

Application Number	16/1057/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	21st June 2016	Officer	Charlotte Burton
Target Date	16th August 2016		
Ward	Newnham		
Site	37 Grantchester Street Cambridge CB3 9HZ		
Proposal	Two storey side extension and rear roof extension incorporating dormer window, including subdivision into two dwelling units, following demolition of converted side garage.		
Applicant	Ms J B Bendall 37, Grantchester Street Cambridge CB3 9HZ		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>The proposal would preserve the character of the conservation area.</p> <p>The proposed extensions and subdivision of the property would have an acceptable impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.</p> <p>The units would have a good quality of amenity for future occupiers.</p>
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

1.1 No. 37 is a two storey end-of-terrace property on the western side of Grantchester Street. The property is set back from the road with a front garden and driveway. The property has a side garden to the north which wraps around the rear of the property. There is an existing single storey former garage on the northern elevation which has been converted to a study, and a two storey outrigger at the rear. The materials are red brick and painted brick with a slate roof.

- 1.2 The surrounding area is residential. To the south is No. 39 Grantchester Street. To the north west of the garden is the rear of the properties on the south east side of Eltisley Avenue orientated at 45 degrees to Grantchester Street, which are separated by a passageway. There are some mature trees within the rear gardens of these properties.
- 1.3 The site is within the Newnham Croft Conservation Area. The property is not listed and is not a Building of Local Interest. There are no tree preservation orders on the site or within the vicinity, however trees are protected by virtue of their location within the conservation area. The site is outside the controlled parking zone.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposal is for a two storey side extension and rear roof extension incorporating dormer window, including subdivision into two units, following demolition of the existing converted side garage. The side extension would provide a bedroom on the ground floor and a kitchen on the first floor.
- 2.2 The extension would allow the property to be used as two units comprising a ground floor one-bed flat; and a 2-bed flat on the first and second floors. The applicant intends to occupy the ground floor unit and her daughter and family would occupy the upper floor flat. The units would have an interconnected staircase and would both be accessed via the existing front door. However the upper floor flat would also have a separate access allowing it to be occupied as a separate unit. For this reason, it is the Local Planning Authority's opinion that the proposal would create two planning units and thus, during the course of the application, the description of development was amended to include the change of use to two separate units. The units would share the existing garden.
- 2.3 The side extension would be one-and-a-half storeys and would have a cat-slide roof with three stepped roof heights. The rear roof extension would be a box dormer stepped up from the eaves. The materials would be red brick and slate to match the existing. During the course of the application the following amendments were submitted:

- Removal of the dormer window on the side elevation of the side extension;
- Removal of the circular windows on the front and rear elevations of the side extension;
- Amended design of the windows to a more traditional style; and
- Change from zinc cladding on the rear dormer window to slate tiles.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
15/1496/FUL	Part single, part two storey front and side extension with roof extension incorporating rear dormer.	Withdrawn

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 Local Plan 2006	3/1 3/4 3/7 3/10 3/14 4/4 4/11 4/13 5/1 5/2 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) Roof Extensions Design Guide (2003)
	<u>Area Guidelines</u> Newnham Croft Conservation Area Appraisal (2013)

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 car parking space in front of the property scales at significantly less than the 5.0 metre standard required to keep most cars from projecting over the public highway. It is therefore considered impractical for keeping most cars that are currently being produced without potentially obstructing the public highway. The Highway Authority therefore requires that a condition be placed upon any permission that the Planning Authority may choose to issue requiring that the redundant vehicular access to the property be replaced with a full-face kerb and normal footway. This requirement can be rendered void by moving the extension away from the highway boundary to provide 5.0 metres clearance in which to keep a car.

Recommended informative advised on work to the public highway.

6.2 Urban Design and Conservation Team

Comments on initial submission 26.07.2016

Objection.

The proposal seeks to increase the three bedded accommodation further by means of redeveloping the former garage with a two storey structure and an extension at roof level in order to provide three generation family accommodation though it is not clear how this is to be configured and will still involve the need for steps between areas on the ground floor.

