

<b>Application Number</b>	16/0990/FUL	<b>Agenda Item</b>	
<b>Date Received</b>	31st May 2016	<b>Officer</b>	Sav Patel
<b>Target Date</b>	26th July 2016		
<b>Ward</b>	Romsey		
<b>Site</b>	1 Great Eastern Street Cambridge CB1 3AB		
<b>Proposal</b>	Demolition of existing frontage building (1 Great Eastern Street) and replace with 2no. flats (as approved under application 14/0607/FUL), alteration to the cycle / refuse area and minor fenestration alterations.		
<b>Applicant</b>	N/A c/o Agent		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed replacement of the front façade with matching brickwork and design would help to maintain the traditional appearance of the original property and preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.</li> <li>- The proposed alterations to the rear and side are of a minor nature and would not have any significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.</li> <li>- The proposed alterations would not have any significant adverse impact on the residential amenity of the adjacent neighbours.</li> </ul>
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

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

- 1.1 The application site consists of a two storey end of terrace property located on the western side of Great Eastern Street. This primarily residential area is characterised by two storey terrace housing fronting the back edge of the pavement. To the south of the site is a car park and play area. To the west of the site is the railway line.
- 1.2 The site is located within the Mill Road Conservation Area. There are no Listed Buildings or Building of Local Interests within close proximity of the site.

## **2.0 THE PROPOSAL**

- 2.1 The proposal is for the demolition of the existing frontage building, No. 1 Great Eastern Street, which is in office use, and the construction of a new two storey building consisting of two flats. It follows a previous consent on a larger site that included a replacement building for 4 flats to the rear and a similar proposal for the frontage building No. 1 albeit that the front façade of this building was to be retained. The new proposal also includes alterations to the cycle store, refuse area and minor alterations to the fenestration for the front and side of the building. This planning application does not include any alterations to the approved building to the rear of No.1 which consists of four flats. It is the applicant's intention to part implement the previous consent in relation to the consented redevelopment to the rear and to implement this new proposal to rebuild No. 1 without having to retain its front façade.

### **Background**

- 2.2 Planning permission (ref: 14/0607/FUL) was granted in January 2015. The site encompassed the frontage building, No. 1 and land to the rear. The planning permission was for the conversion and extension of the existing frontage building from office into two flats and the erection of a building in the rear garden area following demolition of the existing outbuilding to provide 4 flats with associated provisions. The frontage building was not consented to be demolished and the front façade was shown to be retained.

- 2.3 The planning application was originally presented to East Area Committee on 31 July 2015 but was deferred due to members not been given or being made aware of the relevant appeal decision on the site which related to planning application 11/0351/FUL and Conservation Area Consent (CAC) ref: 11/0865/CAC. The CAC application related to the demolition of the existing outbuildings. The 11/0351/FUL application was for the change of use and side extension to the frontage building from office into two flats and erection of a building at the rear to provide 6 flats following demolition of the existing outbuildings.
- 2.4 The Inspector ruled that the design of the building would not harm the character of the Conservation Area, and that the residential amenity of occupiers of no. 5 would not be harmed. However, he considered that the enclosing impact of the building on the garden of no.3, the absence of appropriate amenity space for future occupiers of the scheme, and the impact on the adjacent Tree of Heaven all meant the appeal should be dismissed. He also dismissed the appeal on the associated Conservation Area Consent application saying that in the absence of an acceptable scheme to replace, the loss of the existing outbuildings was not justified, despite the fact that they did not enhance the character of the Conservation Area.
- 2.5 The 2014 scheme (14/0607/FUL) was revised to accommodate the issues raised by the inspector. The revision consisted of the following:
1. The single-storey element along the common boundary with number 3 Great Eastern Street was removed;
  2. The main two storey rear building was set further away from the common boundary with number 3 by a further 2m, giving a 3m gap rather than the 1.3m gap in the dismissed appeal scheme
  3. The new bin and bike store was set in from the common boundary with number 3 by 2m;
  4. The roof over the existing two-storey wing was increased in height
  5. The existing single-storey flat roof is to be a lean-to.
- 2.6 Prior to the determination of the 2014 application a Development Control Forum was held with local residents and the developer to discuss possible alterations to improve the scheme. Prior to the DCF the applicant submitted amended

plans which showed, amongst other minor alterations, the garden of number 3 Great Eastern Street being extended by 2 metres into the application site, effectively transferring ownership to the neighbouring resident.

