

Application Number	16/0641/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	11th April 2016	Officer	Charlotte Burton
Target Date	11th July 2016		
Ward	Coleridge		
Site	68 - 80 Perne Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3RR		
Proposal	Residential development comprising 8 x 3 bedroom houses, 5 x 1 bedroom apartments and 1 x 2 bedroom apartment, formation of access including demolition of no. 74 Perne Road, landscaping, open space, drainage and supporting infrastructure.		
Applicant	Mr Robert Wheatley And Milton Nutt 26 St Andrew Street Hertford SG14 1JA		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>The proposal would deliver 14 new units which would contribute to meeting housing demand in the city, including a mix of family homes and apartments</p> <p>The proposal would have some overshadowing and enclosing impact on neighbouring properties, however this would not have a significant adverse impact on residential amenity</p> <p>The proposal would not harm the character of the area in terms of the design of the units or the loss of any features of high amenity value</p>
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The site comprises the easternmost part of the rear gardens of Nos. 68-80 (even) Perne Road. The site is 'T'-shaped and includes the whole curtilages of Nos. 74 and 76 Perne Road. The site is currently laid out as gardens with some mature trees and planting, as well as some outbuildings.
- 1.2 Nos. 68-80 (even) Perne Road would retain a rear garden approximately 25m long. This includes several outbuildings and annexes, including along the southern boundary of No. 78 and along the northern side of No. 72. There are also some outbuildings at the rear part of the garden of No. 70.
- 1.3 To the north is the rear garden of No. 82 Perne Road. This property has a long rear garden and the part adjacent to the application site is currently used for composting and growing vegetables. There is an existing low hedge along the boundary. To the south of the site is the rear garden of No. 66 Perne Road which is occupied by an outbuilding. The Perne Road properties have a long curtilage measuring approximately 80m from the front of the site.
- 1.4 The rear of the site backs onto the rear of the properties along Chalmers Road to the east. These are semi-detached two-storey properties, some of which have been extended and have outbuildings at the rear, not all of which are shown on the applicant's drawings. These properties have reasonably long gardens measuring approximately 28m from the general building line of the main houses. There is currently planting along the boundary.
- 1.5 The site is not within a conservation area. There are no listed buildings or buildings of local interest on the site or within the vicinity. There are no tree preservation orders on the site and the site has not been identified as being of any nature conservation importance. The site is outside the controlled parking zone and the air quality management area.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposal is for residential development comprising 8 x 3-bedroom semi-detached houses and an apartment block

containing 5 x 1-bedroom apartments and 1 x 2-bedroom apartment. It includes formation of an access following demolition of no. 74 Perne Road, and associated landscaping, open space, drainage and supporting infrastructure. The proposal includes alterations to No. 76 Perne Road which would become a detached property and the erection of a workshop in the rear garden of No. 76.

- 2.2 The site would be laid out in a 'T'-shape with the semi-detached houses along the eastern part and the apartment block on the south west corner. There would be a shared surface access from Perne Road opening to turning heads on either side. Car parking would be on-plot or within small parking courts. Cycle and bin storage would be in the rear gardens of the houses and within a communal store on the ground floor of the apartment block. Soft landscaping is proposed within the site, including in the north west and south west corners and along the site access.
- 2.3 The semi-detached houses would be two storeys plus an attic storey including large dormers and roof terraces. The apartment block would be two storeys plus an attic storey on the northern half and two storeys with a roof terrace on the southern half. The buildings would have pitched roofs and gable ends. The external materials would be red brick with stone parapet copings, natural silver standing seam zinc roof and dormers with glazed balustrades, and aluminum windows and timber panels. The design would be contemporary.
- 2.4 The proposal includes works to No. 76 which would be converted from a semi-detached property to detached following demolition of No. 74. The works include altering the hipped roof to a gable, the insertion of roof lights on the front elevation, making good the side (southern) elevation, a single storey rear extension and insertion of a rear dormer. The works would reuse the bricks from the demolished No. 74 so that the appearance would match the existing.
- 2.5 During the course of the application, two sets of revised plans were submitted to address officer concerns and third party representations. These are summarised as follows:

Revision 1

- 2.6 Amendments to address comments from the Urban Design Team, Landscape Officer and Highways Authority including:
- Reorientation of the apartment block and amendments to the elevations
 - Additional landscaping to the west of the apartment block
 - Change from buff brick to red brick throughout
 - Increasing the radius of the kerbs at the site entrance
 - Small changes to the design of No. 76 Perne Road.
- 2.7 The revision included a proposed outbuilding at the rear of No. 76. The building would be single storey to an eaves height of 2.5m and a pitched roof to a maximum height of 4m. It would be constructed of brick with windows only on the southern elevation.

Revision 2

- 2.8 Amendments to the rear elevation of the semi-detached houses were submitted to address concerns about overlooking towards the rear of the Chalmers Road properties. These comprised amendments to the first floor windows to change them from full height windows to oriel windows with a timber obscured panel on one side.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

- 3.1 There is no relevant planning history for the application site.

4.0 PUBLICITY

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

5.0 POLICY

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

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN		POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Plan 2006	Local	3/1, 3/4, 3/7, 3/8, 3/10, 3/11, 3/12, 3/14 4/3, 4/4, 4/6, 4/13, 4/14, 4/15 5/1, 5/5, 5/9, 5/10 8/2, 8/3, 8/4, 8/5, 8/6, 8/7, 8/10, 8/11, 8/16, 8/18 10/1

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework March 2012 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014
Supplementary Planning Guidance	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012) Planning Obligation Strategy (March 2010) Public Art (January 2010)
Material Considerations	<u>City Wide Guidance</u> Biodiversity Checklist for Land Use Planners in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (March 2001).

	<p>Cambridge Landscape and Character Assessment (2003)</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>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>
	<p><u>Area Guidelines</u></p> <p>Cambridge City Council (2002)–Eastern Corridor Area Transport Plan.</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

6.1 Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

Initial comment

Objection.

The proposal intensifies the use of an existing access, requiring the relocation of a bus stop. The proposed bus stop location is opposite an existing tee junction and immediately adjacent to the junction of the access to the development, within the visibility splay. Perne Road functions as a section of the City's Ring Road and carries very high levels of traffic, including a high proportion of non-motorised users. The Highway Authority therefore recommends that the proposal be refused planning permission due to the impact upon the safe and efficient operation of the public highway. Please note that it may be possible to overcome this objection by relocating the bus stop to a different location.

For the number of dwellings served by the access the Highway Authority would normally seek an adopted public highway, however the layout of the junction and access way is such that the Highway Authority would be unable to accept the road for adoption without significant changes to the layout and construction. The developer proposes the use of 4 metre radius kerbs at the access. This must be increased to 6 metres in the interests of highway safety, given the nature of Perne Road.

Comment on revision 1

The junction radii have been increased to 6 metres, to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority. Despite the alteration of the access radii the Highway Authority would still not accept the layout as being suitable for adoption. This should be brought to the attention of the developer and an appropriate informative added to any permission that the Planning Authority may be minded to grant in regard to this proposal.

The relocation of a bus stop is still required. I recommend that an alternative location is found, at least in principle, for the bus stop and that this issue is resolved as far as is practicably possible, prior to determination.

Recommended conditions:

- future management and maintenance of highway;
- detailed plans of the roads, footways, cycleways, foul and surface water drainage
- construction of highway works prior to occupation
- no gates to be erected across the approved access
- minimum access width
- vehicular access to be laid out prior to occupation
- surfaces to be laid out prior to occupation
- visibility splay to be laid out prior to occupation
- kerbs to be laid out prior to occupation
- no overhanging the public highway
- access to be constructed with adequate drainage measures
- bus stop to be relocated
- informative – works on public highway
- informative – copy of management company constitution and details of funding for maintenance

Additional comment in response to third party comments

There is no published or adopted scheme for Perne Road under the Cambridge City Deal. There would be no policy basis for reconsidering the proposal on those grounds. The development, for 14 dwellings, would, at worst, be anticipated to generate 70 motor vehicle movements (two-way) in a 24 hour day. 10% of these would be anticipated to occur in peak hours, i.e. 7 movements. The level of disruption on the network resultant from

this would not, in my opinion, be demonstrable as “severe” and so I do not feel an objection on those grounds could be sustained. In practice, generation of motor traffic in Cambridge tends to be less than the figures quoted above; they are rough figures for a worst case scenario.

