

Application Number	16/1002/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	7th June 2016	Officer	Sav Patel
Target Date	2nd August 2016		
Ward	Abbey		
Site	19 - 21 Godesdone Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB5 8HR		
Proposal	Erection of a residential development containing seven units (one 2xbed flat and six 1xbed flats) including bin and cycle storage, following the demolition of the existing buildings on the site		
Applicant	C/O Agent		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed development respects the built form of the area in terms of design and scale; - The proposed development would not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area; - The proposed development is not significantly harmful to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers;
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

1.1 The application site is located on the western side of Godesdone Road and is currently occupied by office/warehouse buildings. The buildings are in two elements, a large pitched roof element and a smaller set back pitched roof element. The buildings occupy the entire footprint of the plot aside from an area at the front of the smaller element where there is space for off street parking.

- 1.2 The site is located within a residential area characterised by mainly two storey terrace housing with small thresholds at the front. However, there are small pockets of commercial use such as the previous use of the site. No.72 Beche Road which is north of the site and on the corner of Godesdone Road and Beche Road is in commercial use. However, many of the commercial uses have been converted back into residential. Opposite the site is relatively recent housing infill development which replaced an office building.
- 1.3 The site is located within the Riverside and Stourbridge Common Conservation Area. The properties to the north of the site in Beche Road are identified in the Area Appraisal as 'Buildings Important to the Character'. However, none of the properties in Godesdone Road are identified as such.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposal is for the demolition of the existing buildings and construction of a two and half storey building with a lean-to element to the north. The development would consist of seven flats (1x2bed and 6x1bed) with bin and cycle storage. Both ground floor flats would have the benefit of external space to the rear. The lean-to element would be set back from the 2 " storey element.
- 2.2 The proposed development has been amended to respond to Officers concerns with the scale of development within the street scene and impact on the residential amenity of the occupiers in the properties to the north of the site in Beche Road and to the south at no.17 Godesdone Road.
- 2.3 The proposed development would be set off the western boundary by between 2.7 and 3 metres. The setback would provide flats 1 and 2 with outdoor amenity space.
- 2.4 The proposed 2 " storey building would be 9.7 metres to the ridge and 6.3 metres to the eaves line. The building would also contain three pitched roof dormer windows in the front roofspace and one on the rear. The rear elevation of the two storey element has been revised to respond to concerns on the impact on no.17 Godesdone Road. As a result the two storey element that projects past the first floor window of no.17 has been chamfered at first and second floor.

2.5 The side lean-to element would be 6.75 metres to the main ridge and 3.5 metres to the eaves line. The lean-to element would be connected to the 2 " storey block by a flat roof link which would be 1.1 metres wide and 5.5 metres in height.

2.6 The original scheme consisted of a 2 " storey on the entire site which contained a central projecting back and identical wings either side. The wings contained large pitched roof dormers in the roofscape. The rear elevation was designed with a small setback to the side boundary with no.17 with a dormer in the roofscape. However, due to concerns with the potential impact on the neighbouring properties either side, the scheme was amended to mitigate the impact.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
09/1193/FUL	Recovering of existing roof with minor modifications.	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 Local Plan 2006	3/1 3/4 3/7 3/11 3/12 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)
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> Riverside and Stourbridge 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 No car parking proposed. Future residents will not qualify for Residents' Permit Parking scheme. 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;
- Collection hours during construction;
- Piling;
- Contaminated land (x6)
- Dust;
- Dust informative.

Urban Design and Conservation Team

First comments:

6.3 Amendments required to make this scheme acceptable.

6.4 The overall form and scale of the building are generally acceptable in the CA context but there are detailed design elements that require refinement to make the scheme wholly acceptable. The existing shed is of little architectural merit, so no objection to its demolition but it does seem a pity to lose the potential for retaining a mix of uses in the CA. A new building could have had a commercial GF with flats above.

- 6.5 *Roofscape* – The dormers are mis-proportioned and are too wide for their height; the windows look lost in the lead / render surrounds. The gables of both the main projecting wing and the dormers should have pointed verges to make them look less cumbersome [this would also work better with the decorative dentil brickwork].
- 6.6 *Front elevation* – The windows have the correct upright proportion but look ill-placed within the expanse of brickwork. This may be partly because they don't have proper sills [which should be the same stone / pre-cast artificial stone as the lintels] but the flanking ones are too far below the eaves and too close to the tops of the projecting GF bays. Those canted bays have no cills or lintels, which looks very poor compared to the other windows; maybe these too could also be of stone / pre-cast artificial stone which would obviate the need to squeeze sills & lintels into limited space.
- 6.7 *Side elevation* – The gable end (NW) looks cluttered by the GF projection – particularly with the hip on the end of the mono-pitched roof. This stretching to gain a tiny amount of floorspace is unwelcome. The gable also needs to have a pointed verge not barge boards. The blind window to relieve the cliff of brickwork [which will be quite prominent when travelling up the street] is a good idea and could be repeated at GF with something higher up near the ridge – a datestone or blind circular window maybe. The other end elevation is quite complicated but is likely to be hardly visible.
- 6.8 *Materials* – The proposed palette seems generally acceptable for the CA but, should a more finely honed scheme be approved, would need to be subject to discussion via Conditions.

Comments on amended plans:

Two storey element

- 6.9 The two storey side 'extension' forms an awkward relationship with both pitched and flat roof elements. Flat 5 should be deleted and a lower pitched roof introduced to reinforce the subservient appearance of the 'extension'. The pitched roof

should continue back to the northern gable end of the main 'house' element and the flat roof section deleted.

- 6.10 The proposed flat 5 (1 bed unit) is likely to form a poor living environment for future occupants. The outlook from the unit is poor and limited to the kitchen/living/dining room window on the front elevation, all other windows are either obscured (corridor) or form roof lights (bedroom and bathroom).
- 6.11 The cycle store is located at the rear of the block; as a result all bicycles have to be wheeled through the communal entrance hallway/lobby in order to exit the building onto Godesdone Road. The treatment of the entrance hall needs to be robust in order to prevent damage to floor and wall finishes. Locating the cycle store within the side 'extension' and combining it with the bin store would improve the relationship and access to Godesdone Road and would reinforce the subservient appearance and function of the 'extension'.