- 2.7 The minutes of the East Area Committee note the concerns raised by local residents but made no reference to the scheme being reliant on extending the rear garden of no.3 GES by 2 metres. Furthermore, the original plans were listed on the final decision notice rather than the revised plans showing the additional land given to no.3.

### 3.0 SITE HISTORY

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
11/0351/FUL	Change of use and side extension to the frontage building from an office to create 2no 1 bed flats; and erection of 6 studio apartments at the rear (following demolition of existing rear buildings), together with associated infrastructure.	Non-determination – appeal dismissed.
11/0865/CAC	Demolition of existing rear outbuildings.	REFUSED – dismissed at appeal
14/0607/FUL	Conversion and extension of existing frontage building from office to 1no. flat and 1 studio flat; and erection of 4 studio flats to the rear (following demolition of existing outbuildings), together with associated infrastructure.	APPROVED
16/0146/NMA	Non material amendment on application no 14/0607/FUL to add condition linking planned drawing nos.	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 3/11 3/14 4/10 4/11 5/1 8/6

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 (Appendix A)  Planning Policy Statement – Green Belt protection and intentional unauthorised development August 2015
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)
	<u>Area Guidelines</u>
	Mill Road Area Conservation Area Appraisal (2011)

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

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

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

## 6.0 CONSULTATIONS

### **Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)**

6.1 The proposal should have no significant impact on the public highway subject to the following informatives:

- Traffic Management Plan;
- No structures to overhang the highway;
- Public utility apparatus;

### **Environmental Health**

6.2 The proposed development is acceptable subject to the following conditions and informatives:

- Demolition/Construction hours;

- Piling;
- Dust;
- Dust informative
- Contaminated land informative

### **Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)**

6.3 The proposal is acceptable.

### **Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Officer)**

6.4 The proposal is acceptable subject to condition on maintenance and management of surface water drainage.

### **Urban Design and Conservation Team**

6.5 The proposals for the alterations to the fenestration and the cycle/refuse area are acceptable as they will not impact on the character or appearance of the conservation area. By demolishing the whole building, the total loss of historic fabric will be that shown on drawing number 2446-P78. When balanced against the public benefit of a rebuilt façade in appropriate brick and mortar, the Conservation Team believe that the rebuilt façade would better preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area than the patched in alternative. The following conditions have been recommended:

- Sample panel;
- Matching brickwork;
- Stonework details;
- Joinery materials;
- Joinery details matching;
- New joinery;
- Roofing details;

### **Drainage Officer**

6.6 The proposed development is acceptable subject to condition on maintenance and management of surface water drainage.

6.7 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:

- 3 Great Eastern Street;
- 5 Great Eastern Street;
- 17 Great Eastern Street;
- 96 Cavendish Road;

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Demolition of the frontage does not maintain the integrity of a key building at the start of Great Eastern Street;
- Demolition of the building based upon cost and convenience;
- An entirely new building will change the character of the entry into Great Eastern Street;
- Concerns with the potential noise impact from the changed siting of bin area;
- Maintain the initial objections to the whole development as outlined previously;
- Permission would never have been granted if the committee knew of the developer intention to demolish the building;
- No.1 is the most important building in the terrace being visible from Mill Road;
- Replacing the frontage will change the reason the area was made a Conservation Area;
- The proposal would negatively impact the street and ruin the look of the street;
- Cramming too many dwellings on to one site;
- The row of terrace houses should be preserved for generations to come;

7.3 Cllr Baigent has requested this application be referred to the planning committee for the following reasons:

- Object to the proposed loss of the original brickwork which should not change;
- Concerns with how the material from the demolition work will be taken from the site without considerable impact on Great Eastern Street in regards to the means of removal and dust.
- Unacceptable to use the car park for lorries or to move the height restriction.



