

<b>Application Number</b>	16/0822/FUL	<b>Agenda Item</b>	
<b>Date Received</b>	16th May 2016	<b>Officer</b>	Charlotte Burton
<b>Target Date</b>	11th July 2016		
<b>Ward</b>	Petersfield		
<b>Site</b>	27 Mill Road Cambridge CB1 2AB		
<b>Proposal</b>	Erection of a two storey dwelling containing two one-bedroom flats on the land behind 27-29 Mill Road. Works involve the demolition of an existing outhouse.		
<b>Applicant</b>	Dr George Mathai 27 Mill Road Cambridge CB1 2AB		

<p>SUMMARY</p>	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>The proposal would deliver two additional units which would contribute to meeting housing demand in the city.</p> <p>The proposal would not have an unacceptable overshadowing, overbearing or overlooking impact on residential amenity of neighbouring properties.</p> <p>The future occupants of the site would have an acceptable level of residential amenity.</p> <p>The scale, massing and design of the proposal would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area.</p>
<p>RECOMMENDATION</p>	<p>APPROVAL</p>

## **1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT**

- 1.1 The site forms part of the conjoined curtilages of Nos. 27 and 29 Mill Road which comprise a pair of gault brick and slate semi-detached two-storey dwellings fronting Mill Road. The site forms the rear/northern part of the curtilages and is located on the east side of Guest Road.
- 1.2 There is an existing single storey garage against the northern boundary of the site and a vehicular access from Guest Road. The remainder of the site is currently laid out as hardstanding.
- 1.3 Nos. 27 & 29 Mill Road have been extended at the rear at two storeys. No. 27 is understood to be currently occupied as a single dwellinghouse (C/01/0817). No. 29 was converted from a single dwellinghouse to form 2 flats and 6 bedsits (C/01/1026).
- 1.4 To the north along the boundary runs a passageway serving the rear gardens of houses along Guest Road. The property immediately to the north is No. 2 Guest Road which is orientated with a gable side elevation facing the application site. To the east, the site adjoins the rear garden of No. 31 Mill Road.
- 1.5 The site falls within the Mill Road Area of the Central Conservation Area. The buildings are not listed and are not buildings of local interest. There are no trees on the site. The site is also within the controlled parking zone.

## **2.0 THE PROPOSAL**

- 2.1 The proposal is for the erection of a two storey extension to Nos. 27-29 Mill Road containing 2 one-bedroom flats, following demolition of an existing single storey garage and store, with associated car and cycle parking, and bin storage. The materials would be brick and slate to match the existing.
- 2.2 The application was presented to the planning committee on 31 August 2016 and a decision was deferred due to a lack of information regarding the internal layout of Nos. 27 and 29, and the impact that the loss of the windows and doors on the rear elevation would have on the amenity of those occupants. Since then, revised plans have been submitted which show:

- Existing and proposed ground and first floor plans of Nos. 27 and 29.
- The insertion of a first floor window on the side elevation of No. 29 serving the kitchen of bedsit, which would be fixed and obscured glass to 1.7m above finished floor level.
- Amendment to the red line of the application site shown on the location plan to include the additional kitchen window.

### 3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
15/1201/FUL	Erection of a two storey building containing two one-bedroom flats on the land behind 27-29 Mill Road. Works involve the demolition of an existing outhouse.	Refused
15/0084/FUL	Two-storey infill development to provide two one-bedroom apartments in place of two single-storey sheds that will be demolished.	Withdrawn
C/01/1026	Change of use from dwelling house to 2 bed flat and 6 no bedsits and two storey rear extension.	Approved
C/01/0817	Erection of a two storey rear extension	Approved

### 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, 3/10, 3/11, 3/14 4/11, 4/13 5/1 8/2, 8/6, 8/10 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 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)
Material Considerations	<u>City Wide Guidance</u> Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)

	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Area Guidelines</u></p> <p>Mill Road Area Conservation Area Appraisal (2011)</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)**

The vehicular access to the site is already in existence and so, although lacking in pedestrian visibility spays and of a very constrained nature, I am unable to demonstrate severe additional detriment as being resultant to conditions on the public highway from the proposal, however the proposal removes off-street parking for the existing dwelling, which, as the existing dwelling will retain any rights to Residents' Parking Permits which they currently enjoy, may result in additional parking demand appearing on-street

The development may therefore impose additional parking demands upon the on-street parking on the surrounding streets and, whilst this is unlikely to result in any significant adverse impact upon highway safety, there is potentially an impact upon

residential amenity which the Planning Authority may wish to consider when assessing this application.