Dormer windows

- 6.12 The dormer windows, whilst properly aligned with the main windows below on the front elevation, remain poorly proportioned. The amount of walling either side of the sash is too broad for the dimensions of the window making the whole look too squat. Having a pointed verge to the main gable is fine, so it seems odd to have barge boards on the dormer roofs; consistency of detailing is important. Speaking of the main gable, with the suggested lean-to roof coming in at GF, a large area of blank brickwork will be prominent obliquely up the street. This might be relieved by some decorative feature [a datestone, blind window, etc.] to break up the expanse.

Daylight and sunlight assessment

- 6.13 A daylight and sunlight assessment accompanies the submitted amendments (provided By No. 16 Design dated October 2016) and assesses the impact of the proposal on neighbouring properties. A Vertical Sky Component (VSC) assessment for

daylight and an Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH) assessment for sunlight have been carried out for a total of 23 existing windows in the rear elevation of 72, 74 Beche Road and 17 Godesdone Road and front elevation of 22a-5 Godesdone Road. All of the windows assessed meet the BRE recommendations for VSC and ASPH by virtue of retaining in excess of 80% of their current values. The impact to daylight and sunlight is in accordance with the recommended levels of change set out within the BRE guidance and is therefore acceptable in design

6.14 Further detailed design of the side 'extension' is needed to reinforce its subservient appearance. Flat 5 forms a poor living environment as a result of the limited outlook and should be deleted. The roof pitch should be lowered and the flat roof section deleted. Cycle and refuse storage should be provided within the side 'extension' so as to improve access and relationship with Godesdone Road and reinforce the subservient appearance and function of the 'extension'. It is important in a quasi-traditional building type to follow the historic hierarchies and put the main activities in the main building and the service activities in the 'outbuilding'. The rear elevation appears very contrived [for understandable reasons] but this will not adversely affect the CA.

6.15 Comments on additional revised plans:

6.16 No comments have been received. I will either update Members of the comments on the amendment sheet or orally at the meeting.

Historic Environment Team:

6.17 No objections or further requirements for the proposed development.

6.18 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:

Objectors to original proposal:

- 7 Godesdone Road
- 12 Godesdone Road
- 14 Godesdone Road
- 15 Godesdone Road
- 17 Godesdone Road
- 18 Godesdone Road
- 20 Godesdone Road
- 22D Godesdone Road
- 36 Beche Road
- 56 Beche Road
- 62 Beche Road
- 64 Beche Road
- 68 Beche Road
- 69 Beche Road
- 70 Beche Road
- 72 Beche Road
- 30 Riverside
- 43 Priory Road
- 11 Mandeville Road, Burwell

Representations to revised scheme:

- None to date. If any comments are received between the time of writing and the Planning Committee, I will update members of this and the issues raised on the Amendment Sheet or orally at the committee meeting.

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Design, scale and impact on Conservation Area

- The proposed development does not respond to the rhythm of the terraced street;
- No architectural justification for the projecting gable;
- The proportion of the dormer windows facing Godesdone Road are oversized and do not relate to the character of the area and reduces the quality of the street and roofscape;
- There should be an agreement about the refuse wheelie bins will be put away after they have been emptied. Bins left out on the street could block the pavement and detrimentally affect the appearance of the Conservation Area;

- The tree shown on the plan in the rear garden of 70 Beche Road does not exist;
- The loss of commercial use is likely to further isolate the remaining commercial buildings within the area and be detrimental to the character of the area and economic contribution that they make;
- Overdevelopment of the site that is out of keeping with the surrounding properties in the Conservation Area;
- The proposal would dominate neighbouring properties – roof line higher than adjacent properties and broken by large dormer windows;
- Dormers on the front elevation are out of character, particularly in the front elevation;
- Three storey form of the proposed building is out of character with the houses in the Riverside area;
- The projecting gable is incongruous and out of keeping with the general pattern of flat fronted properties in the street;
- Other recent developments have kept the height and frontage the same as the neighbouring properties;
- The density of the development and number of future occupiers would be out of keeping with the type of housing in the area;
- Poor design and steroidal bulk is disproportionate in height and area for the site;
- 3 terrace houses (or equivalent in flats) could be acceptable but without the height and depth proposed;
- The development lacks set back from the road which makes a difference to the impression given to the road;
- The proposal will cause overshadowing in the afternoon to the only west facing window;
- The proposed development does not match the Victorian style and should be redesigned;
- The new building should not extend further than the wall of no.15 and 17 Godesdone Road;
- The proposal would be contrary to policies 3/12 and 4/11 of the Local Plan;
- Case Officer should visit the properties in Beche Road;
- The site has been used by small companies for many years and is a valuable addition to the area;
- Concerned that the applicant has not considered a mix-use scheme;
- The existing chalet-style structures are pleasing to the eye, well-proportioned and unobtrusive and therefore makes a positive contribution to the area;

- The proposal is for a three storey building. It is misleading to say it is 2 " storey;
- The height of the building will be enhanced by the descending gradient of Godesdone Road at this point;
- Bin collection will only be from the roadside and so who will be responsible for putting the bins away;
- The proposal would present an anomalous and unsympathetic bulk which is out of context with the area;
- The window arrangement in the proposed development has no alignment
- The third floor should be removed;
- The proposal is neither modern or vernacular in architectural style;
- Design and Access Statement fails to include the buildings on Godesdone Road amongst those important to the character of the area;

Residential amenity

- Size of units below the minimum standards in the emerging Local Plan and current National Space Standards;
- Insufficient mix of units – only one 2bed unit;
- Potential sense of enclosure and overshadowing created by the blank north elevation;
- Daylight to the rear garden and property will be compromised;
- Original buildings designed to maintain light to the properties in Beche Road;
- The proposal would result in unacceptable overlooking from the windows in the rear elevation of the garden of the properties in Beche Road and Godesdone Road;
- The new building will block light and have a substantial negative impact on the quality of life of the occupiers in Beche Road;
- Inadequate provision of amenity space;
- The shadow plan is inadequate as it relates solely to the spring equinox – a comprehensive assessment should be carried out to include the winter and summer solstices;
- The applicant acknowledges the scheme will create issues of overshadowing but is happy to continue discussions on this post submission – this is unacceptable and make the scheme half-baked and incomplete;

- The proposal would result in a significant loss of sunlight and daylight and create a sense of enclosure from the first and second floor windows;
- The semi-external bin store and communal entrance will lead to noise impact from potentially 16 residents coming and going from the site;
- The north elevation would be 8 metres from kitchen and bedroom windows and as such will present an oppressive and overbearing aspect and sense of enclosure;

