

<b>Application Number</b>	16/1067/FUL	<b>Agenda Item</b>	
<b>Date Received</b>	1st August 2016	<b>Officer</b>	Michael Hammond
<b>Target Date</b>	26th September 2016		
<b>Ward</b>	Coleridge		
<b>Site</b>	30 Davy Road Cambridge CB1 3QW		
<b>Proposal</b>	Demolition of existing building and the erection of two new buildings to provide 2no. Maisonettes and 3no. 1bed flats, together with bin & cycle store and landscaping.		
<b>Applicant</b>	n/a c/o Agent		

<b>SUMMARY</b>	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposal would not adversely impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties.</li> <li>- The proposed development would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area.</li> <li>- The proposal would provide an appropriate living environment for future occupiers.</li> </ul>
<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>	<b>APPROVAL</b>

**1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT**

1.1 The application site, no.30 Davy Road, is comprised of a two-storey end of terrace building situated on the north side of Davy Road. The building is sub-divided internally and used as two self-contained dwellings. There is a car parking space at the front of the site and a long garden to the rear. The rear garden is flanked by a tall conifer hedge along the side and rear boundaries. To the south of the site is the Coleridge Recreation

Ground. Three-storey residential flats are to the east and there are single-storey garages to the north of the site.

1.2 There are no site constraints.

## **2.0 THE PROPOSAL**

2.1 The proposal, as amended, seeks planning permission for the demolition of the existing building and the erection of two new buildings to provide 2no. maisonettes and 3no. one-bedroom flats.

2.2 The proposed replacement building (block 1) on the front of the site would mirror the existing building in terms of height but would be approximately 1.5m wider with an undercroft underneath the first-floor element. The proposal would also involve the addition of a 5.7m deep single-storey element from the existing rear building line. This would be designed with a gently sloping flat roof measuring 2.5m at its lowest point and 3.1m its highest point. This building would accommodate a one-bedroom flat and 2no. one-bedroom houses.

2.3 The proposed new building (block 2) at the end of the rear garden would occupy a footprint of approximately 59m<sup>2</sup>. The proposed building would be two-storeys in scale and constructed with a pitched roof measuring 4.8m to the eaves and 7m to the ridge. This building would accommodate 2no. one-bedroom flats.

2.4 Visitor cycle and car parking would be situated at the front of the site. A cycle and bin store would be situated in the rear garden in-between blocks 1 and 2 and this store would be designed with a green roof.

2.5 The proposed buildings would be designed in brick with tiled roofs to match the materials of the existing building on-site.

2.6 The application has been accompanied by the following information:

1. Drawings
2. Design and Access Statement

### 3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
C/02/0156	Change of use from residential to 3no self contained units (retrospective).	Permitted.
C/01/1309	Change of use from residential to 4no self contained units (3 self contained units (Retrospective)).	Withdrawn.
C/99/1229	Erection of a single storey rear extension to existing dwellinghouse.	Permitted.
C/99/0283	Erection of a two storey rear extension to existing dwellinghouse.	Permitted.

### 4.0 PUBLICITY

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

### 5.0 POLICY

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

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

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

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework March 2012  National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014  Circular 11/95
Supplementary Planning Guidance	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007)  Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012)  Planning Obligation Strategy (March 2010)
Material Considerations	<u>City Wide Guidance</u>  Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)

#### 5.4 Status of Proposed Submission – Cambridge Local Plan

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

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

## 6.0 CONSULTATIONS

### Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

- 6.1 In its current for the development is considered very likely to impose additional parking demands upon the on-street parking on the surrounding streets and, whilst this is unlikely to result in any significant adverse impact upon highway safety, there is potentially an impact upon residential amenity which the Planning Authority may wish to consider when assessing this application. Traffic management plan condition and informative recommended.

### Environmental Health

- 6.2 No objection, subject to construction hours, collection during construction, piling and dust conditions and informative.

### Refuse and Recycling

- 6.3 More information on where the collection point will be and who will be putting the bins there is requested.

### Landscape Team

- 6.4 No objection subject to hard and soft landscaping and boundary treatment conditions.
- 6.5 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:

26 Davy Road	26B Davy Road
32 Davy Road	34 Davy Road
36 Davy Road	

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Design

- Overdevelopment of the plot.
- Out of character with area.