## 6.2 Environmental Health

No objection. Recommended conditions:

- Construction hours
- Piling

## 6.3 Refuse and Recycling

No comments received.

## 6.4 Urban Design and Conservation team

No objection. Recommended conditions:

- Sample panel of facing materials – not listed building
- Roofing details - not listed building
- New joinery – not listed building

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:

- 2 Guest Road
- 4 Guest Road
- 8 Guest Road
- Unknown address

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- The area is already over-developed with in-fill buildings and rented properties
- In-filling and loss of openness is out of character with the area.
- Lack of parking.
- Increased congestion on Mill Road.

- Loss of light to houses and gardens nearby.
- Loss of light, sense of enclosure of actual/perceived loss of privacy impact on No. 2 Guest Road.
- Existing rear extension is inconsistent with the character of the area and the proposed design would add to different styles.
- Use of obscure glazed windows to protect privacy is not a robust solution as cannot be enforced.
- Reduced height of wall alongside the property reduces privacy for neighbours and future occupiers.
- The existing site is not brownfield or underused, and is an integral part of the curtilage of the existing properties.
- Loss of open space for existing occupants of the flats.
- The elevations onto the alleyway ignore the historic and distinctive pattern of terraced housing with back gardens backing onto rear alleyways.
- The proposal would damage the area which would be out of proportion to the benefit resulting from the proposed development in terms of delivering housing.
- The description of 'apartments' is misleading as they are bedsits.
- Cramped accommodation with 11 units on the site.

7.3 Councillor Robertson has called the application to planning committee for the following reasons:

- Impact on the streetscape.
- Loss of on-street parking for residents.

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

7.5 There is an outstanding public consultation on the revised plans which is due to end on 25 October. Representations will be reported on 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. Context of site, design and external spaces (and impact on heritage assets)
3. Residential amenity
4. Refuse arrangements
5. Highway safety
6. Car parking
7. Cycle parking
8. Third party representations
9. Planning obligations

### **Principle of Development**

- 8.2 Policy 5/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) states that proposals for housing development on windfall sites will be permitted subject to the existing land use and compatibility with adjoining uses. The surrounding area on this side of Mill Road is predominantly residential, and the principle of residential development on the site is broadly acceptable and in accordance with Policy 5/1.
- 8.3 Policy 3/10 states that residential development within the garden area or curtilage of existing properties will not be permitted if 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 nuisance;
  - 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.
- 8.4 The proposal would not affect protected trees/wildlife features and would not prejudice the comprehensive development of the area. Issues relating to residential amenity impacts and the character of the area are considered below.

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

- 8.5 Nos. 27 and 29 are identified in the Mill Road Conservation Area Appraisal (2011) as part of a group of buildings along the northern side of Mill Road that are 'positive buildings'. These are defined generally as "good examples of relatively unaltered buildings where their style, detailing and building materials provides the streetscape with interest and variety... [and] make a positive contribution to the special interest of the Conservation Area." The appraisal describes the group as being of interest due to their two-storey canted bay windows and heavily moulded front doors. It is their front elevations, therefore, that are considered to make the positive contribution to the character of the conservation area.
- 8.6 The conservation area appraisal states that the area is characterised by streets laid out roughly at right angles to Mill Road, with long rows of well-detailed terraced houses. The buildings on the east side of Guest Road comprise a terrace of two-storey brick and render dwellings, all set slightly back from the edge of the pavement behind low boundary walls and with a single bay window to the front elevation. On the opposite side of the road is a handsome terrace of brick dwellings, also set slightly back from the road, with regularly spaced projecting three-storey gables with two-storey bay windows. The properties on the western side are identified as Buildings of Local Interest.
- 8.7 Guest Road is typical of the cohesive frontages that the appraisal identifies as a key characteristic that contributes towards making the area of special interest. Nos. 27 and 29 Mill Road have been substantially extended to the rear which has already significantly altered the streetscene along Guest Road. The existing extension is set back from the west gable end of No. 27, thereby ensuring a degree of subservience to the original building. There is currently a gap of approximately 10m between the rear extension and the side wall of No. 2 Guest Road, although part of this is filled with the single storey garage against the northern boundary. The historic grid street pattern can still be read, although it has already been compromised by the existing extension.