Traffic/car parking/cycle provision

- Insufficient cycle parking and more should be provided;
- Additional pressure in the area for car parking;
- Car free development can only work if restrictions are applied to future residents on car ownership;
- Existing car parking spaces are at capacity and there is little scope for potentially 8 more vehicles;
- The main blocks would open onto the pedestrian sidewalk;
- Insufficient facilities for loading and unloading nor any visitor parking;

Other issues:

- Insufficient neighbour consultation;
- Plans not to scale so how can detailed comparison be made;
- The site is located in area of great archaeological sensitivity. The applicant has failed to provide any archaeological investigation;
- The plans do not appear to be clear – some plans show a space of about 2-4 metres between the south boundary between 17 and the proposed development and on other plans it is much narrower;
- There has been flooding from foul water sewers in the last ten years and the proposal is likely to exacerbate this;

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

Principle

8.2 The proposal would result in the loss of a commercial use. I understand the site was last occupied by Outspoken a cycle courier service when the application was originally submitted. However, they have now moved out and the building is currently vacant. Outspoken has now consolidated their entire Cambridge operation to Cowley Road.

8.3 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 land uses. There is an existing dwelling standing on the site, and the site is within a predominantly residential area.

8.4 Paragraph 14 of the NPPF is also important. It states that there should be a presumption in favour of sustainable development running through the decision making process. This means approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay unless any adverse impact would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

8.5 Although the last lawful use of the existing warehouse building appears to be B8 use, the site is not within an identified protected industrial/storage site and as such it would not conflict with Policy 7/3 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006). However, policy 7/3 does consider loss of floorspace within these use classes elsewhere in the City. It states that loss of floorspace will only be permitted where:

- a) There is sufficient supply of such floorspace in the City to meet the demand and/or vacancy rates are high; and either
- b) The proposed development will generate the same number or more unskilled or semi-skilled jobs than could be expected from the existing use; or
- c) The continuation of industrial and storage uses will be harmful to the environment or amenity of the area; or
- d) The loss of a small proportion of industrial or storage floorspace would facilitate the redevelopment and continuation of industrial and storage use on a greater part of the site; or
- e) Redevelopment for mixed use or residential development would be more appropriate.

8.6 Having consulted with colleagues in the Policy Planning team, they have advised me that there is sufficient supply of available floorspace in the City and wider area for employment site. This is also supported by the findings from the Employment Land Review Update and Review of Selective Management of Employment Policies 2012. Therefore the proposal would comply with part a) of policy 7/3. Criteria (b) and (d) of policy 7/3 are not applicable to this application, because no new employment development is proposed. In my view, criteria (c) and (e) are both satisfied by the proposal; the development would be compatible with the increasingly residential character of the area. The loss of the commercial use from the site would lead to improvements to the visual amenity of the site and for neighbouring occupiers, and a reduction in the noise and disturbance associated with deliveries and collections by commercial vehicles and other associated activity on the site.

8.7 Also I understand the building is in need of significant refurbishment and investment. The site is therefore considered to be a more suitable location for residential use as it would be compatible with surrounding residential context of the area. Whilst I understand the area has some small ad hoc commercial uses amongst the houses, these uses cannot be protected in policy terms, particularly as there is a housing need in the City. Furthermore, the loss of this commercial element does not undermine or compromise the existing commercial uses in the area as each application for redevelopment or change of use will be considered on its own merits.

- 8.8 In my opinion, the principle of residential development is acceptable and in accordance with policy 5/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006). In the context of the findings of the Employment Land Review 2008, it is my opinion that the loss of employment use on the site is acceptable, and in accordance with policy 7/3 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

Context of site, design and external spaces

- 8.9 The site is located within a predominantly residential context where the built form is characterised by mainly two storey terrace housing with small front thresholds bound by low brick walls. The surrounding streets are predominantly C19 terraced housing of Gault-type brick and Welsh slate with a variety of detailing such as painted stone lintels & sills, fanlights above the main entrances and timber, vertically sliding sash windows. The building form is almost exclusively of two or two-and-a-half storey houses with pitched roofs. Opposite the site is a modern housing development which adds to the variety of housing in this location.
- 8.10 Aside from the built form, this area is also characterised by small pockets of commercial uses mainly located on the corner of streets or at the end of terraces. Nevertheless, as Godesdone Road is predominantly characterised by residential dwellings, the redevelopment of the site from its parcel storage and delivery use to residential would be compatible and potentially improve the street scene. Currently the site consists of a wide pitched roof building with an ancillary pitched roof element which set back and to the side. The building is low in height but of a commercial scale in terms of footprint which covers most of the plot.
- 8.11 The original proposal, as submitted, was for a 3 storey residential block of flats which was designed with a projecting front gable and two wings either side which contained large pitched roof dormers in the front roofslope. Following concerns with the scale of the development and potential impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties, officers engaged with the applicant to try and resolve these issues. As a result of the discussions, amended plans were submitted which have now addressed the previous concerns. Local residents have been re-consulted on the revised plans. I therefore set out

below my assessment of the proposed development based upon the revised scheme.

- 8.12 The amended scheme has been reduced in scale and design to respond to the existing terrace to the south. The proposed scheme has been designed to appear as two semi-detached dwellings with an ancillary lean-to linked by a flat roof element.

Lean-to element

- 8.13 The lean-to element has been designed to reflect the scale and appearance of the existing commercial building. The proposal includes using similar material to the existing commercial building such as stained timber cladding on the first floor with a brick base on the front, side and rear elevations and metal flashing on the roof. This element would therefore represent a gesture to the commercial past of the site in built form. In terms of design, it would successfully contrast with the traditional design of the main building. Both elements would read as separate entities without appearing incongruous. My view is that the lean-to element is a clever way to reduce the scale of the development on the boundary to respond to the site constraints, and showing respect to the site's commercial past.
- 8.14 In terms of scale, the eaves height of the lean-to element would be 3.6 metres, 6.7 metres to the ridge and 4.9 metres wide. The proposed lean-to element would be 500mm above the eaves of the existing and 1.5 metre above the ridge of the existing. The increase in height of the lean-to over and above the existing is not significant in my view. The lean-to element would mostly fit within the side gable of the main building. Therefore proportionally the lean-to element would respect the main building and appear as a subservient element which reflects the smaller part of the existing commercial buildings on site.
- 8.15 The proposal includes a flat roof glazed link element which would connect the main building with the lean-to element. The link would be set back from the front of the lean-to which is set back from the main building and appear as a subservient form. The flat roof link and lean-to elements would successfully contrast with the traditional design of main building. Therefore, in my view, in terms of design and scale, the proposed lean-to and link elements are acceptable as they would appear as

subservient to the main building and would preserve the character of the Conservation Area.