Residential Amenity

- Under provision of parking.
- Visual enclosure/ dominance.
- Construction noise and disturbance.
- Overlooking/ loss of privacy.
- Shadow study required.
- Dust pollution during construction/ demolition.
- Poor quality of amenity provision for future occupants.

Other

- Further information/ consultation regarding bats is required.
- Structural damage to adjoining properties during demolition.
- Security of garden during construction.
- The proposed development would devalue other properties.
- Construction rights regarding land ownership.
- Right of access to garages at rear would be affected during construction.
- The two study rooms are likely to become bedrooms.
- Under provision of bin storage.
- Use of property, private/rental/social?
- Would affect plans to extend at no.32 in future.
- Party wall agreement required and implications of that.
- Noise and disturbance from proposed use of site.
- Inadequate cycle parking provision.

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

## **8.0 ASSESSMENT**

8.1 From the consultation responses and representations received and from my inspection of the site and the surroundings, I consider that the main issues are:

1. Principle of development
2. Context of site, design and external spaces
3. Residential amenity

4. Refuse arrangements
5. Highway safety
6. Car and cycle parking
7. Third party representations
8. Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

## **Principle of Development**

- 8.2 The provision of extra housing within the city is supported in the Cambridge Local Plan (2006). As policy 5/1 points out, proposals for housing development on windfall sites will be permitted, subject to the existing land use and compatibility with adjoining uses.
- 8.3 The principle of developing the site for residential purposes is considered acceptable and conforms to the provisions set out in the development plan. However, while residential development is broadly supported, it must comply with considerations such as impact on the appearance of the area and impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties. These, and other relevant issues, are assessed below.
- 8.4 As the proposal is for the subdivision of an existing residential plot, Local Plan policy 3/10 is relevant in assessing the acceptability of the proposal. Policy 3/10 allows for the subdivision of existing plots, subject to compliance with specified criteria. However, in this instance, Section d and f of the policy are not relevant as the proposal would not adversely affect the setting of a listed building (d) and would not prejudice the comprehensive development of the wider area (f).
- 8.5 Residential development within the garden area or curtilage of existing properties will not be permitted if it will:
  - a) have a significantly adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties through loss of privacy, loss of light, an overbearing sense of enclosure and generation of unreasonable levels of traffic or noise nuisance;
  - b) provide inadequate amenity space, or access arrangements and parking spaces for the proposed and existing properties;
  - c) detract from the prevailing character and appearance of the area.

e) would not adversely affect trees, wildlife features or architectural features of local importance

8.6 I consider that the proposal complies with the four criteria set out in policy 3/10 for the reasons set out in the relevant sections of this report.

### **Context of site, design and external spaces (and impact on heritage assets)**

8.7 The proposed buildings would be visible from the street scene of Davy Road and the private road leading up to the single-storey garages to the rear of the site.

8.8 Block 1 would be similar in appearance to that of present as the gable end would face onto Davy Road and would be of a similar scale and mass. The additional width proposed would increase the prominence of the building on the corner of the plot. However, this would not in my view result in the building appearing alien on the end of the terrace. The general fenestration of windows and doors would be in keeping with the rest of the terrace and would help to break up the perception of the additional mass whilst engaging successfully with the street scene from an active frontage perspective. The proposed use of small sections of Flemish bond brickwork panels, with the end on bricks protruding outwards, would also provide a degree of interest that helps to break up the large expanse of brickwork proposed. This is also applicable to the proposed timber doors and louvers, as well as the metal finish around the angled windows.

8.9 Block 2 would mimic the general scale, massing and design principles proposed in block 1. The position of this block at the end of the garden would appear more unorthodox when compared to block 1 due to the lack of two-storey developments along the rear gardens of properties. However, the site and its surroundings are relatively unique in that the flats opposite the site to the east and garages to the north of the site provide a degree of variation in terms of building lines and orientations of built forms in the wider area. The proposed building has been deliberately designed to utilise the east elevation as the front elevation in respect of active frontage.

- 8.10 The proposed bin and cycle store would be a relatively discreet and simple single-storey structure that would not adversely impact on the character and appearance of the area. The proposed works would also involve the loss of the large conifer hedge that surrounds the site at present. The Landscape Team has not raised any objection to the proposal, subject to conditions, and I agree with this advice.
- 8.11 Overall, I consider the proposed works would respect the character and appearance of the area and would be acceptable from a design perspective.
- 8.12 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/10, 3/11, 3/12 and 4/4.