The two storey structure undermines the cohesiveness of the terrace form by the use of a much slacker pitched roof form at two levels at ninety degrees to the main roof. The upper level eaves line is also interrupted by a flat roofed dormer window in order to achieve adequate headroom whilst the lower portion introduces an unfamiliar circular window to the road elevation. A

further single storey element housing the en-suite cloakroom is canted in plan in order to limit imposing on the garden area but is covered by a roof which is square on plan. Consequently it fails to comply with NPPF para 64 in failing to improve the character and quality of the area.

The roof extension to the main house is of a box form albeit set in a little from the eaves and end wall. The Cambridge Roof Extensions Design Guide states the more visible a roof is from public areas, the more important it will be for it to be well designed and therefore in accordance with the Guide. Therefore it is essential that any roof extension fit with the traditional character of the surrounding area and not give the visual effect of an incongruous three storey building but instead an extension to the roof. Consequently, as the proposal is not in accordance with the Design Guide, this aspect of the application cannot be supported due to the visibility of the rear and side of the building and the dominance of the loft extension.

The proposal does not adhere to policy 3/4 by virtue of the design and detailing of the two storey extension or the introduction of a large loft extension which appears as a third storey to a two storey terraced house. The current proposal will have a negative impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and is contrary to this policy 3/14. This proposal complies with neither of the points in policy 4/11 for the reasons stated previously.

Comments on revised drawings

Objection.

The amended plans have addressed some of the issues raised by the Conservation Team. The round windows in the side extension have been removed, as has the dormer window. These amendments are welcomed as they simplify the side extension, reducing its impact.

The dormer window on the rear roof slope has not been altered and therefore still does not comply with policy 4/11 or the Roof Extensions Design Guide. This element of the proposed scheme is still not supported.

6.3 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:

- 39 Grantchester Street
- 57 Grantchester Street
- 23 Eltisley Avenue
- 25 Eltisley Avenue
- 26 Eltisley Avenue
- 27 Eltisley Avenue
- 28 Eltisley Avenue
- 29 Eltisley Avenue
- 30 Eltisley Avenue

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Response to context

- Overdevelopment of the site;
- The design, appearance and size is not in keeping with the character of the conservation area;
- The design is modernistic;
- The creation of a separate unit is out of keeping;
- The round windows do not match the existing building styles;
- The multi-level roofs create an overcomplicated end elevation to the terrace and the insertion of modern windows to the side elevation do not match the style of the existing house;
- The gap between the terrace and Eltisley Avenue will be reduced;

Residential amenity

- Overlooking towards gardens and rear windows of Eltisley Avenue properties;
- Loss of light to gardens of Eltisley Avenue properties;
- Noise and disturbance from the increased occupancy.
- Having a living room next door to a bedroom at first floor level could generate noise and disturbance;

- Increased occupancy and pressure on traffic and parking in a very congested area.

Other

- Impact on trees in neighbouring gardens has not been considered, including Purple Leafed Plum on the boundary with No. 29 Eltisle Avenue.
- The drawings do not show the relationship with neighbouring properties.

7.3 Councillor Cantrill has called in the application on the basis that:

- The design fails to address the context of the surrounding area contrary to Local Plan policy 3/4;
- The extension undermines the cohesiveness of the terrace form and therefore fails to improve the character and quality of the area;
- The roof extension fails to meet the design requirements of the Cambridge Roof Extension Guide and does not fit with the surrounding area.

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

8.0 ASSESSMENT

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

1. Principle of development
2. Context of site, design and external spaces / Impact on heritage assets
3. Residential amenity
4. Refuse arrangements
5. Car parking
6. Cycle parking
7. Trees
8. Third party representations
9. Planning obligations

Principle of Development

- 8.2 The proposal would sub-divide the existing property so that it could be used as two separate units. Policy 5/2 relates to the conversion of large properties. The policy states that the conversion of single residential properties and the conversion of non-residential buildings into self-contained dwellings will be permitted except where:
- a) The residential property has a floor space of less than 110 square metres measured externally;
 - b) The likely impact upon on-street parking would be unacceptable;
 - c) The living accommodation provided would be unsatisfactory;
 - d) The proposal would fail to provide for satisfactory refuse bin storage or cycle parking; and
 - e) The location of the property or the nature of nearby land uses would not offer a satisfactory level of residential amenity.
- 8.3 The existing property has an external floor space of over 110 sqm notwithstanding the proposed extensions, and meets criterion a. The remaining criteria are addressed in the relevant sections below. In summary, in my opinion, the proposal meets these criteria and the principle of the development is acceptable and in accordance with policy 5/2.