2 " storey main building

- 8.16 The main 2 " storey element has been designed to visually read as a continuation of the existing terrace in terms of appearance. In terms of scale, the ridgeline would be higher than the neighbouring property (no.17) by approx. 1.4 metre with a pitched roof but the eaves line (6.3 metres) would be similar. This element would be 10.7 metres wide but appear, due to the arrangement of the fenestration, as two properties. Whilst the main building would be taller than the neighbouring dwellings, I do not consider the additional increase in height to be significant such that it would make the development appear incongruous and have a detrimental impact on the street scene or character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- 8.17 The design responds to the general pattern of development in the area and makes use of the roofspace to provide additional accommodation. Also being at the end of the row of terrace properties before turning into Beche Road, I feel that the development would read as an appropriate book end to the street which also responds to the constraints of having dwellings that back onto the side boundary but stepping down in scale. Therefore, in terms of scale and appearance, the proposed 2 " storey building would integrate into the site without appearing unduly dominant or out of keeping with the existing built form of the area.
- 8.18 The articulation of the fenestration in the front elevation has been carefully arranged to give it a symmetrical appearance. The front elevation also includes details that are found locally such as stone lintels, fanlights above the doors and a small threshold space in the front of the building. The proposal also has a canted ground floor bay window. Whilst not a common feature, there is a property with a similar bay window in Godesdone Road. In my view the bay window helps to break up and better articulate the flat frontage of the main building.
- 8.19 In terms of detailing, the pitched roof dormer windows in the front have been reduced in scale from those previously proposed and now sit comfortably within the roofscape. Whilst front facing dormer windows are not common features within

Godesdone Road, there are some examples in Beche Road. Nevertheless, the proposed dormers are of a subservient scale and so would not have a detrimental impact on the character of the area. The dormer would add to the variety of the architectural features in this location in a way that is considered to be acceptable.

- 8.20 The rear elevation of the proposed development has been specifically designed to mitigate the impact on the occupier of no.17 Godesdone Road by including a chamfered edge to the south elevation with a ground floor lean-to element. Whilst this is not ideal in terms of designing a building, this element would not be visible from the public realm and so would not impact the Conservation Area. The rest of the rear elevation has been formally arranged and includes a pitched roof dormer within the roofscape which would serve a bedroom. The dormer would be bigger than the dormers on the front but would not appear too dominant or overbearing within the roofscape. The rear elevation would be set back from the rear boundary by approx. 3 metres. (The existing buildings extend the entire depth of the plot). This set back would bring the main building more in line with the rear elevations of the neighbouring dwellings to the south.
- 8.21 I have recommended a materials condition to ensure sample of the types of the materials to be used in the development are submitted to and approved by officers before any construction work is started.
- 8.22 Overall therefore the proposed design and scale of the development responds to the character and context of the street. Whilst the development would be taller than the adjacent terrace properties, I do not consider the additional increase in height to be significant such that it would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- 8.23 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12, 4/10.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.24 The proposed development has been revised to mitigate its impact on the residential amenity of the surrounding occupiers. I accept that the proposed development will have some degree of impact on the surrounding neighbours particularly those immediately adjacent to the site. However, I do not consider the degree of harm that would arise from the proposed development as revised, would be significant subject to conditions.
- 8.25 One of the main concerns raised was the impact on the occupiers of the dwellings to the north of the site in Beche Road (no.68 and 70). The impact the commercial property on the corner of Beche Road and Godesdone Road (no.72) is not considered to be harmful. I also considered the impact on the occupiers of no.17 Godesdone Road which is to the south of the site. I set out below my assessment on these dwellings and the surrounding dwellings.

Impact on no.68 and 70 Beche Road

- 8.26 Currently these two dwellings have small rear gardens compared to the other dwellings to the west. The rear garden of no.68 backs onto the site whereas to the rear of no.70 there is a 1 metre wide rear passage between the boundary and site. The rear gardens are between 4.6 metres (no.70) and 5.6 metres (no.68) deep. Therefore the outlook from the ground floor windows in the rear elevations of these dwellings, which serve kitchens, are already impeded by the existing commercial building. Particularly no.70, as the commercial building cuts across the entire rear boundary whereas for no.68 it cuts across half the rear garden. Nevertheless, at this range, concerns were originally raised with the applicant about the potential impact on the residential amenity in terms of outlook and loss of privacy, sense of overbearing enclosure and overshadowing.

Outlooking and loss of privacy

- 8.27 In terms of outlook, the revised proposal is to retain a building which is of similar scale to the existing commercial building on the northern boundary. The majority of the outlook from the rear of nos.68 and 70 is currently consumed by the existing commercial building. The proposal would be set off the rear (west) boundary by 3 metres so the proposed development would cut across half the rear boundary of no.68 but would still

be adjacent to the rear boundary of no.70. Therefore, the impact on outlook from no.68 would be reduced. In terms of the impact on no.70, in the original scheme, the proposed building was full two storey in height adjacent to the northern boundary of the site. This was considered to be unacceptable as it would have adversely enclosed the outlook from the rear of the dwellings. The proposed revised scheme has significantly reduced the scale of the development adjacent to the northern boundary. The lean-to element reflects a similar scale of the existing building and the applicant has proposed to use similar materials to the existing to reduce the appearance of the increase in height. The lean-to element would also contain a row of high level rooflights which would help to break up the mass of the roof which would further mitigate the impact on neighbouring occupiers. The lean-to element would also be seen against the backdrop of the side gable of the two storey element which would be located approx. 10.6 metres from the ground floor window in the rear elevation and approx. 12.3 metres from the first floor window. The lean-to element would be located 5.6 metres from the rear elevation of no.68 and no.70. I am satisfied that in this built up urban context, the level of separation between the existing and proposed, and reduced scale of the proposal, would not have a significantly detrimental impact on the outlook of the existing occupiers such that it would warrant refusal.