### **Residential Amenity**

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.13 The main consideration is the impact of the proposed works on the residential flats to the east and no.32 Davy Road to the west of the site.

#### Impact on flats to the east

- 8.14 There are several flats to the east of the site with rear amenity spaces and windows that face towards the application site. These flats are set at a tangent to the site and all of the windows face out to the north-west.
- 8.15 In terms of overlooking, I do not consider the proposed development would compromise the privacy of these neighbours. The proposed first-floor side (east) window of block 1 would be purposefully designed to be angled to channel outlooks to the south-east only. The two first-floor side windows that would serve the study's of each of the first-floor flats would be obscure glazed to a height of 1.7m. The windows on the north elevation would look directly to the north and the view out to the east would be oblique. There would be windows on the east elevation of block 2 but there would be a separation distance of over 20m from the nearest windows of the flats to the east and this is considered adequate to ensure there would be no harmful overlooking.

- 8.16 The proposal would not adversely overshadow neighbouring flats in my opinion. The proposed two-storey footprint and scale of block 1 would be similar to that of present and would be set westwards of these flats. Block 2 is also proposed to be over 20m from the nearest windows of these flats and this separation distance is considered to be sufficient to ensure there would be no significant loss of light experienced at these neighbouring windows. A shadow study has been produced by the applicant which demonstrates that the level of overshadowing over the rear gardens of these flats would be similar to that cast by the existing conifer hedge. Any overshadowing would be limited to the late afternoon and the amount of light reaching these gardens for the remainder of the day would be acceptable.
- 8.17 The proposed works would not visually enclose these neighbours. Again, the footprint and form of block 1 would be comparable to the existing building and this would not visually dominate neighbouring outlooks. As block 2 would be over 20m from the nearest windows of these flats, I am confident the proposal would not visually dominate these outlooks.

#### Impact on no.32 Davy Road

- 8.18 No.32 Davy Road is a two-storey terraced property which adjoins onto the application site from the west. This neighbour has raised concerns regarding visual enclosure, loss of privacy and noise and disturbance from both the proposed occupation of the site and the construction/ demolition process.
- 8.19 I consider the proposal would respect the privacy of this neighbour. The views out to the rear (north) of block 1 across the garden of this neighbour would be similar to the relationship experienced further along the terrace where neighbours share views across each other's gardens. Whilst I acknowledge the large hedge prevents this view at present, I do not consider the view out in this direction would be any worse than that already experienced at no.32 due to the first-floor rear outlooks of no.34. No windows are proposed on the side or rear (west) elevations of block 2 and there would consequently be no overlooking caused by this part of the proposed development. It is acknowledged that other properties further to the west along the terrace have raised concerns regarding the loss of the hedge and the subsequent overlooking of gardens that would occur. However, for the same reasons set out above, I do not

consider the privacy of these neighbours would be compromised.

8.20 With respect to overshadowing, I am of the opinion that the proposal would not lead to a significant loss of light at this neighbouring property. A shadow study has been prepared which demonstrates that the levels of overshadowing would be comparable to that caused by the large hedge, particularly in the morning hours. The proposed two-storey mass of block 2 would slightly increase the levels of overshadowing experienced but this would be limited to the latter part of the garden only. The additional single-storey element proposed on block 1 would be of a modest scale and depth and would not adversely overshadow this neighbour.

8.21 From a visual dominance and enclosure perspective, I consider the impact on this neighbour would be acceptable. The scale and mass of block 1 would mimic that of the existing building on-site and the additional single-storey element is deemed to be of a low enough height to ensure it would not appear oppressive along the garden boundary. The two-storey mass of block 2 would be more prominent than the existing hedge due to the difference between the softer hedge compared to the harder expanse of brickwork proposed. However, this wall would be situated at the far end of the garden, well away from the windows of this neighbour and a reasonable distance away from their rear patio area. The removal of the hedging along the entire length of this side boundary would also help to improve the outlook available from the garden out to the east. On balance, given the distance between the rear patio and the proposed wall of block 2 of approximately 15m, I consider the proposal would not result in this neighbour being visually enclosed.