6.2 Environmental Health

Initial comment

No objection. Recommended conditions/informatives:

- construction hours
- collection during construction
- construction/demolition noise/vibration & piling
- dust condition
- plant noise insulation
- external lighting
- plant noise insulation informative
- dust condition informative
- contaminated land informative

Comments on revision 1

A condition is recommended to ensure the workshop use is ancillary to the residential use of No. 76 Perne Road only.

6.3 Refuse and Recycling

Where bin stores are located away from the public highway the developer and future managing agent and/or householders must accept that the collection authority (Local Authority) will not be held responsible for any damage caused to that access road by its use thereof. Refuse collection vehicles (RCVs) weigh a minimum of 26 tonnes, (up to 32 tonnes) are dual steering and multi-axled. They are 11m long and 2.50m wide. It is the responsibility of the developer/managing agent/householders to maintain the access road to a standard suitable for such regular vehicular access. Should that standard be deemed unacceptable by the collection authority it reserves the right not to access the site and the responsibility (“*Duty of Care*”) remains with the householders/managing agents/developers to present the bins for collection on or near (<10m) the public highway.

6.4 Urban Design and Conservation Team

Initial comments

Objection.

The principle of residential accommodation, number of units and proposed scale and massing is acceptable in design terms. As raised at pre-application stages the following amendments are need to the width of the footpaths and design of the flat block before the application can be fully supported:

1. Ensure the paths to Plot 1 and Plot 8 achieve a minimum of 1.2m width;
2. The flat block needs to be re-orientated to improve the relationship to the communal amenity space. Access and security to the amenity space needs to be resolved.

Recommended conditions:

- Materials samples
- Details of non-masonry walling systems etc.
- Full details of wall windows
- Boiler flues, soil pipes, waste pipes or air extract trunking, etc,

Comments on revision 1

The changes to the elevations of the flat block as a result of its re-orientation on the site are acceptable in design terms. The amendments to the elevations are acceptable in design terms. The shadow studies show the BRE requirement for sunlight would be met for the neighbouring gardens and the proposed communal space.

Recommended conditions:

- Sample panel of facing brickwork

Comments on revision 2

The introduction of projecting oriel windows (serving bedrooms) on the rear elevation of Plots 1-8 are acceptable in design terms and reduce potential overlooking to the rear gardens of houses in Chalmers Road.

Recommended conditions:

- The detailed design of the windows should be provided as part of a materials condition.

6.5 **Senior Sustainability Officer (Design and Construction)**

No objection. Recommended condition:

- Renewable energy statement

6.6 **Tree Team**

No comment.

6.7 **Landscape Team**

Initial comment

It is not clear how the buffer planting between the apartment block and the retained houses on Perne Road will be achieved, managed or maintained. As they are essentially off-site on land under the ownership of others, there is risk that any planting would be removed or altered. We feel that buffering in this location is important as the apartment block elevations include bedroom windows and external terraces. (We note the design of the terraces which limit overlooking) To protect both tenants and the Perne Road residents from overlooking and to retain privacy, a buffer including tree planting would be recommended as part of any approved application. We note the statement which identifies that affected, existing residents are aware of and supportive of the proposals. Please clarify how these buffers will be achieved and who would be responsible for their maintenance.

The path which leads to the apartment block bike store is less than a metre wide when measured from the plan provided. This needs to be wider to better accommodate a cycle being walked. Refer to the Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (Feb 2010).

Comments on revision 1

No objection. Recommended conditions:

- Hard and soft landscaping
- Boundary treatments

6.8 **Walking and Cycling Officer**

No comment.

6.9 **Sustainable Drainage Officer**

Initial comments

Objection . As it stands, it has not been adequately demonstrated that there are suitable drainage proposals or that flood risk will not be increased by the development proposals.

Additional comment on flood risk assessment

No objection.

The proposals have demonstrated that there should be no impact on Anglian Water's existing infrastructure. Sufficient calculations have been provided to demonstrate that the development can accommodate a 1 in 100 year event plus 40% for climate change. A management and maintenance plan should be included with the application. High groundwater and surface water flooding issues have been dealt with by the introduction of under-drained swales.

Recommended condition:

- management and maintenance plan for surface water drainage scheme

6.10 **Nature Conservation Officer**

No objection. Area considered to of low potential for bats.

Recommended conditions:

- Controlled demolition
- Details of external lighting scheme
- Details of bird and bat boxes
- Details of boundaries

6.11 **Highways England**

No objection.

6.12 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:

Community facilities

It is proposed that the council requests £20,710 (based on the funding formula set out in the council's Planning Obligations Strategy 2010). This proposed development is within around 170 metres of the Lichfield Road Community Hall facility, which is on the council's 2016/17 'target list' of facilities for which specific S106 contributions will be sought. The community facilities audit (2016) highlights that the capacity of this facility needs to be improved to mitigate the impact of local development, like that proposed by this planning application. So far, the council has agreed zero specific contributions for this project so there is still scope for this contribution (and up to 4 others) to be requested.

£20,710 – Towards the provision and / or improvement of the facilities (inc kitchen, toilets, storage and furniture and equipment) at Lichfield Road Community Hall.

Indoor sports

It is proposed that the council requests £8,204.50 (based on the funding formula set out in the council's Planning Obligations Strategy 2010). This proposed development is within around 2/3 of a mile of the Netherhall School, which is on the council's 2016/17 'target list' of facilities for which specific S106 contributions will be sought. The indoor sports audit (2016) highlights that the capacity of this facility needs to be improved to mitigate the impact of local development, like that proposed by this planning application. So far, the council has agreed zero specific contributions for this project so there is still scope for this contribution (and up to 4 others) to be requested.

£8,204.50 – Towards the provision of a new floor for the sports hall and/or sports changing room facility improvements at Netherhall School.

Outdoor sports

It is proposed that the council requests £7,259 (based on the funding formula set out in the council's Planning Obligations Strategy 2010). This proposed development is within around 1/3 of a mile of the Coleridge Rec pavilion facility, which is on the council's 2016/17 'target list' of facilities for which specific S106 contributions will be sought. The outdoor sports audit (2016) highlights that the capacity of this facility needs to be improved to mitigate the impact of local development, like that proposed by this planning application. So far, the council has 1 proposed specific contribution for this project so there is still scope for this contribution (and up to 3 others) to be requested.

£7,259 – Towards the provision and/or improvement of outdoor sports pitches and changing rooms at Coleridge Recreation Ground.

Informal open space

It is proposed that the council requests £7,381 (based on the funding formula set out in the council's Planning Obligations Strategy 2010). This proposed development is within around 640 metres of the Coleridge Recreation ground facility, which is on the council's 2016/17 'target list' of facilities for which specific S106 contributions will be sought. The informal open space audit (2016) highlights that the capacity of this facility needs to be improved to mitigate the impact of local development, like that proposed by this planning application. So far, the council has proposed 1 specific contribution for this project so there is still scope for this contribution (and up to 3 others) to be requested.

£7,381 – Towards the provision and/or improvement of and/or access to Informal Open Space at Coleridge Recreation Ground (including creation of wildflower meadows, paths, information boards, new seating and general planting of new features).

Play provision for children and teenagers

It is proposed that the council requests £7,268 (based on the funding formula set out in the council's Planning Obligations Strategy 2010). This proposed development is within around 250 metres of the Lichfield Road Recreation Ground play area, which

is on the council's 2016/17 'target list' of facilities for which specific S106 contributions will be sought. The play area audit (2016) highlights that the capacity of this facility needs to be improved to mitigate the impact of local development, like that proposed by this planning application. So far, the council has agreed zero specific contributions for this project so there is still scope for this contribution (and up to 4 others) to be requested.

£7,268 – Towards the provision of and / or improvements of the Lichfield Road Recreation Ground play area.

6.13 **Cambridgeshire County Council (Growth & Economy Cambridgeshire County Council)**

The County Council will not be seeking contributions for 68 - 80 Perne Road towards education provision as the development will generate a low number of children.

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

7.0 **REPRESENTATIONS**

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

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 29 Chalmers Road | <input type="checkbox"/> 17 Langham Road |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 32 Chalmers Road | <input type="checkbox"/> 22 Langham Road |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 36 Chalmers Road | <input type="checkbox"/> 30 Langham Road |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 38 Chalmers Road | <input type="checkbox"/> 56 Langham Road |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 40 Chalmers Road | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 Gisborne Road |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 42 Chalmers Road | <input type="checkbox"/> 22 Gisborne Road |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 44 Chalmers Road | <input type="checkbox"/> 70 Cromwell Road |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 48 Chalmers Road | <input type="checkbox"/> 28 High Street, Bourn |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 50 Chalmers Road | <input type="checkbox"/> Unaddressed comments |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 62 Perne Road | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 64 Perne Road | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 66 Perne Road | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 82 Perne Road | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 22 Perne Avenue | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 63 Perne Avenue | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 6 Langham Road | |

7.2 No representations have been received in support of the proposal.

7.3 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Principle of development

- Appreciate the significant demand for increased housing in Cambridge.
- The development is unwanted.
- Overdevelopment of the site.
- Extreme example of "garden grabbing".
- Likely to set an unwelcomed precedent for development in rear gardens.