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

- 8.4 The property forms the end of the terrace along the western side of Grantchester Street. The Newnham Conservation Area Appraisal identifies Grantchester Street as forming an 'historic spine through the Conservation Area. The terrace is – along with the majority of the traditional terraces in this part of the conservation area – identified in the appraisal as 'buildings important to the character'. The properties form a long row of very cohesive terraced houses, with red brick facades and painted stone details, punctuated by prominent chimney stacks and two storey canted bay windows to each property.
- 8.5 Eltisle Avenue to the north runs at approximately 45 degrees from Grantchester Street so that No. 37 has a triangular plot and a garden which wraps around the side and rear of the property. The gable end of No. 37 is prominent in views along

Grantchester Street, however this is not identified in the appraisal as 'an important positive view', unlike the views along Eltisle Avenue. The gable end is partially obscured by the mature planting in the garden of No. 37 and trees are protected by virtue of their location within the conservation area.

Side extension

- 8.6 The existing side elevation of No. 37 has a single storey lean-to garage which has been converted for use as a study. The former garage is red brick with painted white brickwork on the side elevation. There are painted timber garage doors on the front elevation, windows on the side elevation and glazing on the rear elevation. The garage has a cat-slide tiled roof. It has the appearance of a subservient element which, in my opinion, is entirely in-keeping with the character of the traditional property.
- 8.7 The proposed side extension would be set back 0.2m from the front elevation on the same building line as the existing garage. The width would be 3.7m compared to 3.0m of the existing garage. The roof of the side extension would be stepped so that the front element would be lower than the middle section. The front element would have an eaves height of 3.6m and a maximum roof height of 5.2m, compared to 2.4m and 3.7m respectively for the existing garage. The middle element would have an eaves height of 4.4m and a maximum roof height of 5.9m. The rear element would be a small connecting element with an eaves height of 2.8m and a maximum roof height of 3.6m.
- 8.8 During the course of the application, the design of the side extension was amended to respond to comments from the Urban Design and Conservation Team and third parties. The amended scheme removed the dormer window on the side elevation, removed the circular windows on the front and rear elevations, and amended the design of the windows to a more traditional style, including the ground floor windows on the proposed side elevation and the rear elevation which would have brick lintels to match the existing property. The front elevation would have timber panelled doors to resemble the existing former garage doors. The materials would be brick and slate to match the existing.

- 8.9 The Urban Design and Conservation Team support the amended scheme. In my opinion, the scale and form of the extension respects the existing dwelling. The stepped elements and cat-slide roof would have the appearance of being a subservient element of the building, similar to the existing garage. Third parties have commented that the stepped elements would create an 'overly-complicated' gable elevation, however in my opinion, this would break up the roof form visible from Grantchester Street and would allow parts of the gable end to be visible.
- 8.10 The use of timber panelled doors on the front elevation would have a similar appearance to the existing garage, and the windows on the side and rear elevations, and brickwork quoining and window lintels would be in keeping with the character of the existing house. In my opinion, the amendments have responded to the concerns of third parties regarding the modernistic design. The circular windows that were originally proposed have been removed and the windows have been designed with traditional proportions and brickwork details.
- 8.11 Third parties have raised concern that the side extension would reduce the gap between the Grantchester Street terrace and the Eltisley Avenue properties. In my opinion, the scale of the proposal would not significantly reduce this distance as the side extension would be only 0.7m wider than the existing garage. Moreover, the side extension would only be one-and-a-half storeys. The gap would still read within the street scene as a substantial gap, albeit with existing outbuildings, boundary treatments and mature planting within it.
- 8.12 Third parties have also raised concern that the subdivision would be out of keeping with the character of the area. The front elevation of the extension would have the appearance of a garage extension. The secondary separate entrance would be behind a proposed fence. There would not be a prominent new front door to the unit, and in my opinion, passers-by would not be able to readily discern that there were two units on the site. There would be no first floor window on the front or side elevations indicating residential use of the side extension.
- 8.13 For these reasons, in my opinion, subject to a condition requiring matching materials, the proposed side extension

would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area and is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/14 and 4/11.