#### Noise and disturbance

8.22 It is acknowledged that concerns have been raised from neighbours regarding the noise and disturbance that would occur from the proposed use of the site. The proposed flats would all be one-bedroom in size and would each have their own independent access from the side private road. The movement of people coming and going to and from the property and accessing cycle and bin storage would not be along the boundary of any neighbours and I am therefore confident there

would be no significant harm to neighbour amenity from this. The outdoor garden area is limited and it would be more likely that future occupants would rely on Coleridge Recreation Ground as the main outdoor space if needed. In any case, I do not anticipate the use of this garden area would be significantly worse in terms of noise than that of present. There is only one visitor car parking space proposed and vehicle movements to and from the site would be low.

- 8.23 Third party representations have also been raised regarding the noise and disturbance during the construction/ demolition stages of development. The Environmental Health Team has recommended conditions relating to these phases of development to protect neighbour amenity. The Highway Authority has also recommended a traffic management plan condition to ensure contractor vehicle movements and parking are controlled and do not pose a threat to highway safety. In my opinion, subject to these conditions, the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the amenity of neighbours during the construction/ demolitions stages.

#### Impact on on-street parking

- 8.24 Several concerns have been raised in respect of the lack of car parking provided on-site and the subsequent pressure this would put on on-street parking in the surrounding area. The Cambridge Local Plan (2006) has maximum parking standards and there is no policy obligation for residential developments to provide any dedicated car parking. One visitor car parking spaces would be provided at the front of the site but there would be a net loss of one car parking space on-site as a result of the proposed development. This loss of a car parking space and net increase of 3no. residential units on-site would inevitably lead to a degree of pressure on on-street parking in the surrounding streets. However, I am of the opinion that this increase would not be significant enough to warrant refusal of the application. The application site is within 400m of the Mill Road East District Centre and 520m of the Cherry Hinton Road West Local Centre. 10no. cycle spaces have been proposed which is above the minimum cycle parking standards of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006). There are bus stops along Cherry Hinton Road, Mill Road and Coleridge Road in the wider area, the site is within walking distance of the railway station and the city centre is within cycling distance. In my opinion, the

site is highly sustainable and would not be dependent on private car as the only means of travel to and from the site which would alleviate the impact on on-street parking.

- 8.25 In my opinion the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and I consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/10.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

- 8.26 The proposal would provide 5no. one-bedroom residential units. The two maisonette style units would be over two-storeys and would have a floor area of approximately 60m<sup>2</sup> whilst the three one-bedroom flats would vary at 27m<sup>2</sup>, 41m<sup>2</sup> and 46m<sup>2</sup> respectively. All habitable rooms would have acceptable outlooks. No meaningful outdoor private amenity space has been proposed and this is an on-balance issue given the suburban location of the site. The Coleridge Recreation Ground is situated opposite the site which would provide a large area of outdoor amenity space available to future occupants albeit not private. In respect of the one-bedroom size of these units, I consider the absence of on-site private outdoor amenity space to be acceptable in this instance. The site is well served by public transport links, would have sufficient cycle parking and is within walking distance of Local and District Centres.

- 8.27 In my opinion the proposal provides 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, 3/10 and 3/12.

### **Refuse Arrangements**

- 8.28 The proposal includes a bin store situated in a central location on the site with a straightforward access onto the private road leading to the garages and Davy Road. The Waste Team is satisfied with the level of provision proposed but has requested further information regarding the collection point and how the refuse arrangements would be managed. I am of the view that this can be dealt with through condition.

- 8.29 In my opinion, subject to condition, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

## Highway Safety

- 8.30 The Highway Authority has raised no objection to the application, subject to a traffic management plan condition.
- 8.31 In my opinion, subject to condition, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

## Car and Cycle Parking

- 8.32 Car parking has been addressed in paragraph 8.24 of this report. A car club informative has been recommended.
- 8.33 The proposal would provide 10no. cycle spaces, 8no. for the future occupiers and 2no. for visitors. The level and type of cycle parking provision proposed is considered to be compliant with the Cambridge Local Plan cycle parking standards.
- 8.34 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10.