Residential amenity

- The plans are inaccurate and do not show the rear extensions and outbuildings at the Chalmers Road properties.
- Overlooking, overshadowing and loss of outlook impact on Chalmers Road properties due to scale, massing and proximity of rear elevations and windows and small gardens.
- Overlooking from roof terraces of apartment building towards neighbouring gardens.
- Proposal for bin store against the boundary with Chalmers Road properties will cause pollution to gardens.
- The proposed development would add car pollution, noise and security risks.
- Impact of noise pollution and dust pollution whilst the building works are carried out, including health risks.
- Street lighting and access to the rear of Chalmers Road properties, thus creating more security risk.
- The gardens of the 3 bed houses are small for family living and prone to damp, bogging and poor drainage, and the lack of other amenities in the development for young families shows poor consideration for the future occupants.
- Resultant gardens of Nos. 76 and 78 Perne Road would be very restricted and already have annexes.

Response to context

- The greenbelt and gardens should be kept.

- Any development on these gardens would represent over-development of the site and would be out of character with surrounding area.
- The density of the development is inappropriate for the area and seems overdeveloped for the space available.
- Demolition of a very attractive 1930s semi-detached property.
- The 3-storey houses and 3-storey apartment block would be significantly detrimental to the character and design of this area. The style and design of the proposed buildings does not complement the surrounding houses.
- The use of light silver standing seam zinc roofing, gabled windows in the roof line, full length windows and Cambridge white bricks would make the buildings look out-of-keeping.
- The apartment block would be entirely ill-fitting to the surrounding area and higher than the surrounding properties with a roof terrace.
- New road junction is not in keeping with the surrounding area.

Highway safety

- Perne Road already suffers from severe traffic congestion in both directions and is an accident 'blackspot'. The proposed development will increase congestion along Perne Road both from the traffic from the development and from vehicles on Perne Rd trying to turn right onto the development, and increase risk of accidents.
- The traffic investigations took place in school holidays which does not represent normal traffic conditions, and does not appear to include the increase in traffic volumes, speeding and accidents.
- A count by third parties at rush hour traffic during the summer in both directions counted approximately 1000 vehicles per hour: approximately 250 bicycles per hour: approximately 110 pedestrians per hour. During the winter many more vehicles and darker morning/evenings to contend with.
- Increased congestion along Perne Road will create problems for ambulances coming to and from Addenbrookes Hospital using this route, compromising the lives of city residents.
- The new access and overspill car parking on verges will break the continuous stretch of pavement/cycle path which

provides a safe route for pedestrians and cyclists along Perne Road.

- Impact from construction vehicles on traffic congestion and highway safety.
- The new access would create a staggered junction opposite Perne Avenue which poses an increased safety risk to traffic using Perne Road and adjacent streets.
- Unless large vehicles (e.g. refuse collection vehicles) can go into the access road, bins would be left on the footpath which would block access. Perne Road would not be able to accommodate the number of additional bins proposed.
- The proposed single track access is inadequate for the number of proposed dwellings and would block the entrance should a car already be waiting to turn in or out leading to more congestion on Perne Road.
- The Highways Authority comment that moving the bus stop will overcome the objection is somewhat conflicting as moving the bus stop will not change the "deterioration in the efficiency of the road".
- Approval of these plans would be presumptuous at a time when a broader traffic solution for Cambridge is being developed and would not fit stated intentions to encourage cycling, walking and use of public transport.
- The Highways Authority unwillingness to adopt the access road indicates it is ill thought out, inappropriate for the number of dwellings and suggests overdevelopment of the land for this access road and location.
- If the Highways Authority do not adopt the access, who would be responsible for maintenance of the road?
- No consideration for emergency and service vehicle access.

Car parking

- Inadequate car parking spaces. 18 car parking spaces for 14 dwellings is not a realistic assessment of need. One car parking space for visitors / tradespeople is not enough.
- Car parking spaces 3 and 9 are not valid spaces as they are one behind the other, thus rendering them inaccessible. Spaces 5, 6, 7 and 8 would be compromised too.
- No integral car parking for House Type A or the apartment block.
- Inadequate parking will mean more cars being parked in Perne Avenue at the Perne Road end, impacting on access and an overspill parking on nearby roads.

- Due to tiny garden plots, storage in the property would be limited, therefore those with garages may be likely to use them for storage and not for car parking.
- Overspill parking or visitors parking on the road outside the houses would cause more noise pollution to the residents and would block emergency access for Fire engines/emergency services, particularly those in House Type A.

Drainage

- Increased hard surfaces and buildings will have a negative effect on the already high water table with clay subsoil due to loss of natural soak-away garden space and trees.
- A separate report commissioned indicates the site is at "... high risk of surface water flooding". The modeling is in direct conflict with the application submission.
- Water will drain to the east, an area which already has problems with surface water drainage at times of heavy rainfall.
- To proposal will add stress on the existing surface water sewers.

Ecology

- Several mature and semi mature trees would be destroyed.
- Sparrowhawk nesting in trees, woodpeckers, kingfishers, herons, owls, bats and squirrels as well as ground animals such as frogs, toads, hedgehogs, foxes and deer seen within the gardens.
- The loss of gardens and noise and disturbances will be detrimental for wildlife.
- Loss of important wildlife corridor.

Landscaping

- No plans to replace any of the trees at the Chalmers Residents boundary.
- Unclear about the proposed boundary treatment along the boundary with No. 82.

Refuse

- Bin storage at the rear of the property would make more noise for residents including bin smells and potential disposal issues.
- Bin store will certainly not have the space for the green, blue and black bins alongside bicycles.

Comments on revision 1

- Do not address the concerns of local residents.
- No changes have been made to the direct overlooking into neighbouring properties.

Other

- Numerous errors in the planning application including inaccurate measurements.
- The demolition of No. 74 Perne Road may cause subsidence or groundwork issues which may affect whether No. 76 is able to stand alone.
- Unclear whether the proposal is to demolish No. 78 Perne Road or No. 74 Perne Road.
- Covenants restrict building and use of the land which the proposal contravenes.
- The catchment schools are already oversubscribed.
- The plans don't clearly show the annexes at Nos. 76 and 78 Perne Road which already increase the housing density in this area.
- Will the applicants be paying compensation to the occupants of Chalmers Road?
- Are the City Council the purchasers?

7.5 Councillor Herbert requested that the application be called into planning committee on the following grounds:

- Inadequate drainage in an area with a dangerously high winter water table.
- Overdevelopment, particularly the damage to the provision of amenities and overall design acceptability caused by the excess development of adding the block.
- Inadequate transport and access proposals including for the new road junction which should, if it proceeds at all be a single signalled four way junction with Perne Avenue.

- Inadequate communal space for the flats.
- Expected use of houses as shared homes given that proposed gardens do not meet the needs of families with children.
- Consequential lack of parking compared to the expected 25+ car owners.

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.

7.7 There is an outstanding public consultation on the revision 2 amendments which is due to end on 23 September. I will report on any representations received in the amendments sheet.

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 site, design and external spaces
4. Residential amenity
5. Flooding and drainage
6. Ecology
7. Renewable energy and sustainability
8. Refuse arrangements
9. Highway safety
10. Car parking
11. Cycle parking
12. Public art
13. Third party representations
14. Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

Principle of Development

8.2 The Government's planning policy – the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) - places strong emphasis on the need to deliver a wide choice of high quality homes. Paragraph 49 states that 'housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development'. For decision-taking, this presumption means

‘approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay’ (para 14).