Roof dormer

- 8.14 The Urban Design and Conservation Team has objected to the proposed roof dormer on the basis that it conflicts with the Roof Extensions Design Guide (2003). While I accept this advice, in my opinion, there is strong precedent for box dormers within the immediate vicinity. The rear of the properties along Eltisley Avenue show the majority have been extended with full width box dormers that cover the whole roof slope from the eaves to the ridge. These dormers are highly visible from the public highway within the conservation area. In my opinion, the prevalence of these dormers sets a strong precedent for the box type dormer in this part of the conservation area.
- 8.15 The Roof Extensions Design Guide (2003) refers to 'insensitively designed large 'box type' roof extensions which show little respect for the existing roofline or for the scale, design and proportions of the existing property and its neighbours' as being inappropriate. In my opinion, the proposed dormer would have a lesser impact than those within the immediate vicinity. The side cheek would be stepped in approximately 0.8m from the gable end, so that the profile of the roof line would be visible from Grantchester Street. The base of the dormer would be set up approximately 0.9m from the eaves so that part of the roof slope would be visible. The top of the dormer would be stepped down from the ridge by approximately 0.3m so that the ridge line would be unaltered. For these reasons, in my opinion, the dormer would not be 'insensitively designed' and would respect the existing roof, so that it would be in accordance with this part of the Roof Extension Design Guide.
- 8.16 In terms of materials, during the course of the application, the side cheek and rear elevation of the dormer were changed from zinc cladding to slate tiles. There would be windows on the rear elevation of the dormer. The Roof Extensions Design Guide states that 'the choice of materials should reflect or complement the character of the existing roof, the rest of the property and the immediate area.' The use of slate would match the existing roof and would be similar to other dormers within the vicinity. In

my opinion, the use of slate would be appropriate for the age and style of the existing property, in accordance with this part of the Roof Extensions Design Guide.

- 8.17 For these reasons, on balance, in my opinion, the rear box dormer would not cause substantial harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area and is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/14 and 4/11.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.18 The side extension would be on the northern side of the existing terrace and therefore would not have a significant overshadowing impact on the Eltisley Avenue properties to the north and north west, compared to the existing situation. As No. 37 Grantchester Street is separated from the Eltisley Avenue properties with a substantial gap, in my opinion, the scale of the proposed side extension would not have an overbearing impact on the gardens of the Eltisley Avenue properties.
- 8.19 There would be some views from the window on the first floor rear elevation of the side extension and the rear dormer towards the rear elevations and gardens of the Eltisley Avenue properties. The window on the first floor would serve a kitchen/dining room. Views towards the nearest rear elevations and rear gardens of the Eltisley Avenue properties (Nos. 25-27) would be at an oblique angle. Due to the orientation, there would be no direct views into living accommodation.
- 8.20 Direct views into the gardens of the Eltisley Avenue properties would be approximately 8.5m to the site boundary with the passageway. This is similar to the existing first floor window on the rear elevation of the main house. In addition to this, there are also already direct views from the first floor window on the rear elevation of the outrigger which is 7m from the boundary. The overlooking from the first floor window would be from a kitchen/living room rather than a bedroom. There would be some additional overlooking of the gardens, however in my opinion, as there would be no direct views into windows and views towards rear gardens would be partially obscured by trees, the overlooking would not be significantly different from

the views that are already obtained from the existing windows. In my opinion, the degree of overlooking would be acceptable.

- 8.21 In terms of the subdivision, the proposal would convert an existing family home into two smaller flats. As the property is an end-of-terrace, some intensification of use could be acceptable without causing unacceptable disturbance to neighbouring properties. In my opinion, due to the size of the 1-bed and 2-bed units, the proposal is likely to have an acceptable impact. Third parties have raised concerns about noise from first floor living accommodation. As the occupants of the existing property could rearrange their property to have a living room on the first floor, without the need for planning permission, this is not a relevant matter that I can take into account.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

- 8.22 The Council has no adopted internal space standards. In my opinion, the existing property and the proposed extensions would provide a good level of amenity for future occupiers. The existing side and rear garden would provide amenity space for both units. There would be some views from the amenity space into the windows of the ground floor bedroom and living spaces. The site is within the same ownership and the occupiers would be able to split the garden into two or take other measures to protect their privacy should they wish to.
- 8.23 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 5/2, 3/7 and 3/14.