- 8.8 The previous application for a similar proposal was refused partly on the basis that:

*“By virtue of the scale, massing and design of the proposed development (notably the resultant length of the extension to Nos. 27/29 Mill Road and the lack of spacing between the property and No.2 Guest Road to the north), the proposal would be out of keeping with the pattern of development in the area and would result in a visually intrusive form of development that would dominate and be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the Central (Mill Road) Conservation Area....”*

- 8.9 The Conservation Team support the current application. The previous application had a two storey elevation along the northern boundary of the site. The current proposal has pushed the extension away from the boundary with No. 2 Guest Road. The two storey gable end would be 3.5m from the site boundary. Combined with the alleyway, the separation gap between the side of No. 2 Guest Road and the two storey gable end would be approximately 4m. While I accept that the existing separation gap would be reduced, in my opinion, there would be sufficient spacing between the development and adjacent properties in Guest Road to retain the historic pattern of development in the area.
- 8.10 The extension would have the same building line, ridge and eaves height as the rear extension so that it would be well-related to the existing property. It would feature a projecting two storey bay which would complement the features of the traditional properties along the street including at No. 2 Guest Road. The streetscene has already been altered by the existing extension at the rear of No. 27/29. In my opinion, because the proposal would continue a similar pattern of development and would include features that complement the traditional character of the streetscene, it would better integrate the existing rear extensions into the streetscene, thereby enhancing the character of the conservation area compared to the existing situation.
- 8.11 The materials would be brick and slate to match the existing. The Conservation Team have recommended a condition for a sample panel and joinery details to be submitted and constructed in accordance with the approved details. I have

also recommended a condition requiring submission of details of the proposed brickwork and materials for the wall along Guest Road to be submitted prior to any demolition. Subject to these conditions, I am satisfied that the materials and appearance would be acceptable.

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

### **Residential Amenity**

#### Impact on amenity of neighbouring properties

- 8.13 The adjacent gable of No. 2 Guest Road is blank, but in the south elevation of the rear wing are a ground floor dining room window and first floor bedroom window, both of which are the sole windows to these rooms. This property's principal rear garden area is on the east side of the rear wing, rather than in the small strip on the south side. No. 31 Mill Road has an existing outrigger that is shorter than the extended No. 29 Mill Road. This property has a relatively long rear garden.
- 8.14 The previous application was also partly refused on the basis of amenity concerns as follows:

*“The proposed dwelling would, by virtue of its scale and proximity to the boundary with No.2 Guest Road, be an unduly oppressive feature and have an unacceptably overbearing impact in the outlook from the ground floor dining and first-floor bedroom windows in the south side elevation. The submitted Daylight and Sunlight Assessment also fails to adequately demonstrate that the development would not give rise to an unacceptable loss of light to No.2 Guest Road's ground floor dining room window. Additionally, the proposed first-floor bedroom window in the north side elevation would directly overlook No.2 Guest Road's dining room and bedroom windows. This window would be required to be fixed shut and obscure glazed up to a minimum height of 1.7m above the internal finished first floor level in order to prevent overlooking of No.2 Guest Road, and this would give rise to an unsatisfactory level of amenity for the occupiers of the proposed development given that the window serves a bedroom....”*

8.15 Again, compared to the previous application, the current proposal has a separation distance of 4m between the two storey gable end and the side elevation of No. 2 Guest Road. I have assessed the impact on residential amenity as follows.

#### *Overbearing*

8.16 The two storey part of the proposed extension would overlap with the single storey outrigger and side garden of No. 2 Guest Road only a small amount. In my opinion, the set back of the two storey element 3.5m from the boundary would not have an unacceptable overbearing impact these windows or the garden. The proposed single storey element would be pushed back 2.6m from the boundary and would have a lesser enclosing impact compared to the existing garage on the boundary to be demolished.