- 8.3 The site is for residential development on an unallocated site and therefore Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 5/1 applies. This supports residential development on windfall sites subject to the existing land use and the compatibility with adjoining uses. The site is currently in residential use as garden and for the reasons given in this report, I consider the proposal is compatible with adjoining uses. Therefore, in my opinion, the proposal is compliant with policy 5/1 and the principle of development is acceptable.
- 8.4 Policy 3/10 for the sub-division of existing plots also applies. This supports residential development within the garden area or curtilage of existing properties unless it will:
- a. Have a significant adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties through loss of privacy, loss of light, an overbearing sense of enclosure and the generation of unreasonable levels of traffic or noise disturbance;
 - b. provide inadequate amenity space, or vehicular access arrangements and parking spaces for the proposed and existing properties;
 - c. detract from the prevailing character and appearance of the area;
 - d. adversely affect the setting of Listed Buildings, or buildings or gardens of local interest within or close to the site;
 - e. adversely affect trees, wildlife features or architectural features of local importance located within or close to the site; and
 - f. prejudice the comprehensive development of the wider area of which the site forms part.
- 8.5 This report considers criteria a, b and c in detail below. Criteria d, e and f are not relevant to this proposal. In summary, in my opinion, the proposal is compliant with these and therefore meets policy 3/10 and the principle of development is acceptable. For the reasons outlined in this report, in my opinion, the proposal accords with the relevant development plan policies, and therefore the ‘presumption in favour of sustainable development’ in the Government’s planning policy applies.

Affordable housing

- 8.6 Policy 5/5 states that on sites of 0.5 ha or more and all developments including an element of housing which have 15 or more dwellings, the Council will seek affordable housing of 40% or more of the dwellings or an equivalent site area. The proposal is for 14 units on a site area of 0.28 ha and therefore does not trigger the requirement for affordable housing. Given the site constraints, I am content that the proposal does not represent under-development. For these reasons, in my opinion, the current application for 14 units is acceptable and does not conflict with policy 5/5.

Context of site, design and external spaces

Response to context

- 8.7 The site is located between Perne Road and Chalmers Road. These are characterised by semi-detached 1930's properties fronting the roads with rear gardens. The Perne Road properties have particularly long rear gardens which are longer than many on similar streets within the wider area. The gardens of the Chalmers Road properties are shorter and more typical for the area. Many of the properties along Perne Road and Chalmers Road have been extended at the rear and have single storey outbuildings.
- 8.8 The site occupies a backland position and does not have a street frontage. There are several examples of backland development in the area between Perne Road and Chalmers Road, including three detached properties on 'The Spinney' accessed from Birdwood Road. There is also a bungalow at the rear of Nos. 90-96 which has been constructed. While I appreciate that the proposed development would have more units and a larger scale and massing than these examples, a precedent for backland development in this area has already been established and would not therefore be contrary to the character of the area.
- 8.9 With regard to the response to context, the policy test is whether the proposal would 'detract from the prevailing character and appearance of the area' to the degree that it would conflict with criterion 'c' of policy 3/10; and whether the

proposal has 'used the characteristics of the locality to help inform the siting, massing, design and materials of the proposed development' to meet policy 3/4. These are considered in detail below. In summary, in my opinion, the proposal would not harm the character of the area to a degree that it would conflict with policies 3/4 and 3/10.

Layout

- 8.10 The site is 'T'-shaped and the units have been arranged so that the semi-detached dwellings would be at the back of the site and the apartments in the south western corner. The semi-detached dwellings would have gardens backing onto the rear gardens of the Chalmers Road properties. Thus the dwellings would be set back from the boundary by approximately 8m. Bedroom windows on the upper floors would have windows on the eastern elevations. In my opinion, this creates an appropriate buffer between the proposed units and the neighbouring properties in design terms.
- 8.11 The semi-detached dwellings would provide an active frontage onto the access road with living room windows on the ground floor, or where there are integrated garages, living rooms windows on the first floor. The northern elevation of the apartment building at first floor level would have large windows serving a lounge which would provide surveillance of the access road, entrance to the bin/cycle store and parking area opposite. The southern half of the apartment block would have living accommodation to provide surveillance of the amenity space.

Scale and massing

- 8.12 The semi-detached dwellings would be two storeys plus attic storey. The apartment block would be two storeys plus an attic storey on the northern half and two storeys with a roof terrace on the southern half. I have considered the representations from third parties, however in my opinion the scale of the proposed development is acceptable for the following reasons:
- The eaves of the semi-detached dwellings would be 6m on the rear elevations facing the Chalmers Road properties. The ridge height would be 9.6m. Although this would be slightly higher than the Chalmers Road properties as shown

on the sections, I do not consider this to be unacceptable given the separation distance.

- On the western elevation of the semi-detached dwellings, the eaves of the central units 03 – 06 would be higher with a parapet wall, however these would face into the site. The eaves on outermost units 01/02 and 07/08 would be the same as on the rear elevation.
- The maximum ridge height of the apartment block would be 9.2m on the gable ends. This would be similar to the height of the Perne Road properties, using No. 72 as a guide shown on the section.
- The apartment block would present a 9.2m high gable end facing the rear of No. 72, however following revision 1 this has been stepped away from the boundary to allow space for some planting in order to soften the impact of the massing.
- The southern half of the apartment block facing the garden of No. 66 would be stepped down with a lower maximum ridge height of 7.5m and single storey elements, which would be domestic in scale.

Elevations and Materials

8.13 While I accept that the elevations and materials do not replicate the appearance of neighbouring properties, in my opinion, the design is high quality and complements the character of the surrounding properties. The front elevations of the central semi-detached properties (units 03-06) feature a central element stepped forward which reflects the bay windows of the 1930's properties; and the pitched roofs, gable ends and dormers are contemporary while reflecting traditional building styles. In my opinion, the elevations complement, rather than replicate, the character of the surrounding area.

8.14 The apartment block would also feature gable ends and dormers in a contemporary style. The southern half of the building would have hipped roofs which would complement the surrounding properties. While I accept that roof terraces and glazed balustrades are not common within the area, these would be in keeping with the contemporary design of the building and other new buildings within the vicinity, including Helix House on the junction of Perne Road and Radegund Road.

- 8.15 The external materials would be red brick with stone parapet copings; natural silver standing seam zinc roof and dormers with glazed balustrades; and aluminum windows and timber panels. The palette of materials is supported by the Urban Design team, particularly the use of red brick rather than the buff brick originally proposed, which is more in-keeping with the surrounding area. In my opinion, the materials reflect the characteristics of the area whilst providing a contemporary appearance.
- 8.16 The alterations to No. 76 are considered separately below, however the impact on the street scene is addressed here. While the proposal would lead to the loss of one of the semi-detached pair which is characteristic of Perne Road, in my opinion, this would not have a significant impact on the street scene. No. 76 would be altered so that it would appear to be a detached property. In my opinion this would not cause unacceptable harm to the street scene, as it would be common for a detached property to occupy a corner plot adjacent to the new access.

Movement and Access

- 8.17 The new access from Perne Road would be shared surface so that it would be used by vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians. The Highways Authority is satisfied with the access arrangements and I accept their advice. In my opinion, the proposed shared surface would provide safe access for all users taking into account the volume of traffic likely to be generated by the proposed development.
- 8.18 On-plot parking would be provided for the dwellings with the exception of the outermost semi-detached units 01 and 02 which would have parking bays. The apartments would have parking spaces in an undercroft or on the opposite side of the access road. These would be closely related to the units they serve and in my opinion, the parking arrangement is acceptable. Visitor parking would be provided close to the units, so that it would be in a convenient location for all units.
- 8.19 Cycle and bin storage would be provided in the rear gardens of the semi-detached dwellings, and a communal store would serve the apartments. A footpath within the site would provide access from the apartment block and the bin/bike store.

Occupants of the apartments would also have an internal access from the store into the communal stairwell. In my opinion, this would be a convenient location.

Open Space and Landscape

- 8.20 The semi-detached dwellings would have rear gardens which would provide private amenity space. The original submission included amenity space for the apartment block to the south of the building adjacent to the car parking, cycle store and bin store. Revision 1 included moving the apartment building northwards and internal rearrangements so that units 09 and 10, rather than the service areas, would provide surveillance of the amenity space.
- 8.21 The proposal includes landscape buffers along the access road and in the north west corner of the site. As part of revision 1, the northern part of the apartment building was moved eastwards to allow space for a landscape buffer along the boundary with No. 72.
- 8.22 The Landscape Officer supports the revised proposal and has recommended a condition requiring a detailed hard and soft landscaping scheme and details of boundary treatments. In my opinion, subject to conditions, the proposed landscaping scheme is acceptable.

Alterations to No. 76.