- 8.28 In terms of overlooking, neither no.68 or no.70 would be directly overlooked by the proposed development. The row of rooflights in the lean-to element would be set at a high level (internal cill height above 2 metres) and would provide natural light into Flat 5. There are no windows in the gable end of the main building. Therefore, I am satisfied that the proposal would not cause any loss of privacy on the occupiers of no.68 and no.70 Beche Road.
- 8.29 The rear elevation of the proposed building, which would be set off the rear (west) boundary by 3 metres, would face over the rear gardens of the properties in Beche Road. The rear elevation is articulated with four first floor windows, and on the roofscape contains a roof dormer and two rooflights. Three of the windows in the first floor are proposed to be obscure glazed as they would serve a communal circulation space (one) and the hallway (two) for Flat 5. The window that is not proposed to be obscure glazed is the window that would serve the bedroom

for Flat 3. This window would be located towards the southern end of the elevation. Whilst it would allow direct views of the gardens in Beche Road, the views would be of the rear most part of the gardens. I do not consider this window would cause any more overlooking of the existing gardens over and above that which already exists from windows in the surrounding dwellings. Therefore, I am satisfied that this window does not need to be obscure glazed. However, I have recommended an obscure glazing condition for the other three windows.

8.30 The roof dormer is proposed to be located in the roofscape nearest the northern boundary and would serve the bedroom for Flat 7. With regard to the rooflights, one would serve the bedroom for Flat 6 and the other would serve the stairwell up to the second floor and both would have an internal cill height of 1.8 metres. The dormer window, which would be set into the roof, would allow views over the rear gardens of the properties in Beche Road at a high level. Whilst in the urban context, there is a sense of mutual overlooking, I have nevertheless, proposed a condition which requires the windows in the dormer to be obscure glazed to a height of 1.7 from internal floor level. This would restrict views downwards from the window but still provide an outlook for the future occupier. I feel that this is a suitable solution to mitigate any overlooking issues in this context.

8.31 The proposed development, subject to obscure glazing conditions on certain windows, would not in my view cause any significant loss of privacy or overlooking on the occupiers of Beche Road. I also do not consider there would be any direct overlooking impact on the dwellings in Godesdone Road over and above that which already exists. The proposal is for a new building in this location and therefore is likely to result in a degree of harm but I do not consider the degree of harm to be significant enough to warrant refusal.

Sense of overbearing enclosure

8.32 The proposal has addressed two areas of concerns in this regard; the impact on the occupiers of no.17 Godesdone Road and the impact on the occupiers of no.68 and no.70 Beche Road.

17 Godesdone Road

- 8.33 The existing building on the site forms part of the side boundary of no.17 and its roofscape is clearly visible from the rear garden and bedroom windows at first and second floor. No.17 has been extended at the rear and contains a conservatory on the ground floor which extends off a flat roof three storey structure. The roof has been extended with a flat roof dormer.
- 8.34 The proposed development would not project beyond the rear of the existing conservatory. However, there are two bedroom windows at the first and second floor which are adjacent to the side boundary. The back bedroom is served by one window out of which there are clear views of the existing building. As the footprint of the building would extend beyond the first and second floor windows, the applicant has created a chamfered edge (47 degree) in the side elevation of the main building which extends 400mm beyond these windows. Whilst the chamfered edge would still conflict with the 45 degree rule from the centre point of the first floor window, the impact over and above the existing is not considered to be significant. Furthermore, the applicant's daylight and sunlight assessment demonstrates that the windows in the rear elevation would retain over 80% of daylight and sunlight which is compliant with BRE guidance.
- 8.35 At ground floor level, the proposal includes a lean-to element than links into the chamfered edge side elevation. The lean-to element would have a lower roof profile than the existing outbuilding.
- 8.36 The side (south) elevation of the lean-to element would replace the existing brick wall and would project 3.7 metres at 3.1 metres in height. The side boundary would then be defined by a 1.6 metre high timber fence which encloses the garden area for Flat 1. The new boundary wall and lean-to element would be screened from the garden by the existing structures.
- 8.37 In view of the design changes and existing situation, I do not consider the proposed development would cause an adverse sense of enclosure on the occupier of no.17.

68 and 70 Beche Road

- 8.38 The rear gardens of these two properties are a lot smaller than the neighbours to the west which extend up to the side boundary of no.17 Godesdone Road save for a side passage. Concerns were raised with the applicant about the potential impact on the occupiers of these dwellings from the original scheme. The applicant was advised to reduce the scale of the development at the northern end and pick up the roof profile of the existing building to reduce any significant overbearing impact. The northern part of the proposal has been remodeled with a lean-to element which reflects the appearance and scale of the existing commercial building currently on the boundary. Whilst the lean-to element would be approx. 500mm taller at the eaves, I do not consider this would result in causing an adverse sense of overbearing enclosure on the occupiers of no.68 and 70. The profile of the proposed lean-to element would be located within the side elevation of the main building which would be located approx. 10.6 metres from the rear elevation of the existing dwellings. At this level of separation, I do not consider the main building would have any adverse overbearing impact on the existing occupiers.
- 8.39 No.72 is in commercial use and therefore does not benefit from the same level of consideration as for dwellings. I also do not consider the scale of the proposed development would have any adverse overbearing impact on the occupiers of the dwelling opposite (east) of the site in Godesdone Road such that it would warrant refusal.

Overshadowing

- 8.40 The site is located south of the dwellings in Beche Road and north of the dwellings in Godesdone Road. The applicant has submitted a daylight and sunlight assessment which has assessed 23 windows from the dwellings that are adjacent to the site. The applicant has also submitted a shadow study covering the Spring Equinox.
- 8.41 The daylight and sunlight assessment demonstrates that all 23 windows would retain over 80% of the existing value in terms of daylight and sunlight which is compliant with BRE guidance. The Spring Equinox shadow study has been carried out for the existing situation and proposed at 9am, noon, 3pm and 5pm

intervals. The study demonstrates that there would be a small increase and decrease in shadowing throughout the day but there would be no significant shadowing over the dwellings to the north in Beche Road. The study also demonstrates there would be no difference in shadowing on the dwellings in Godesdone Road. The Urban Design Team has assessed these documents and advised that the impact on daylight and sunlight is in accordance with the recommended levels of change set out within the BRE guidance and is therefore acceptable in design terms. Therefore, based upon the evidence presented, the proposed development is acceptable as it would not cause significantly harmful levels of overshadowing.