8.17 The existing outrigger of No. 31 Mill Road is shorter than No. 29. There is therefore already a reasonably high degree of enclosure affecting this property. While the proposal would increase the two storey depth of No. 29 by 5m, given the set back of the two storey element 3.2m from the eastern boundary, I am satisfied that this would not have an unacceptable enclosure impact on the rear garden compared to the existing situation. The existing garage on the boundary would be demolished and the proposed single storey element would be pushed back 1m from the boundary.

#### *Overshadowing*

8.18 A Shadow Study has been submitted which assesses the impact of the development.

8.19 At the summer/autumn equinoxes, there would be some small increase in the amount of overshadowing of the windows on the rear wing of No. 2 Guest Road during the evenings, however in my opinion this would not have a significant additional impact compared to the existing situation. The Shadow Study shows there would be no increase in overshadowing at other times of the year.

8.20 There would be some small increase in the overshadowing of the rear garden of No. 31 Mill Road during the evening on the

summer solstice. The proposal would not increase overshadowing at other times. In my opinion, this would not have a significant additional impact compared to the existing situation.

### *Overlooking*

- 8.21 The northern elevation has one ground floor window, one obscure-glazed high-level first floor window and one oriel window orientated to face north-west towards Guest Road. In my opinion, the obscure-glazing of the high level window is not necessary as there would be a restricted view from this and there are no windows on the facing gable elevation of No. 2 Guest Road. I am satisfied that the current proposal has addressed previous concerns about overlooking of this property.
- 8.22 The eastern elevation facing No. 31 Mill Road has one obscure-glazed window on the ground and first floors serving a bathroom. Subject to a condition to secure the obscure glazing with a restricted opening, I am satisfied there would be no unacceptable overlooking of the garden of this property.
- 8.23 The proposed additional first floor window on the side elevation facing No. 31 would be fixed and obscured glazed to 1.7m above finished floor level. Subject to this, in my opinion there would be no unacceptable overlooking from this window.

### *Impact on host properties*

- 8.24 Revised plans have been submitted which show the internal floor plans of the host properties Nos. 27 and 29. Additional windows are proposed on the side elevations so that the rooms currently served by the windows on the rear elevation (to be lost) would be served by other windows to provide light and outlook. I have recommended a condition for the proposed windows on the side elevations to be inserted prior to blocking up the windows on the rear elevation, so that the living accommodation would be an acceptable quality. The blocking up of the doors on the rear elevation would not affect residential amenity as there would be an alternative access into the units.

### *Noise and disturbance*

- 8.25 While I accept there would be the additional coming and goings from two additional units, in my opinion, this would not cause significant noise or disturbance that would have an unacceptable impact on residential amenity. There would only be one car parking space so there would be no additional noise from cars maneuvering compared to the existing situation.
- 8.26 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 and 3/14.

### Amenity for future occupiers of the site

- 8.27 In my opinion, the proposed first floor oriel window and high level window in the northern elevation overcome previous concerns about the amenity of future occupants. In my view, obscure glazing the high level window would not be necessary to protect privacy as this window would already have a restricted view and there are no windows on the facing elevation. Therefore in the interests of the amenity of future occupiers, I recommend that the obscure glazing of this window is not conditioned, therefore giving future occupants the option to do this.
- 8.28 The proposal provides courtyard space for the future occupants. Given the proposed units are likely to be occupied by single people, I am satisfied that the amount of external amenity space is acceptable in this location. The future occupants would be in close proximity to Parker's Piece, Donkey Common and Petersfield. While the existing occupants of Nos. 27 and 29 would lose some of their amenity space, as this is already limited and compromised by car parking, in my opinion the loss of this space would not have a significant impact on their residential amenity.
- 8.29 For these reasons, in my opinion the proposal provides a high-quality living environment and an appropriate standard of residential amenity for future occupiers, and I consider that in this respect it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/10 and 3/14.

## **Refuse Arrangements**

- 8.30 The proposal provides a bin storage area for each of the proposed units which, in my opinion is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/14.

## **Highway Safety**

- 8.31 The proposal would use an existing vehicular access. The occupants of the existing properties would lose the existing car parking space. While these occupants would retain rights to Residents' Parking Permits which may increase demand for on-street car parking, in my opinion this would not be unacceptable. The potential number of additional vehicles parking on-street would be low and, in any case, the existing occupants already have rights to on-street parking. The future occupants of the new units would not have rights to permits to park on the public highway within the controlled parking zone. Nonetheless, I have recommended an informative for future occupiers to be made aware of the car club within the city.