- 8.23 The proposal includes works to No. 76 which would be converted from a semi-detached property to detached following demolition of No. 74. As stated above, while I appreciate that the character of Perne Road is for semi-detached dwellings, in my opinion, the proposed detached dwelling on the corner of the access road would not cause unacceptable harm to the street scene.
- 8.24 The works include altering the hipped roof to a gable, the insertion of roof lights on the front elevation, making good the side (southern) elevation, a single storey rear extension and insertion of a rear dormer. The works would reuse the bricks from the demolished No. 74 so that the appearance would match the existing. These works could be done under permitted

development rights, and therefore they are not material considerations for this application.

- 8.25 There are several existing outbuildings within the rear gardens of the neighbouring properties. The building would not fall within permitted development rights. In my opinion, the scale, form and design of the outbuilding would be appropriate and it would be a subservient structure to the main house.
- 8.26 For these reasons, in my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12 and 3/14.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.27 The site layout ensures that the rear of the semi-detached properties would back onto the gardens of the Chalmers Road properties. The proposed dwellings would have rear gardens which would be 8m long so that the mass of the buildings would be stepped away from the boundary with space for some landscaping in the rear gardens. The semi-detached properties would present side gable ends to the rear gardens of the neighbouring properties. The apartment building would have a gable end facing the rear of No. 72 and a two-storey element at the rear of No. 70. It would be pushed away from the boundary with No. 66.
- 8.28 Third parties have commented that the applicant's drawings do not accurately show the extensions and outbuildings at the rear of the Chalmers Road properties. I accept that this may be the case and have visited Nos. 38 and 40 Chalmers Road. I have based my assessment on my observations from these visits and information provided in third party representations. I have also visited Nos. 66 and 82 Perne Road.

Overshadowing/loss of light

- 8.29 Third parties have raised concerns about the impact of overshadowing. The shadow studies submitted show that:
- There would be some overshadowing part of the middle part of the garden of No. 82 in the morning in March and September.

- There would be some overshadowing of part of the rear of the garden of Nos. 82 and 84 at lunchtime in March, June and September.
- There would be complete overshadowing of the garden of No. 82 in December however this is from the boundary treatment which is as existing.
- There would be partial overshadowing of the rear gardens of the Chalmers Road properties in the evening in March and September, and partial overshadowing in the evening in June.

8.30 While I accept that there would be some overshadowing of the rear garden of No. 82, due to the length of the garden, I consider there is ample outdoor space for the occupiers so that the overshadowing of part of their garden would not have an unacceptable impact on their residential amenity. The rearmost part of their garden is less sensitive in terms of residential amenity.

8.31 I also accept that there would be some overshadowing of the rear gardens of the Chalmers Road properties. There are currently large trees along the boundary and some outbuildings are the rear of the gardens, I am content that the overshadowing would not have a significant adverse impact on residential amenity compared to the existing situation. Again, the rearmost part of the garden is less sensitive to overshadowing.

8.32 The Urban Design team have assessed the overshadowing and have commented that it meets the relevant BRE requirements. In my opinion, the degree of overshadowing of neighbouring properties would not be unacceptable.

Overlooking/loss of privacy

8.33 Third parties have raised concerns about the impact of overlooking from the rear of the semi-detached dwellings towards the gardens of the Chalmers Road properties and any extensions/outbuildings. The nearest elevation of the Chalmers Road properties – notwithstanding outbuildings - is understood to be the ground floor extension of No. 40 Chalmers Road which has a window serving a bedroom. The distance to the boundary taken from onsite measurements is 15m. The rear elevations of the proposed semi-detached dwellings would be

set back 8m from the boundary. In total, the distance between the elevations would be approximately 23m. I have used this as a 'worst case' scenario in my assessment below.

- 8.34 The initial submission included full height bedroom windows on the first floor rear elevation of the semi-detached dwellings. Due to distance between the elevations of approximately 23m, my initial opinion was that this would not have an unacceptable overlooking impact on habitable rooms. However, following a site visit to several of the Chalmers Road properties, I shared local residents' concerns that this could have an unacceptable overlooking impact on their private amenity space due to the direct views that could be gained from these windows.
- 8.35 Revision 2 included a change from full height windows on the first floor rear elevation of the semi-detached dwellings to smaller oriel windows with a timber obscured panel. In my opinion, this would prevent direct views along the rear gardens and would only allow oblique views towards the rear part of the gardens, which are mainly occupied by outbuildings and planting. In my opinion, this would provide an acceptable degree of privacy at the part of the garden closest to the house which is typically more sensitive. I have recommended a condition (35) requiring details of the timber panels to be submitted for approval and for these to be installed prior to first occupation of the units. In my opinion this would address any concerns about overlooking from these windows.
- 8.36 The revised plans also include oriel windows for the bathroom windows on the first floor rear elevation of the semi-detached dwellings, however I have recommended a condition for these to be fully obscure-glazed with restricted opening in order to protect the privacy of future occupants. The dormer windows on the second floor would serve ensembles and are shown on the floor plans as being obscured glazed. I have also recommended a condition for these to be fully obscure-glazed with restricted opening. Subject to this condition (34), in my opinion, there would be no unacceptable overlooking from these windows.
- 8.37 There would be one first floor window on the side elevations of the outermost semi-detached dwellings (units 01 and 08). This would serve a staircase/hall. As this is not a habitable room and would be adjacent to the rear part of the neighbouring

gardens, in my opinion, there would not be an unacceptable loss of privacy for neighbouring properties.

8.38 The western elevation of the apartment block would have obscure glazed windows in order to protect the privacy of the occupants of the Perne Road properties. I have recommended a condition (34) to impose this and to restrict the opening. There would be a first floor terrace on the southern elevation of the apartment building which would have an obscure glazed balustrade above the parapet wall to a height of 1.8m which would obscure any views of the neighbouring gardens. I have recommended a condition (36) for this to be installed prior to first occupation of the unit.

8.39 There would be a second floor roof terrace on the northern and southern sides of the apartment building. The northern terrace would be over 15m from the boundary with No. 78 and would have a brick gable end to prevent overlooking to No. 72. The southern terrace would be approximately 10m from the boundary with No. 66 and would have a 1.7m parapet formed by the roof below. In my opinion, there would not be any overlooking from the second floor roof terraces.

Enclosure/loss of outlook

8.40 Third parties have raised concerns about the development being overbearing and enclosing. In my opinion, the Chalmers Road properties currently benefit from an uncommonly high degree of openness at the rear of their gardens as a result of the particularly long rear gardens of the Perne Road properties. While I accept that the proposal would introduce built form at the rear of their gardens, in my opinion this would not have an unacceptable overbearing impact given the urban context.

8.41 The rear elevations of the semi-detached properties would be 6m high to the eaves and 9.6m high to the ridge. This would be slightly higher than the Chalmers Road properties as shown on the sections. Due to the separation distance of at least 23m, in my opinion this would not have an unacceptable overbearing impact on habitable rooms. The rear elevations of the semi-detached properties would be set back 8m from the site boundary. There would be gaps 1.5m or 3.5m wide between the semi-detached pairs which would break up the massing. In my opinion, the rearmost part of the Chalmers Road properties

are less sensitive than parts of the garden closer to the house. As a result, the proposed development would not have an unacceptable overbearing impact on private amenity space.

8.42 The side elevations of the semi-detached properties would be 9.8m high and approximately 1.2m from the site boundaries with Nos. 66 and 82 Perne Road. I have visited these properties. The rearmost part of the garden of No. 66 is occupied by a large outbuilding and of No. 82 is used for a vegetable patch and composting. I accept that the proposal would have some overbearing and enclosing impact due to the height and proximity to the boundary, however, in my opinion, the rearmost part of the neighbouring gardens is less sensitive than parts close to the house. These properties have long gardens and, in my opinion, the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on their residential amenity.

Noise and disturbance

8.43 I have considered the impact of additional comings-and-goings on neighbouring properties. The Transport Note submitted by the applicant demonstrates the proposal would generate 94 trips to and from the site per day. Of these, 39 would be vehicle trips, calculated using the modal split for the area taken from census survey data. The proposal includes 19 car parking spaces and one visitor space and therefore in my opinion, this number of trips is likely to be realistic. The Highways Authority has not objected to the number of trips generated.

8.44 The access would be alongside Nos. 72 and 76. No. 72 is set back from the side boundary and has an existing outbuilding along part of the rear garden. No. 76 would have a side elevation along the boundary with ground floor living room and kitchen windows. The access would be shared surface which would encourage lower driving speeds. In my opinion, the number of vehicle trips the proposal is likely to generate would not cause unacceptable noise and disturbance on Nos. 72 and 76.