- 8.42 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

- 8.43 Concerns have been raised regarding the proposed level of accommodation within each flat. However, the current Local Plan (2006) does not contain any space standard requirements for new residential units. Whilst the emerging Local Plan (policy 50) contains internal space standards, this can only be given very limited weight at this stage, as it has not been adopted. Therefore, it would be difficult to refuse the application based upon insufficient size of flats.
- 8.44 Both ground floor flats (1 and 2) would include private gardens and cycle storage at the rear of the development. None of the other flats would benefit from outdoor space. However, the nearest open space is located five minute walk from the site at Logan's Meadow, six minute walk from Midsummer Common, and 12 minutes walk from Stourbridge Common. The site is also located a four minute walk from the retail park and 12 minute walk to the Grafton Centre.
- 8.45 The proposal includes secure cycle storage for 6 cycles at the rear between the gardens of Flats 1 and 2 and internal bin storage space.
- 8.46 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.

Refuse arrangements

- 8.47 The proposal includes a bin store on the ground floor which is accessible from within the building and from the street. The proposal is for three bins 2x 660 litres and 1x 240 litre bin. The proposed refuse arrangement is acceptable for this development. I have however, recommended a waste management condition so that details of how the bins are managed in terms of responsibility is submitted to and agreed by the Local Planning Authority.
- 8.48 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

Car and cycle parking

Car parking

- 8.49 The proposal does not include any car parking and is being promoted as a 'car free' development. The adopted Local Plan (2006) promotes lower levels of private car parking in order to encourage a modal shift where development sites are located with good access to public transport, shops and services. The site is considered to be located within a sustainable location due to its proximity (walking and cycling) from bus stops on Newmarket Road which provide routes into and out of the City, the retail park on Newmarket Road and the Grafton Centre, and public open space in Logan Meadow, Stourbridge Common and Midsummer Common. Therefore, given the size of the units, and central location to public transport, shops and services, a car free development is acceptable in this location. The County Council has confirmed that future residents will not be eligible for the residents' permit parking scheme. I have therefore recommended the car-club informative to request the applicant to give details of local car club schemes to future occupiers.

Cycle parking

- 8.50 The proposal includes a cycle store which is located at the rear of the site and accessible through the building. The store would

provide three cycle hoops for six cycles to serve flats 3 to 7. Flats 1 and 2 would have their own cycle parking provision within the garden space. The Cycle Parking Standards requires 1 space per bedroom up to 3 bedroom dwelling. The proposal in total provides 9 spaces and 6 of the spaces would be shared between 4 flats. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed cycle parking is acceptable.

8.51 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10.

Third Party Representations

8.52 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:

Representation	Response
<i>Design, scale and layout</i>	
The proposed development does not respond to the rhythm of the terraced street	The scheme has been revised from its original design. The revised design and scale responds appropriately to the rhythm of the terraced housing and street.
No architectural justification for the projecting gable	This element has been removed in the revised scheme.
The proportion of the dormer windows facing Godesdone Road are oversized and do not relate to the character of the area and reduces the quality of the street and roofscape	The scheme has been revised and the oversized dormers in the front elevation removed. The revised scheme includes small more ancillary scale dormers which sit comfortably with the roofscape.
There should be an agreement about the refuse wheelie bins will be put away after they have been emptied. Bins left out on the street could block the pavement and detrimentally affect the appearance of the Conservation Area	I have recommended a waste management condition.
The tree shown on the plan in	Noted.

the rear garden of 70 Beche Road does not exist	
The loss of commercial use is likely to further isolate the remaining commercial buildings within the area and be detrimental to the character of the area and economic contribution that they make	See para 8.1 to 8.8
Overdevelopment of the site that is out of keeping with the surrounding properties in the Conservation Area	The proposal is not considered to be overdevelopment of the site. The revised design and scale is considered in keeping with the surrounding properties.
The proposal would dominate neighbouring properties – roof line higher than adjacent properties and broken by large dormer windows	The ridge line of the revised scheme would still be higher than the neighbouring dwelling but I do not consider the additional increase in height would be harmful to the character of the area. The large dormers have been removed and replaced with three smaller dormers.
Dormers on the front elevation are out of character, particularly in the front elevation	Dormers are not a common feature with Godesdone Road however they have been designed to appear ancillary within the roofspace and would not be harmful to the character of the area, in my opinion.
Three storey form of the proposed building is out of character with the houses in the Riverside area	The scheme has been revised and now appears as a 2 " storey dwelling with rooms in the roof. There are some dwellings within Riverside that are similar in scale.
The projecting gable is incongruous and out of keeping with the general pattern of flat fronted properties in the street	Projecting gable has been removed.
Other recent developments	Each application is considered

have kept the height and frontage the same as the neighbouring properties	on its own merits.
The density of the development and number of future occupiers would be out of keeping with the type of housing in the area	The proposal is for seven flats mainly 1 bed flats and two of the flats have outdoor space. The development has been designed to read as a pair of semi-detached dwellings with an ancillary element to the side.
Poor design and steroidal bulk is disproportionate in height and area for the site	The original scheme has been revised and reduced in scale.
3 terrace houses (or equivalent in flats) could be acceptable but without the height and depth proposed.	Each application it considered on its own merits.
The development lacks set back from the road which makes a difference to the impression given to the road	The development is set back from the road at various degrees. Between no.17 and the site, there is a slight bend in the road. The main entrance to no.17 is at the start of the bend in the road. The main entrance is located on the back edge of the pavement. The proposed development tapers away and follows a similar building as the existing commercial building on site. The proposed footprint of the building is set back from the pavement by between 800mm and 2 metres.
The proposal will cause overshadowing in the afternoon to the only west facing window	See para 8.39 to 8.41
The proposed development does not match the Victorian style and should be redesigned	The original scheme has been revised to response to the Victorian style.
The new building should not extend further than the wall of	Due to the angle of the road and footprint of the existing

no.15 and 17 Godesdone Road	building it would be unreasonable to apply such a restriction.
The proposal would be contrary to policies 3/12 and 4/11 of the Local Plan	The proposal is considered to be compliant with Local Plan policies.
Case Officer should visit the properties in Beche Road	I did visit no.70 Beche Road. The occupier of no.68 was not available at the time of visiting no.70.
The site has been used by small companies for many years and is a valuable addition to the area	This is not a reason to frustrate the redevelopment of the site.
Concerned that the applicant has not considered a mix-use scheme	Officers can only consider the proposal as submitted.
The existing chalet-style structures are pleasing to the eye, well-proportioned and unobtrusive and therefore makes a positive contribution to the area	The revised scheme is considered to be of high quality and respects the character of the area.
The proposal is for a three storey building. It is misleading to say it is 2 " storey	The revised scheme is now 2 " storey.
The height of the building will be enhanced by the descending gradient of Godesdone Road at this point	The increase in height is not considered to be significant and would not be noticeable from the wider context in my view. Ridgelines of the terraces in Godesdone Road and Beche Road are not consistent and there are examples of infill developments having higher ridge lines and roof profiles.
Bin collection will only be from the roadside and so who will be responsible for putting the bins away	I have recommended a waste management condition.
The proposal would present an anomalous and unsympathetic	The original scheme has been revised to a form that is