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

## **Car Parking**

- 8.33 The proposal provides one car parking space for the proposed development. There would be a loss of car parking for the existing units. The proposal accords with the adopted car parking standards which set maximum limits. Given the highly sustainable location and that the future occupants are likely to be single people, in my opinion, there is no justification for requiring car parking spaces to be provided at the maximum limits.

- 8.34 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/10.

## **Cycle Parking**

- 8.35 The proposal provides space for parking six cycles. This is in excess of the adopted standards which require one space per unit. While these are within the curtilage of the property, I

recommend a condition requiring at least one space per unit to be secure.

- 8.36 Subject to this condition, in my opinion, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/6.

### **Third Party Representations**

- 8.37 The majority of third party representations have been addressed in the main body of this report. Concerns regarding the impact of more rented properties within the area are not a relevant planning matter.

## **9.0 PLANNING OBLIGATIONS**

- 9.1 National Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph 031 ID: 23b-031-20160519 sets out specific circumstances where contributions for affordable housing and tariff style planning obligations (section 106 planning obligations) should not be sought from small scale and self-build development. This follows the order of the Court of Appeal dated 13 May 2016, which gives legal effect to the policy set out in the [Written Ministerial Statement of 28 November 2014](#) and should be taken into account.

- 9.2 The guidance states that contributions should not be sought from developments of 10-units or fewer, and which have a maximum combined gross floorspace of no more than 1000sqm. The proposal represents a small scale development and as such no tariff style planning obligation is considered necessary.

## **10.0 CONCLUSION**

- 10.1 In my opinion, the proposal has addressed the concerns on the previous application regarding the impact on the character of the conservation area and the amenity of neighbouring occupiers, and therefore the principle of development is acceptable in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 5/1 and 3/10.
- 10.2 The existing rear extensions to Nos. 27 and 29 have already altered the appearance of the streetscene and the historic pattern of development. In my opinion, subject to conditions

regarding materials, the proposal would better integrate the existing extensions into the streetscene and would enhance the character of the area by incorporating features which complement the traditional terraced properties.

- 10.3 The proposal would have an acceptable residential amenity for neighbouring properties and future occupiers. In my opinion, the committee's concerns about the impact of blocking up the windows on the rear elevation on the amenity of the occupiers of the host properties has been addressed by the additional windows on the side elevations so that this is now acceptable.

## **11.0 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. 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, type of jointing 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 the visual amenity of the Conservation Area 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 3/14 and 4/11)

4. No roofs shall be constructed until full details of the type and source of roof covering materials and the ridge, eaves and hip details, if appropriate, have been submitted to the local planning authority as samples and approved in writing. Roofs shall thereafter be constructed only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/11)

5. All new joinery [window frames, etc.] shall be recessed at least 50 / 75mm back from the face of the wall / façade. The means of finishing of the 'reveal' is to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to installation of new joinery. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/11)

6. Prior to any works to the boundary wall along Guest Road, including demolition, details of the materials, bonding, coursing and colour, and type of jointing shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the local planning authority. The works shall be completed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the Conservation Area (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/11).

7. 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)

8. 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)

9. The windows on the east elevation identified as having obscured glass on drawing number '528-P07 REV A' shall be obscure glazed to a minimum level of obscurity to conform to Pilkington Glass level 3 or equivalent prior to commencement of use of the development and shall have restrictors to ensure that the window cannot be opened more than 45 degrees beyond the plane of the adjacent wall. The windows shall be retained as such thereafter.

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

10. The first floor windows on the west and east elevations of Nos. 27 and 29 respectively as shown on drawing numbers '2528-P04' and 528-P07 REV A' shall be inserted prior to blocking up the first floor windows on the rear (north) elevation of these properties. The windows shall be retained as such thereafter.

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

11. A means of securing at least 1 cycle to the physical fabric (e.g. Sheffield hoop or bracket affixed to an external wall) shall be installed within the curtilage of the site for each of the units hereby approved prior to first occupation and retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of future occupants (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/6).

**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.