8.45 I have considered the impact of the off-plot parking areas on the amenity of neighbouring properties. There would be two spaces adjoining the boundaries with Nos. 66 and 82. There would be four spaces along the boundary with No. 78. In my opinion, as the car parking has been split between these areas,

the parking and maneuvering would not cause unacceptable noise and disturbance.

- 8.46 The Environmental Health Team have recommended a condition (07) for a scheme for the insulation of the plant and any mitigation measures installed, and I agree with this advice. They have also recommended a condition (37) for the 'workshop' at the rear of No. 76 to be restricted for use ancillary to the dwelling house so that it cannot be used for commercial use. A standard condition to control construction hours is also recommended. Subject to these conditions, I am satisfied that there would not be an unacceptable impact of noise and disturbance on neighbouring properties.

Overspill car parking

- 8.47 The proposal provides car parking at the maximum levels for residential development outside the controlled parking zone, including one visitor space. In my opinion, the proposal is compliant with the adopted car parking standards and there is no policy reason to object to the application on the basis of the impact on overspill car parking on residential amenity of neighbouring properties.
- 8.48 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, 3/10, 3/12 and 5/1.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

- 8.49 The semi-detached dwellings would have rear gardens which would be 8m long. There are no adopted external space standards for private amenity space, however in my opinion, the gardens would provide an acceptable amount of private amenity space. Due to the orientation of the units and the separation distance with the Chalmers Road properties, in my opinion, there would not be any unacceptable overlooking into these gardens. The gardens would be on the eastern side of the dwellings so would receive an adequate amount of sun light. In my opinion, the rear gardens would be an acceptable size and quality, and provide an acceptable private amenity space for future occupiers.

8.50 The apartments are served by a communal area of outdoor amenity space to the south of the block. The original submission included amenity space for the apartment block adjacent to the car parking, cycle store and bin store. Revision 1 included moving the apartment building northwards and internal rearrangements so that units 09 and 10 would provide surveillance of the amenity space, rather than the service areas. There would be some defensible space in front of the ground floor units to protect the privacy of future occupants. The Council has no adopted standards for communal amenity space. In my opinion, the size and quality of the communal area would enhance the amenity of the future occupants of the apartments.

8.51 The original submission included full height windows serving bedrooms on the first floor rear elevation of the semi-detached dwellings. I shared the concerns of third parties that due to the set back of the rear elevation 8m from the site boundary, this would result in a lack of privacy for future occupants due to direct views from the gardens of the Chalmers Road properties. Revision 2 reduced the size of the bedroom windows and changed them to oriel windows with an obscured timber panel. This would prevent direct views into the bedrooms. In my opinion, this would provide an acceptable level of privacy for future occupants. I have recommended a condition (35) for further details of the oriel windows to be submitted. I have also recommended a condition (34) for the ensuites/bathroom windows on the rear elevation of the semi-detached properties to be obscure glazed with restricted opening. In my opinion, subject to these conditions, the future occupants of these units would have an acceptable level of privacy.

8.52 I have considered the level of amenity for future occupiers of No. 76 Perne Road. The side elevation facing the proposed access would have two ground floor windows which would serve a front room and kitchen/dining area. These rooms have other windows on the front or rear of the property. In my opinion, the future occupiers could install curtains or blinds to protect their privacy from users of the access without impact on their residential amenity. The windows are small and in my opinion, there would not be an unacceptable noise and disturbance impact from users of the access on their residential amenity. The floor plans for the dwelling show five rooms that

could be used for bedrooms. I have recommended an informative to advise that use of the property as an HMO may require separate licencing. Occupation of the dwelling by more than six unrelated people would require planning permission for change of use to a large HMO.

- 8.53 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, 3/12 and 3/14.

Flooding and drainage

- 8.54 The site is within Flood Zone 1 which is the category of lowest risk, however the Council's Sustainable Drainage Engineer has commented that high groundwater is an issue in this location. There is also an existing strategic Anglian Water sewer in the proposed back gardens of the semi-detached dwellings which the Sustainable Drainage Engineer has commented has a cover of only around 500mm.
- 8.55 The applicant has submitted an outline surface water drainage strategy which includes permeable paving, surface water drains and depression areas for exceedance events. The Council's Sustainable Drainage Engineer is satisfied that the surface water drainage scheme is acceptable, subject to a condition for a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development to be submitted for approval. I have recommended condition for a detailed surface water drainage scheme to be submitted for approval.
- 8.56 Third parties have raised concerns on this matter, however I accept the advice of the Sustainable Drainage Engineer and in my opinion, subject to conditions, the proposal would not lead to unacceptable surface water drainage.

Ecology

- 8.57 The site is laid out as garden with some mature trees, planting and ponds, as well as outbuildings. Third parties have commented that the site is used by several species of birds, bats, ground mammals and frogs, and forms part of a wildlife corridor. An Ecology Report including site survey has been

submitted. The Ecology Officer has not objected subject to conditions for details of bird and bat boxes and details of a lighting scheme. I accept the advice of the Ecology Officer and, subject to these conditions (08, 33), in my opinion the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on ecology and is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 4/3.

Renewable energy and sustainability

8.58 Policy 8/16 requires major development to provide at least 10% of the development's total predicted energy requirements to be from on-site renewable energy sources. No details have been submitted to demonstrate how this would be achieved, however the applicant has stated that a number of different types of renewable energy technologies are being considered, including solar technologies and air source heat pumps. The Senior Sustainability Officer has recommended a condition for a Renewable Energy Statement to be submitted and for renewable energy technologies to be implemented in accordance with the agreed details. In my opinion, subject to this condition (29), the proposal is in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/16 and the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2007.

Refuse Arrangements

8.59 The proposal provides a bin store in the rear garden of each of the dwellings and a communal bin store for the apartment block. The bin stores for the dwellings provide space for three domestic bins and would be located in a convenient location. The communal bin store for the apartments provides space for three large bins. In my opinion, the proposal would be in accordance with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012).

8.60 Third parties have raised concerns that, should refuse vehicles be unable to enter the site, then bins would need to be collected from the public highway, which would block the footpath. The Refuse and Recycling Team are satisfied with the site layout for refuse vehicles to enter the site for collections. I have recommended a condition (9) for the access to be constructed to a standard capable of supporting vehicles of 26 tonne weight. I have also recommended an informative to advise that it is the

responsibility of the developer/managing agent/householders to maintain the access road to a standard suitable for regular vehicular access.

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

Highway Safety

- 8.62 The proposal includes a new shared surface access from Perne Road creating a new junction. The Highways Authority is satisfied with the proposal, subject to conditions. I have accepted the advice of the Highways Authority and, in my opinion, the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on the highway network and safety.
- 8.63 Third parties have raised concern that the number of trips generated by the proposal would increase congestion on Perne Road and surrounding roads. The Highways Authority have commented that, in their opinion, the proposal would not generate a “severe” level of disruption on the network and an objection on these grounds could not be sustained. I accept their advice.
- 8.64 The Highways Authority have commented that the bus stop on the eastern side of Perne Road would need to be relocated as the existing bus stop is within visibility splay of the proposed access. The Highways Authority has commented that an alternative location should be identified prior to determination. The applicant has submitted options for alternative locations which have been discussed with the Highways Authority. Approval of an alternative location would require a process of consulting other stakeholders and would be outside of the planning system. I have recommended a Grampian-style condition (20) so that development on the site cannot commence until an alternative location for the bus stop has been agreed in writing by the local planning authority and the bus stop installed. The Highways Authority has agreed this approach. In my opinion, this addresses the Highways Authority’s comments.
- 8.65 Third parties have raised concerns that the access would create a staggered junction on Perne Road with the Perne Avenue

access opposite. The Highways Authority has not raised an objection on these grounds and I accept their advice.