bulk which is out of context with the area	broken into two elements; one responds to the existing terrace and the other reflects to the existing commercial building on site.
The window arrangement in the proposed development has no alignment	The window arrangement in the revised scheme is symmetrical and reflects the hierarchy of windows.
The third floor should be removed	There is no third floor other than the roof space.
The proposal is neither modern or vernacular in architectural style	The revised proposal has a combination of modern and vernacular to respond to the context of the site.
Design and Access Statement fails to include the buildings on Godesdone Road amongst those important to the character of the area	The properties in Godesdone Road are not identified in the Area Appraisal as 'Buildings Important to Character'. The dwellings in Beche Road are.
<i>Residential amenity</i>	
Size of units below the minimum standards in the emerging Local Plan and current National Space Standards	There are no statutory minimum standards in the Local Plan or at National level which could be used to assess the size of each unit against.
Insufficient mix of units – only one 2bed unit	There is no requirement for any certain mix of units for a site of this size.
Potential sense of enclosure and overshadowing created by the blank north elevation	See para 8.32 to 8.41
Daylight to the rear garden and property will be compromised	See para 8.39 to 8.41
Original building designed to maintain light to the properties in Beche Road	As above.
The proposal would result in unacceptable overlooking from the windows in the rear elevation of the garden of the properties in Beche Road and Godesdone Road	See para 8.27 to 8.31

<p>The new building will block light and have a substantial negative impact on the quality of life of the occupiers in Beche Road</p>	<p>See para 8.32 to 8.41</p>
<p>Inadequate provision of amenity space;</p>	<p>See para 8.43</p>
<p>The shadow plan is inadequate as it relates solely to the spring equinox – a comprehensive assessment should be carried out to include the winter and summer solstices</p>	<p>Shadow study of the spring equinox demonstrates that the proposed development would not cause adverse levels of overshadowing. The gardens of the surrounding properties would receive more than 2 hours of sunlight on 21 March which is the test for compliance with BRE guidance.</p>
<p>The applicant acknowledges the scheme will create issues of overshadowing but is happy to continue discussions on this post submission – this is unacceptable and make the scheme half-baked and incomplete</p>	<p>The applicant has demonstrated that the proposed development would not cause any adverse levels of overshadowing.</p>
<p>The proposal would result in a significant loss of sunlight and daylight and create a sense of enclosure from the first and second floor windows</p>	<p>The shadow study and daylight and sunlight assessment demonstrates compliance with BRE guidance.</p>
<p>The semi-external bin store and communal entrance will lead to noise impact from potentially 16 residents coming and going from the site</p>	<p>The bin store is within the footprint of the building. Therefore, noise levels from this would not cause harmful levels of noise disturbance particularly as future occupiers would be able to access the bin store via an internal door.</p>
<p>The north elevation would be 8 metres from kitchen and bedroom windows and as such will present an oppressive and overbearing aspect and sense</p>	<p>See para 8.32 to 8.38</p>

of enclosure	
<i>Traffic/car parking/cycle provision</i>	
Insufficient cycle parking and more should be provided	See para 8.49
Additional pressure in the area for car parking	See para 8.48
Car free development can only work if restrictions are applied to future residents on car ownership	As above.
Existing car parking spaces are at capacity and there is little scope for potentially 8 more vehicles	As above.
The main blocks would open onto the pedestrian sidewalk	The main entrance is set back from the pavement by approx. 1 metre.
Insufficient facilities for loading and unloading nor any visitor parking	This is an issue for all residents and not just for the proposed development. This is not an issue that would warrant refusal.
<i>Other issues:</i>	
Insufficient neighbour consultation	Following a review of the original neighbour notification additional neighbours were consulted. Furthermore, a site notice was displayed outside the site and the application was advertised in the local paper.
Plans not to scale so how can detailed comparison be made	All plans are to scale.
The site is located in area of great archaeological sensitivity. The applicant has failed to provide any archaeological investigation	The County's Historic Environment Team has not requested any archaeology investigation of the site to be carried out.
The plans do not appear to be clear – some plans show a space of about 2-4 metres between the south boundary	All the submitted plans for the revised scheme appear to be consistent.

between 17 and the proposed development and on other plans it is much narrower	
There has been flooding from foul water sewers in the last ten year and the proposal is likely to exacerbate this	The applicant will need to receive agreement from Anglian Water to connect into their drainage. There are no known capacity concerns.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The proposal is for the demolition of the existing pitched roof commercial building and redevelopment of the site to create seven flats. The flats would be contained within a form of development that is broken into two parts; the main building which responds to the Victorian terrace character of Godesdone Road and the ancillary lean-to element which reflects the form of the existing commercial building on site. The lean-to element is a nod of the existing commercial use. The proposed development overall works well and would integrate into the site without causing significant harm to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposed development would in my view form an acceptable bookend to Godesdone Road.
- 9.2 The revised scheme has significantly reduced/mitigated the impact on the residential amenity of the adjacent occupiers in terms of outlook, privacy, enclosure, and overshadowing subject to conditions. The proposed development would not have any significant adverse impact on the residential amenity of the adjacent occupiers such that it would warrant refusal in my view.

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. Submission of Preliminary Contamination Assessment:

Prior to the commencement of the development (or phase of) or investigations required to assess the contamination of the site, the following information shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:

(a) Desk study to include:

- Detailed history of the site uses and surrounding area (including any use of radioactive materials)
- General environmental setting.
- Site investigation strategy based on the information identified in the desk study.

(b) A report setting set out what works/clearance of the site (if any) is required in order to effectively carry out site investigations.

Reason: To adequately categorise the site prior to the design of an appropriate investigation strategy in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 4/13.