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. Context of site, design and external spaces
2. Residential amenity
3. Refuse arrangements
4. Car and cycle parking
5. Third party representations

### **Context of site, design and external spaces**

8.2 Great Eastern Street is characterised mainly by two storey terrace housing dating to between 1860s or 1870s. The houses in Great Eastern Street were originally built for and occupied by railway workers working on the Eastern Counties line. They are modest in scale with flat frontages, gault brickwork and located on the back edge of the pavement. No.1 currently has facing yellow buff brick work with sash windows on the front elevation and a white render cement side gable with a small window at ground floor level. Unlike the other properties, no.1 benefits from two first floor windows in the front elevation. This appears to be due it being a wider property than the rest. Within the terrace row there are some properties which have painted brick work on the front elevation and some dwellings have darker brick tones. There are also some properties which have replaced the original sash windows with UPVC casement windows. Therefore whilst there is a general consistency with the scale of the houses, the houses on both sides are varied in terms of external treatment. However there appears to be a general consistency with the lintel detail and fanlight above the front door and dentil features below the eaves. This general consistency is acknowledged in the Mill Road Conservation Area Appraisal (2011). The properties in Great Eastern Street, apart from two (no.31 and 35), are identified as being 'Positive Unlisted Buildings'. Properties that are identified as being 'Positive Unlisted Buildings' vary but commonly they are good examples of relatively unaltered buildings where their style,

detailing and building materials provide the streetscape with interest and variety. Most importantly, they make a positive contribution to the special interest of the Conservation Area.

#### Front façade and side elevation

- 8.3 The proposal differs from the approved scheme in that it is proposed to demolish the front façade (along with the remainder of the building which has already been approved under the previous consent) and replace it with matching brickwork and replicate the existing design. The front façade has in the past been sandblasted and repointed, which has deteriorated the quality of the brickwork. The quality of the existing brickwork therefore makes it difficult to blend and tie in any new bricks into the retained fabric of the facade without carrying out significant work to each connecting brick. The proposal is to try and reuse, where possible, recovered bricks which have not been damaged by sandblasting in the rebuilding of the front façade. However, this will be subject to the condition of each brick when assessed. The proposal to use matching bricks and to replicate the design would avoid the need to see patched brickwork around the new side door, ground floor and junction between the existing and new side extension which would have been visible if the approved scheme was implemented. Whilst this would retain some of the historic fabric of the original property it would appear incongruous within the streetscene and undermine the heritage value of the terrace. As such it would fail to preserve or enhance the character of the Conservation Area.
- 8.4 Paragraph 4.40 of the Local Plan (2006) states that when considering the demolition of buildings which contribute positively to the character of a Conservation Area the same tests would apply to the demolition of a Listed Building. Policy 4/10 (Listed Buildings) states that works for the demolition of Listed Buildings will not be permitted unless:
- a. The building is structurally unsound for reasons other than deliberate damage or neglect;*
  - b. It cannot continue in its current use and there are no viable alternative uses; and*
  - c. Wider public benefit will accrue from redevelopment.*

- 8.5 It is important to understand that the principle of demolishing the side, rear and roof of the existing building has already been established through planning permission ref: 14/0607/FUL which is extant. Therefore, the only element for consideration is whether the removal of the existing front façade would conflict with policy 4/10. In my view, the proposal to use matching bricks and reuse reclaimed bricks, where possible, would provide a better finish and outcome overall than retaining the existing façade and patch working in brick work to accommodate the approved scheme. The building is not a Listed Building and has not been singled out in the Area Appraisal as a building of special interest. I agree with the Conservation Officer that the proposed approach of taking down and rebuilding the front façade to the same design using a matching brick (and where possible reclaimed bricks) would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposal would also ensure the replacement windows match the existing sash windows. I have recommended conditions to ensure the joinery detail matches the existing to ensure the proposed alterations respect the original appearance of the property. Therefore, the proposal to replace and rebuild the front façade is acceptable and would ensure a better outcome in order to preserve the intrinsic heritage value of the street. Drawing no.2446-P78 (Estimated extent of replacement brickwork) demonstrates the area and amount of patchwork that could potentially be required. The patchwork would be in and around important areas of the front facade which would be very noticeable.
- 8.6 Therefore, I consider the proposal would be compliant with section c) of policy 4/10 (as detailed above). The proposed rebuilding of the front façade would, once completed using materials that have been agreed through appropriate conditions that would also ensure the brickwork exactly matches the historic work nearby in terms of bond, mortar, mix design, joint thickness, pointing technique, brick dimension, colour and texture, will achieve a much better outcome than the consented patch brickwork approach.
- 8.7 The proposal includes a break/step in the side (south) elevation. In the approved scheme the side gable including a single storey rear element extended up to the side boundary. The proposal is for the single storey element, which consists of the ground floor and first floor terrace to be set 300mm off the boundary and the