- 8.66 Third parties have also raised concerns that the new access would create a break in the footway and cycle path along Perne Road which is used by local residents including school children. I accept that this is a well-used footway and cycle path. In my opinion, as the access would be shared surface with good visibility and the number of trips generated by the proposed development is likely to be low, the access would not create an unacceptable crossing point for pedestrians or cyclists.
- 8.67 For these reasons, in my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Car Parking

- 8.68 The proposal provides 19 car parking spaces and one visitor space. This provides 2 spaces for each of the dwellings and one space for each of the apartments. The proposal is in accordance with the adopted standards for residential development outside the controlled parking zone. The parking spaces relate well to the units they serve and I am satisfied there is an acceptable degree of natural surveillance of parking courts.
- 8.69 Third parties have raised concern that the level of car parking is too low, which would lead to overspill parking on the verges along Perne Road having an impact on highway safety. As the proposal provides the maximum number of car parking spaces per unit allowed by the adopted standards, providing more spaces would not comply with policy 8/10, the aim of which is to promote sustainable travel modes. I am satisfied that the site is in a highly sustainable location where there is no justification for providing more car parking spaces and departing from the adopted maximum standards.
- 8.70 Third parties have also commented that there is not enough visitor parking. Under the standards, the maximum number of car parking spaces on the site would be 3 visitor spaces. In my opinion, given the parking for residents is at the maximum level and the site is in a sustainable location, it is likely that any residents having visitors or trades-people may be able to make one of their parking spaces available for use. I do not consider

that the additional two visitor spaces that could be provided under the maximum standards would significantly reduce any overspill car parking generated by visitors.

- 8.71 Third parties have raised concerns that the 'double-stacked' car parking spaces for some of the semi-detached properties would be problematic, however these would be allocated to the same unit and is a common arrangement where properties have long driveways. I am therefore satisfied that future occupants would be able to manage this. Concerns have also been raised that the garages could be converted for use without requiring planning permission, which would lead to a loss of car parking and an increase in overspill parking. In my opinion, it would not be reasonable to impose a condition to restrict the conversion of garages as it would not be possible to force people to park in their garages rather than on-street.
- 8.72 For these reasons, in my opinion the car parking provision is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/10.

Cycle Parking

- 8.73 The proposal provides a 3 cycle parking spaces within a store in the rear garden of the dwellings; and a communal cycle store providing 10 spaces within the apartment block. The proposal includes no visitor cycle parking spaces and I have recommended a condition (38) for this to be provided. I am satisfied there would be space to accommodate this without compromising the landscaping scheme. Subject to this condition, in my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/6.

Public Art

- 8.74 The adopted Public Art SPD (2010) requires major development to make a contribution towards public art. A financial contribution is no longer secured via a planning obligation. Given the scale of the proposed development, I am satisfied that it would not be reasonable to recommend a condition requiring public art to be provided.

Third Party Representations

- 8.75 The comments relating to the principle of development, residential amenity, response to context, highway safety, car parking, drainage, ecology, landscaping and refuse have addressed in the relevant sections above. The other matters are considered as follows:

Comment	Response
Numerous errors in the planning application including inaccurate measurements.	The applicant is not required to provide accurate information on land outside of the application site. I have visited neighbouring properties so I am satisfied that my assessment is made on the basis of accurate information. I am not aware of any inaccuracies with the information submitted with regard to the proposed development within the application site.
The demolition of No. 74 Perne Road may cause subsidence or groundwork issues which may affect whether No. 76 is able to stand alone.	This is not a planning matter that I can take into consideration.
Unclear whether the proposal is to demolish No. 78 Perne Road or No. 74 Perne Road.	The description of development confirms the proposal is for the demolition of No. 74 Perne Road.
Covenants restrict building and use of the land which the proposal contravenes.	This is not a planning matter that I can take into consideration.

The catchment schools are already oversubscribed.	The County Council has confirmed that contributions are not required towards education.
The plans don't clearly show the annexes at 76 and 78 Perne Road which already increase the housing density in this area.	During the course of the application, revised plans were submitted which show the annexes. I have taken this into account in my assessment.
Will the applicants be paying compensation to the occupants of Chalmers Road?	This is not a planning matter that I can take into consideration.
Are the City Council the purchasers?	The ownership of the site is not a planning matter that I can take into consideration.

Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

8.76 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.

8.77 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.

8.78 The following table is a summary of the s106 contributions that will be requested in relation to this development:

Open Space	£7,381 – Towards the provision and/or improvement of and/or access to Informal Open Space at Coleridge Recreation Ground (including creation of wildflower meadows, paths, information boards, new seating and general planting of new features).
Play Space	£7,268 – Towards the provision of and / or improvements of the Lichfield Road Recreation Ground play area.
Indoor Sports	£8,204.50 – Towards the provision of a new floor for the sports hall and/or sports changing room facility improvements at Netherhall School.
Outdoor Sports	£7,259 – Towards the provision and/or improvement of outdoor sports pitches and changing rooms at Coleridge Recreation Ground.
Community Facilities	£20,710 – Towards the provision and / or improvement of the facilities (inc kitchen, toilets, storage and furniture and equipment) at Lichfield Road Community Hall.

8.79 Although the County Council is of the view that the proposed development would not generate children and therefore is not seeking contributions towards education, in my opinion the contributions towards play space for children and young people sought by the City Council are justified in line with the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010.

8.80 Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/8, 5/14 and 10/1 and the Planning Obligation

Strategy 2010 and the Cambridge City Council Open Space Standards Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation (2010)

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 In my opinion, the principle of development is acceptable in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 5/1 and 3/10. I have assessed the application against the relevant development plan policies and have given full consideration to third party representations. The revisions submitted during the course of the application have addressed the initial concerns raised by officers. In my opinion, the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on residential amenity. I have been advised by other officers that there are no outstanding technical matters that cannot be resolved through conditions. On this basis, in my opinion, the proposal is compliant with all relevant development plan policies and therefore I must give weight to the 'presumption in favour of sustainable development' within the NPPF.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

1. APPROVE subject to completion of the s106 Agreement 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. No construction work or demolition work shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours and 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

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

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

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

5. 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)

6. 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

7. Before the development hereby permitted is occupied, a scheme for the insulation of the plant in order to minimise the level of noise emanating from the plant shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and the scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

8. Prior to the installation of any artificial lighting, an artificial lighting scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include details of any artificial lighting of the site and an artificial lighting impact assessment with predicted lighting levels at proposed and existing residential properties shall be undertaken. Artificial lighting on and off site must meet the Obtrusive Light Limitations for Exterior Lighting Installations contained within the Institute of Lighting Professionals Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light - GN01:2011 (or as superseded). It should also ensure the gardens on the site and the neighbouring gardens remain available and attractive for foraging and commuter bats from the wider area. The approved lighting scheme shall be installed, maintained and operated in accordance with the approved details / measures.

Reason: To protect residential amenity and to provide ecological enhancements for protected species on the site. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/12 and 4/3)

9. No development shall commence until details of the construction of the hardstanding for the access have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The hardstanding shall, as a minimum, be capable of supporting vehicles of 26 tonne weight and shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2)

10. No works shall commence on site until such time as detailed plans of the roads, footways, cycleways, foul and surface water drainage have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All construction works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory development of the site and a satisfactory standard of highway design and construction. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2)

11. Prior to the first occupation of the development the road(s), footway(s) and cycleway(s) shall be constructed to at least binder course surfacing level from the dwelling to the adjoining County road in accordance with the details approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory development of the site and a satisfactory Standard of highway design and construction. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2)

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

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to ensure satisfactory access into the site. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2)

13. The access shall be a minimum width of 5.0m, for a minimum distance of 15m measured from the near edge of the highway carriageway.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2)

14. Prior to the first occupation of the development the proposed on-site parking / servicing / loading, unloading / turning / waiting area shall be laid out, demarcated, levelled, surfaced and drained in accordance with the approved plan and thereafter retained for that specific use.

Reason: To ensure the permanent availability of the parking / manoeuvring area, in the interests of highway safety. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2)

15. Prior to the first occupation of the development visibility splays shall be provided each side of the vehicular access in full accordance with the details indicated on the approved plans. The splays shall thereafter be maintained free from any obstruction exceeding 0.6m above the level of the adjacent highway carriageway.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2)

16. Prior to the first occupation of the development the junction of the access with the highway carriageway shall be laid out with 6m radius kerbs.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2)

17. No part of any structure shall overhang or encroach under or upon the public highway and no gate / door / ground floor window shall open outwards over the public highway.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2)

18. The access shall be constructed with adequate drainage measures to prevent surface water run-off onto the adjacent public highway prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted and retained thereafter, in accordance with a scheme submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To prevent surface water discharging to the highway. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2)

19. No development shall commence until details of the proposed arrangements for future management and maintenance of the streets within the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The streets shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved management and maintenance details.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory development of the site and to ensure estate roads are managed and maintained thereafter to a suitable and safe standard. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2)

20. No development shall commence until details of the relocated bus stop on the eastern side of Perne Road have been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority; and the development shall not commence until the bus stop has been constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: Failure to secure an appropriate replacement bus stop would undermine the efficiency of the public transport network serving Perne Road. It is vital, therefore that, prior to loss of this facility resultant from development, a replacement location is identified and implemented before development is commenced, this maintaining verifying and implementing continuity of public transport facilities. (Cambridge Local Plan policy 8/2)

21. Notwithstanding the provision of Class A of Schedule 2, Part 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, (or any order revoking, amending or re-enacting that order) no gates shall be erected across the approved access unless details have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety. (Cambridge Local Plan policy 8/2)

22. No development shall commence until a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy prepared by Peter Brett Associates (project ref. 37537 dated March 2016) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted.