4. Submission of site investigation report and remediation strategy:

Prior to the commencement of the development (or phase of) with the exception of works agreed under condition 3 and in accordance with the approved investigation strategy agreed under clause (b) of condition 3, the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:

(a) A site investigation report detailing all works that have been undertaken to determine the nature and extent of any contamination, including the results of the soil, gas and/or water analysis and subsequent risk assessment to any receptors

(b) A proposed remediation strategy detailing the works required in order to render harmless the identified contamination given the proposed end use of the site and surrounding environment including any controlled waters. The strategy shall include a schedule of the proposed remedial works setting out a timetable for all remedial measures that will be implemented.

Reason: To ensure that any contamination of the site is identified and appropriate remediation measures agreed in the interest of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 4/13.

5. Implementation of remediation.

Prior to the first occupation of the development (or each phase of the development where phased) the remediation strategy approved under clause (b) to condition 4 shall be fully implemented on site following the agreed schedule of works.

Reason: To ensure full mitigation through the agreed remediation measures in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 4/13.

6. Completion report:

Prior to the first occupation of the development (or phase of) hereby approved the following shall be submitted to, and approved by the local planning authority.

(a) A completion report demonstrating that the approved remediation scheme as required by condition 4 and implemented under condition 5 has been undertaken and that the land has been remediated to a standard appropriate for the end use.

(b) Details of any post-remedial sampling and analysis (as defined in the approved material management plan) shall be included in the completion report along with all information concerning materials brought onto, used, and removed from the development. The information provided must demonstrate that the site has met the required clean-up criteria.

Thereafter, no works shall take place within the site such as to prejudice the effectiveness of the approved scheme of remediation.

Reason: To demonstrate that the site is suitable for approved use in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 4/13

7. Material Management Plan:

Prior to importation or reuse of material for the development (or phase of) a Materials Management Plan (MMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The MMP shall:

- a) Include details of the volumes and types of material proposed to be imported or reused on site
- b) Include details of the proposed source(s) of the imported or reused material
- c) Include details of the chemical testing for ALL material to be undertaken before placement onto the site.
- d) Include the results of the chemical testing which must show the material is suitable for use on the development
- e) Include confirmation of the chain of evidence to be kept during the materials movement, including material importation, reuse placement and removal from and to the development.

All works will be undertaken in accordance with the approved document.

Reason: To ensure that no unsuitable material is brought onto the site in the interest of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13.

8. Unexpected Contamination:

If unexpected contamination is encountered whilst undertaking the development which has not previously been identified, works shall immediately cease on site until the Local Planning Authority has been notified and/or the additional contamination has been fully assessed and remediation approved following steps (a) and (b) of condition 4 above. The approved remediation shall then be fully implemented under condition 5

Reason: To ensure that any unexpected contamination is rendered harmless in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 4/13.

9. 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)

10. 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)

11. 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)

12. 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

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

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

14. 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)

15. No dormers shall be constructed until full details, at a scale of 1:10, showing the construction, materials, rainwater disposal and joinery of the dormers, including their cheeks, gables, glazing bars and mouldings, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Dormers 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)

16. Prior to construction, full details of the verges and decorative brickwork at roof / wall junctions shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Verges and decorative brickwork 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)

17. 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 3/12 and 4/11)

18. Prior to construction, large scale drawings (1:20) of details of new / altered sills, lintels, jambs, transoms, mullions, thresholds, etc. to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. Sills, lintels, jambs, transoms, mullions, thresholds, etc. shall be installed thereafter 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)

19. Prior to construction, full details of proprietary rooflights to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA [types which stand proud of the plane of the roof ("velux") are unlikely to be approved; "conservation" types may be appropriate]. Rooflights shall be installed thereafter 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)

20. Prior to construction, large scale drawings (1:20) of details of canted bay windows to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. Bay windows shall be installed thereafter 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)

21. 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)

22. No external joinery shall be installed until drawings at a scale of 1:20 of all such joinery (doors and surrounds, windows and frames, fanlights and balustrades, etc.) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. 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)

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

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

24. All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details, and to a reasonable standard in accordance with the relevant recommendation of the appropriate British Standard or other recognised code of good practice. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with the programme agreed by the local planning authority in writing. The maintenance shall be carried out in accordance with the approved schedule. Any trees or plants that, within a period of five years after planting, are removed, die or become in the opinion of the local planning authority, seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced as soon as is reasonably practicable with others of species, size and number as originally approved, unless the local planning authority gives its written consent to any variation.

Reason: To ensure provision, establishment and maintenance of a reasonable standard of landscaping in accordance with the approved design. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12)

25. No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected. The boundary treatment shall be completed before the building(s) is/are occupied and retained thereafter unless any variation is agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

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

26. The windows on the south-west elevation at first floor level shall be obscure glazed to a minimum level of obscurity to conform to Pilkington Glass level 3 or equivalent prior to commencement of use and shall have restrictors to ensure that the window cannot be opened more than 45 degrees beyond the plane of the adjacent wall and shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 3/12 or 3/14).

27. The windows in the rear roof dormer in the south-west elevation at second floor level shall be obscure glazed up to a height of 1.7 metre from internal finished floor level to a minimum level of obscurity to conform to Pilkington Glass level 3 or equivalent prior to commencement of use and shall have restrictors to ensure that the window cannot be opened more than 45 degrees beyond the plane of the adjacent wall and shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 3/12 or 3/14).

28. Prior to the commencement of the use hereby permitted, the arrangements for the disposal of waste detailed on the approved plans shall be provided and information shall be provided on the management arrangements for the receptacles to facilitate their collection from a kerbside collection point. The approved arrangements shall be retained thereafter.

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

29. Prior to the commencement of occupation, full details of the storage facilities for the separation of waste for recycling and composting within the individual flats shall be provided. The approved arrangements shall be retained thereafter.

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

INFORMATIVE: Dust condition informative

To satisfy the condition requiring the submission of a program of measures to control airborne dust above, the applicant should have regard to:

-Council's Supplementary Planning Document - "Sustainable Design and Construction 2007":

<http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/docs/sustainable-design-and-construction-spd.pdf>

-Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction

http://iaqm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/guidance/iaqm_guidance_report_draft1.4.pdf

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

http://www.iaqm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/guidance/monitoring_construction_sites_2012.pdf

-Control of dust and emissions during construction and demolition - supplementary planning guidance

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

INFORMATIVE: With regards to Traffic Management Plan condition, 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.

INFORMATIVE: The residents of the new development will not qualify for Residents' Permits (other than visitor permits) within the existing Residents' Parking Schemes operating on surrounding streets.

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.