main two storey gable to remain on the boundary. This alteration is acceptable, as it would create a shadow line/break in the side elevation and gives architectural interest to the side elevation which is most visible from the public realm. This alteration would not have any detrimental visual impact on the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

#### Bin and cycle storage

- 8.8 The proposal also includes the rearrangement of the approved bin and cycle storage provision. In the approved scheme (ref:14/0607/FUL), the bin store opened out onto the shared space and would have required future residents to have to travel further to put out the bins for collection. However, as part of the discharge of condition 9 (bin storage - 14/0607/COND9A), the applicant submitted revised details showing what is now proposed and the condition has been discharged on this basis following approval by the Council's Waste Team. The proposed arrangement is for the bin store to open onto the side passage via a sliding door. This reduces the travel distance for future occupiers, makes the cycle parking more secure and would improve the use and visual appearance of the shared space. The revised bin store arrangement is therefore an acceptable alteration to the original.
- 8.9 In terms of the cycle store, this has been rotated 90 degrees so that it opens onto the shared space to the rear of the property rather than the side passage. This would make it more convenient and accessible to parking and removing cycles. The store would continue to have sliding doors and provide four cycle stands. The relocation of the cycle store would mean that it would be more secure as it would be located centrally and in a part of the site that would be under natural surveillance. It would also reduce conflict with anyone parking or taking out a bike with anyone entering or leaving the site. Details of the cycle parking arrangement was not conditioned so no further information is required to be submitted. In these terms, therefore, I am satisfied that the revised cycle parking arrangement is acceptable as it would be an enhancement over the approved scheme.

#### Rear elevation

- 8.10 The approved shallow pitched glazed and standing seam metal roof covering of the cycle store is proposed to be replaced with a deeper pitched lean-to roof with slate. The size of the roof would also be reduced in width. The roof in the approved scheme extended across to the boundary with no.3. The proposal would remove this and the roof would only cover the area for the cycle store. The proposed revision to the roof form and material (standing seam to slate) would be in keeping and relate better to the original features of the property.
- 8.11 The other proposed minor alteration to the rear elevation is to replace the first floor window in the rear elevation with a door. This is acceptable as it would not have any adverse visual impact on the area.

#### South (side) elevation

- 8.12 The first floor door in the side elevation of the two storey outrigger would be replaced with patio doors which open out onto a terrace. This is a minor alteration and is acceptable as it would not impact on residential amenity or adversely affect the appearance of the side elevation.
- 8.13 Part of the side boundary wall would be increased in height by 500mm from 2.5 metres to 3 metres but the overall height of the boundary (brick wall and railing) would continue to be 3.7 metres. This alteration is acceptable and would not have a detrimental impact on the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.
- 8.14 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12, 4/10, 4/11 and 8/6

#### **Residential Amenity**

##### Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.15 The proposed alterations would not have any adverse impact on the residential amenity of the adjoining neighbours over and above that which would be experienced from the approved scheme. In the approved scheme, the impact on the residential amenity of the adjacent occupiers was carefully assessed in terms of overlooking, overbearing impact and overshadowing. The proposed scheme does not raise any new or make worse

any existing residential amenity issues on adjacent occupiers than the approved scheme. The proposed amendments would overall result in a status quo but it could be argued that the revised roof detailing for the cycle store would improve the relationship with the occupier of no.3.

- 8.16 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 and 3/7.

#### Amenity for future occupiers of the site

- 8.17 The proposed alterations to the ancillary provision would improve the living environment for future occupiers.
- 8.18 In my opinion the proposal provides a high-quality living environment and an appropriate standard of residential amenity for future occupiers, and I consider that in this respect it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12 (or 3/14).