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding, to improve and protect water quality, and improve habitat and amenity.

23. No building hereby permitted shall be occupied until a surface water drainage scheme management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development has been provided to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The surface water drainage scheme shall be managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the agreed management and maintenance plan.

Reason: In the interests of flood protection.

24. No development should take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been 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, 3/12 and 3/14).

25. Before starting any brick or stone work, a sample panel of the facing materials to be used shall be erected on site to establish the detail of bonding, coursing and colour and type of jointing and shall be agreed in writing with the local planning authority. The quality of finish and materials incorporated in any approved sample panel(s), which shall not be demolished prior to completion of development, shall be maintained throughout the development.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that the quality and colour of the detailing of the brickwork/stonework and jointing is acceptable and maintained throughout the development. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 3/12)

26. Prior to the commencement of the development, full details of all non-masonry walling systems, cladding panels or other external screens including structural members, infill panels, edge, junction and coping details, colours, surface finishes/textures and relationships to glazing and roofing are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This may consist of large-scale drawings and/or samples. Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the materials selected are of a high quality and appropriate to the context of the building (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/12).

27. Full details of all windows (including dormer windows and timber window panels) and doors, as identified on the approved drawings, including materials, colours, surface finishes/textures are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall consist of large-scale drawings and/or samples. Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To accord with Policies 3/4 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

28. No boiler flues, soil pipes, waste pipes or air extract trunking, etc. shall be installed until the means of providing egress for all such items from the new or altered bathrooms, kitchens and plant rooms has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Flues, pipes and trunking, etc. shall be installed thereafter only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To accord with Policies 3/4 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

29. Prior to commencement of development, a renewable energy statement, which demonstrates that at least 10% of the development's total predicted energy requirements will be from on-site renewable energy sources, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The statement shall include the following details:
- a) The total predicted energy requirements of the development, set out in Kg/CO₂/annum;

- b) A schedule of proposed on-site renewable energy technologies, their respective carbon reduction contributions, location, design and a maintenance programme;
- c) An assessment of any air quality, noise or odour impact and;
- d) Mitigation measures required to maintain amenity and prevent nuisance in accordance with the Council's Sustainable Construction and Design Supplementary Planning Document.

The renewable energy technologies shall remain fully operational in accordance with the approved maintenance programme, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/16, Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD, 2007).

30. A plan showing the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatments to be erected shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the erection of any boundaries. The boundary treatment shall be completed in accordance with the approved details prior to first occupation or in accordance with a timetable agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure an appropriate boundary treatment is implemented. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11, 3/12 and 4/3)

31. Details of both hard and soft landscape works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to first occupation or within the first planting season following first occupation. 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. The landscaping scheme shall ensure the gardens on the site remain available and attractive for foraging and commuting bats from the wider area.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and protected spaces, 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, 3/12 and 4/3).

32. No demolition shall commence until the role, responsibilities and operations to be overseen by a competent on-site ecologist have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The appointed person shall undertake all activities, and works shall be carried out, in accordance with the approved details.

Reasons: In the interests of protected species on the site (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/3).

33. No development shall commence until a plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority detailing the proposed specification, number and locations of internal bird and bat boxes within the new building. The installation shall be carried out and subsequently maintained in accordance with the approved plans.

Reasons: To provide ecological enhancements for protected species on the site (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/3).

34. Prior to occupation, the windows identified as having obscured glass on drawing numbers 14_1208_PL08A, 14_208_PL09A and 14_208_PL11C; and the windows on the first floor of the rear (east) elevation of units 1-8 serving ensuites or bathrooms shall be obscure glazed to a minimum level of obscurity to conform to Pilkington Glass level 3 or equivalent and shall have restrictors to ensure that the window cannot be opened more than 45 degrees beyond the plane of the adjacent wall, and shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 3/12).

35. Full details of the oriel windows including timber window panels, as identified on the approved drawings, including materials, colours, surface finishes/textures are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall consist of large-scale drawings and/or samples. Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed details. The timber window panels shall be installed prior to occupation, and shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 3/12).

36. Prior to occupation of unit 13 hereby permitted, the glass screen on the parapet wall identified as having obscured glass on drawing number 14_208_PL11C shall be obscure glazed to a minimum level of obscurity to conform to Pilkington Glass level 3 or equivalent and shall be erected to a height of 1.8m above the level of the terrace, and shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 3/12).

37. The outbuilding within the curtilage of No. 76 Perne Road hereby permitted shall be used solely in conjunction with and ancillary to No. 76 Perne Road and shall not be separately used, occupied or let.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining residential properties and to avoid the creation of a separate planning unit (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 4/13).

38. Prior to first occupation of the development, 2 no. visitor cycle parking spaces shall be provided in accordance with details submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/6.

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

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: The applicant is advised that to discharge condition 19 the Local Planning Authority requires a copy of the constitution and details of a Private Management and Maintenance Company confirming funding, management and maintenance regimes.

INFORMATIVE: Dust condition 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

- Air Quality Monitoring in the Vicinity of Demolition and Construction Sites 2012

http://www.iaqm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/guidance/monitoring_construction_sites_2012.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: To satisfy the plant sound insulation condition, the rating level (in accordance with BS4142:2014) from all plant, equipment and vents etc (collectively) associated with this application should be less than or equal to the existing background level (L90) at the boundary of the premises subject to this application and having regard to noise sensitive premises.

Tonal/impulsive sound frequencies should be eliminated or at least considered in any assessment and should carry an additional correction in accordance with BS4142:2014. This is to prevent unreasonable disturbance to other premises. This requirement applies both during the day (0700 to 2300 hrs over any one hour period) and night time (2300 to 0700 hrs over any one 15 minute period).

It is recommended that the agent/applicant submits an acoustic prediction survey/report in accordance with the principles of BS4142:2014 "Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound" or similar, concerning the effects on amenity rather than likelihood for complaints. Noise levels shall be predicted at the boundary having regard to neighbouring premises.

It is important to note that a full BS4142:2014 assessment is not required, only certain aspects to be incorporated into an acoustic assessment as described within this informative.

Such a survey / report should include: a large scale plan of the site in relation to neighbouring premises; sound sources and measurement / prediction points marked on plan; a list of sound sources; details of proposed sound sources / type of plant such as: number, location, sound power levels, sound frequency spectrums, sound directionality of plant, sound levels from duct intake or discharge points; details of sound mitigation measures (attenuation details of any intended enclosures, silencers or barriers); description of full sound calculation procedures; sound levels at a representative sample of noise sensitive locations and hours of operation.

Any report shall include raw measurement data so that conclusions may be thoroughly evaluated and calculations checked.

INFORMATIVE: Where bin stores are located away from the public highway the developer and future managing agent and/or householders must accept that the collection authority (Local Authority) will not be held responsible for any damage caused to that access road by its use thereof. Refuse collection vehicles (RCVs) weigh a minimum of 26 tonnes, (up to 32 tonnes) are dual steering and multi-axled. They are 11m long and 2.50m wide. It is the responsibility of the developer/managing agent/householders to maintain the access road to a standard suitable for such regular vehicular access. Should that standard be deemed unacceptable by the collection authority it reserves the right not to access the site and the responsibility ("Duty of Care") remains with the householders/managing agents/developers to present the bins for collection on or near (<10m) the public highway.

INFORMATIVE: If during the works contamination is encountered, the LPA should be informed, additional contamination shall be fully assessed and an appropriate remediation scheme agreed with the LPA. The applicant/agent to need to satisfy themselves as to the condition of the land / area and its proposed use, to ensure a premises prejudicial to health situation does not arise in the future.

INFORMATIVE: The use of any property as an HMO may require a licence under the Housing Act 2004. You are advised to contact Housing Standards in Environmental Health at Cambridge City Council on 01223 457000 for further advice in this regard.

2. **In the event that the application is refused, and an Appeal is lodged against the decision to refuse this application, delegated authority is sought to allow officers to negotiate and complete the Planning Obligation required in connection with this development**