Refuse Arrangements

- 8.24 There is space within the side garden for the storage of bins for the units. I have recommended a condition for details of a bin store to be submitted for approval. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/14 and 5/2.

Car Parking

- 8.25 The property has one existing off-site car parking space on the driveway in front of the garage. The Highways Authority has commented that the parking space does not meet the minimum dimensions, however this is an existing situation. The side extension would not project forward of the existing garage and would not reduce the size of the car parking space compared to the existing situation.
- 8.26 Third parties have raised concerns that the proposed separation into two units would increase demand for off-street parking. In my opinion, the site is in a highly sustainable location close to the city centre and within walking distance of bus stops on Barton Road. The size of the additional unit would not be likely to generate a significant amount of demand for parking.
- 8.27 The adopted car parking standards set maximum levels for the number of car parking spaces permissible. As such, in my opinion, there would not be reasonable planning grounds to require parking to be provided and the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/14, 5/2 and 8/10.

Cycle Parking

- 8.28 The proposal includes a bike store within the side garden, however no details have been provided. In my opinion, there is space to accommodate a cycle store which meets the requirements of Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010). I have recommended a condition for details of the cycle store to be submitted for approval. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/14, 5/2 and 8/6.

Trees

- 8.29 Third parties have raised concerns about the impact on trees within neighbouring gardens which are protected by virtue of their location within the conservation area. I have visited the site and the nearest trees are within the gardens of the Eltisley Avenue properties, including a Purple Leafed Plum tree in the rear garden of No. 29 which is separated from the application site by the passageway. The proposed side extension would have a similar foot print to the existing garage and would only

extend approximately an additional 0.7m closer to the tree. From my assessment on site, I was not concerned that the proposal would extend underneath any tree canopies and therefore not within the root protection area.

- 8.30 Notwithstanding this, I have recommended a condition for a tree protection plan to be submitted for approval. No tree works have been included within the application and I have recommended an informative to advise the applicant that separate consent would be required to do any works to trees, as necessary. Subject to this, in my opinion, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 4/4.

Third Party Representations

- 8.31 The comments regarding response to context, residential amenity, subdivision of the units, trees and other comments have been referred to in the relevant sections above.
- 8.32 Third parties have raised concern that the neighboring properties are not shown on the drawings. The applicant is not required to show the land outside of the application site. I have visited the site and made an assessment of the impact on neighbouring properties.

Planning obligations

- 8.33 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.
- 8.34 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.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 In my opinion, the proposal to extend and subdivide the existing property is compliant with Cambridge local Plan (2006) policies 3/14 and 5/2. I have taken account of the comments from consultees and third parties. The amendments to the side extension submitted during the course of the application would retain the appearance of a subservient addition to the end of the terrace, which is similar in character to the existing garage and other traditional lean-to additions, and the Urban Design and Conservation Team support this element of the proposal. I acknowledge that the dormer does not completely comply with the Roof Extensions Design Guide (2003). However I have taken account of the strong precedent for dormers and the design of the proposed dormer, which in my opinion, is sensitive to the existing roof slope. In my opinion, the proposal would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, and would provide a good level of amenity for future occupiers.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

5. There should be no 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)

6. Prior to commencement of the use hereby permitted, a bin store shall be provided in accordance with details submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and retained thereafter.

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

7. Prior to commencement of the use hereby permitted, a cycle store shall be provided in accordance with details submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and retained thereafter.

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

8. Prior to the commencement of development and with reference to BS 5837 2012, details of the specification and position of all protection measures and techniques to be adopted for the protection of any trees from damage during the course of any activity related to the development, shall be submitted to the local planning authority for its written approval in the form of an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and Tree Protection Plan (TPP).

The approved AMS and TPP will be implemented throughout the development and the agreed means of protection shall be retained on site until all equipment, and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area protected in accordance with this condition, and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered nor shall any excavation be made without the prior written approval of the local planning authority.

Reason: To protect the visual amenity of the area and to ensure the retention of the trees on the site. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11, 3/14 and 4/4)

INFORMATIVE: 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.

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.