## Third Party Representations

- 8.35 The third party representations have been addressed in the table below:

<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
Overdevelopment of the plot. Out of character with area.	See paragraphs 8.6 – 8.11
Visual enclosure/ dominance	See paragraphs 8.16 and 8.20
Overlooking/ loss of privacy.	See paragraphs 8.14 and 8.18
Under provision of parking.	See paragraph 8.23
Further information/ consultation regarding bats is required.	The application site is not designated as a County Wildlife Site, a Site of Special Scientific Interest, a Local Nature Reserve or a City Wildlife Site. The hedges/ trees on site are not protected and the removal of these does not need any consent of the Local Planning Authority. There is no policy basis on which

	to request additional information regarding bats.
Structural damage to adjoining properties during demolition. Security of garden during construction. Party wall agreement required and implications of that. What level of permission required to come on neighbours property when construction taking place? Right of access to garages at rear would be affected during construction.	These are a civil/ legal/ party wall matters and are not planning considerations.
The proposed development would devalue other properties.	This is not a planning consideration.
Construction noise and disturbance. Dust pollution during construction/ demolition.	Conditions have been recommended on these issues as advised by the Environmental Health Team.
Use of property, private/rental/social?	This is not a planning consideration.
Could this affect any plans to extend at 32 in future?	Any extension requiring planning permission at a neighbouring property at a future date would be assessed on its own merits.
The two study rooms are likely to become bedrooms.	The application must be assessed on the basis of the plans submitted by the applicant. Therefore, the layout of the flats has been assessed on the basis that the first-floor rooms will be used as study's.
Noise and disturbance from proposed use of site.	See paragraph 8.21
Inadequate cycle parking provision.	See paragraph 8.32
Poor quality of amenity provision for future occupants.	See paragraph 8.25
Under provision of bin storage.	See paragraph 8.27
Shadow study required.	A shadow study has been produced by the applicant.

## **Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)**

8.36 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.

8.37 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.

8.38 I have consulted the service managers who are responsible for the delivery of projects to offset the impact of development. The service managers have not identified any relevant projects to demonstrate compliance with the CIL Regulations tests in relation to informal open space/play space/indoor sports facilities/outdoor sports facilities and community facilities.

### Planning Obligations Conclusion

8.39 It is my view that planning obligations are not required in this case as there is no evidence to demonstrate where planning obligations will contribute towards and so the pooling of contributions would not pass the tests set by the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.

## 9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 In conclusion, the proposed development is considered to be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area, would respect the amenity of neighbouring properties and would provide an appropriate living environment for future occupants. Approval is recommended subject to conditions.

## 10.0 RECOMMENDATION

**APPROVE** subject to the following conditions:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

7. Prior to the commencement of development, full details of the on-site storage facilities for waste including waste for recycling shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Such details shall identify the specific positions of where wheeled bins will be stationed and the specific arrangements to enable collection from within 10m of the kerbside of the adopted highway/ refuse collection vehicle access point. The approved facilities shall be provided prior to the commencement of the use hereby permitted and shall be retained for their intended use thereafter.

Reason: To protect the amenities of nearby residents/occupiers and in the interests of visual amenity. Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/12 and 4/13

8. No demolition or construction works shall commence on site until a traffic management plan has been agreed with the Planning Authority.

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

9. No development shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include proposed finished levels or contours; means of enclosure; car parking layouts, other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials; minor artefacts and structures (e.g. furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting); proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines indicating lines, manholes, supports); retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant. Soft Landscape works shall include planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate and an implementation programme.

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

10. No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatments to be erected. The boundary treatment shall be completed before the use hereby permitted is commenced and retained thereafter unless any variation is agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

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

## **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](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](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](https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Dust%20and%20Emissions%20SPG%208%20July%202014_0.pdf)

**INFORMATIVE:** The applicant is encouraged to ensure all future tenants/occupiers of the flats are aware of the existing local car club service and location of the nearest space.

**INFORMATIVE:** Traffic Management Plan: The principle areas of concern that should be addressed are:

i. Movements and control of muck away lorries (wherever possible all loading and unloading should be undertaken off the adopted public highway)

ii. Contractor parking, for both phases (wherever possible all such parking should be within the curtilage of the site and not on street).

iii. Movements and control of all deliveries (wherever possible all loading and unloading should be undertaken off the adopted public highway)

iv. Control of dust, mud and debris, please note it is an offence under the Highways Act 1980 to deposit mud or debris onto the adopted public highway.

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

No part of any structure may overhang or encroach under or upon the public highway unless licensed by the Highway Authority and no gate / door / ground floor window shall open outwards over the public highway.

**INFORMATIVE:** Public Utility apparatus may be affected by this proposal. Contact the appropriate utility service to reach agreement on any necessary alterations, the cost of which must be borne by the applicant.