7, 5/2 and 8/6)

11. There shall be no manoeuvring or stationing of vehicles to the side or rear of 70 Green End Road, Cambridge.

Reason: to protect the residential amenity of neighbouring residents (Local Plan policy 4/13)