#### Third Party Representations

- 8.19 I have addressed some of the third party representations in the above section of the report. However, for the issues that I have not responded to I address these in the below table:

<b>Representation</b>	<b>Response</b>
Demolition of the frontage does not maintain the integrity of a key building at the start of Great Eastern Street;	See para 8.3 to 8.6
Demolition of the building based upon cost and convenience;	The demolition of the front façade would enable a better finish to the property which would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
An entirely new building will change the character of the entry into Great Eastern Street;	The principle of demolishing the side, rear and roof has already been established. The proposed approach to deal with the front elevation is

	considered to be better than the approved patchwork approach.
Concerns with the potential noise impact from the changed siting of bin area;	The impact from noise generated from the change to the bin store would be no worse than the approved arrangement.
Maintain the initial objections to the whole development as outlined previously;	The objections to the original scheme were addressed in the previous report.
Permission would never have been granted if the committee knew of the developer intention to demolish the building;	Each planning application is considered on its own merits.
No.1 is the most important building in the terrace being visible from Mill Road;	The Area Appraisal does not give no.1 any enhanced status over the other Positive Unlisted Buildings in the terrace. The gable end of the property would be the most visible aspect of the property. Consent has already been established to take this down and rebuild it.
Replacing the frontage will change the reason the area was made a Conservation Area;	I have recommended a materials condition and brickwork condition to ensure the appearance of the new brickwork matches the existing. I am satisfied with this would result in a better outcome than the approved patchwork approach.
The proposal would negatively impact the street and ruin the look of the street;	As above.
Cramming too many dwellings on to one site;	The number of dwellings on the site has already been established.
The row of terrace houses should be preserved for generations to come;	The extension to the frontage property has already been established. The new brick will

	match the existing to ensure continuity with the rest of the street.
--	--

## 9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The proposal to demolish the existing front façade which was to be retained as part of the approved scheme (140/0607/FUL) would result in a better outcome for the benefit of the public. The approved scheme would have resulted in a patchwork of brickwork by knitting in the original façade into the new elements. This would have resulted in areas of patch brickwork around the new undercroft side passage, around the ground floor window and between the existing and new side extension. By taking down the entire brickwork façade of the front elevation, it would allow for consistent brickwork which matches the brickwork design of the original terrace. I am satisfied that the harm of demolishing the front façade would be outweighed by the public benefit of seeing a better finished facade which respects and preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- 9.2 The other minor alterations are acceptable as they would not have a detrimental impact on the character or appearance of the area.
- 9.3 The proposed alterations would not have any adverse impact on the residential amenity of the adjoining neighbours over and above the approved scheme.

## 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. 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)

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

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13

6. No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 3/14)

7. All new brickwork shall match exactly the historic work nearby in terms of bond, mortar mix design, joint thickness, pointing technique, brick dimension, colour and texture, etc.

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

8. 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 bricks from the demolished building are to be re-used unless otherwise agreed by 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 3/12 and 4/11)

9. No stonework, artificial or natural, (including columns, strings, quoins, lintels, sills, copings, plinths or kneelers) is to be erected until details of the source, colour, texture, coursing, mortar mix design, joint type and thickness and pointing technique, have been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority in the form of large-scale drawings and/or samples. If so required by the local planning authority, the latter may need to be submitted as a panel, which must be retained on site for comparative purposes until the development is completed. 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)

10. All new joinery is to be of timber and not metal or plastic.

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

11. All new joinery works shall match exactly the existing in every respect including material, style, moulding detail and workmanship unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

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

12. 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)

13. 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)

14. 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

15. No development shall take place until details of the maintenance and management of the surface water drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented and thereafter managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure appropriate surface water drainage. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/16)

**INFORMATIVE:** If previously unidentified contamination is encountered whilst undertaking the development, works should cease on site until the Local Planning Authority has been notified and/or the additional contamination has been fully assessed and an appropriate remediation and validation/reporting scheme agreed with the LPA. Remedial actions should then be implemented in line with the agreed remediation scheme and a validation report will be provided to the LPA for consideration.

**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:** Traffic Management Plan condition informative

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.

**INFORMATIVE:** 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.