

<b>Application Number</b>	16/1358/FUL	<b>Agenda Item</b>	
<b>Date Received</b>	16th August 2016	<b>Officer</b>	Michael Hammond
<b>Target Date</b>	11th October 2016		
<b>Ward</b>	Kings Hedges		
<b>Site</b>	Garages 1 - 48 Wiles Close Cambridge Cambridgeshire		
<b>Proposal</b>	Erection of three 2-bed affordable houses, associated landscaping, parking spaces, rear gardens and an alleyway for access following demolition of two garage blocks. Replacement of one site (Parking Court) with 21no. space parking courtyard and landscaping.		
<b>Applicant</b>	Cambridge City Council Cambridge City Council CB10JH		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposal is considered to provide a high quality living environment for future occupants.</li> <li>- The proposed works would not adversely impact on residential amenity in terms of increased parking pressure, overshadowing, overlooking or visual dominance.</li> <li>- The proposed development would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area.</li> </ul>
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

**1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT**

1.1 The application site is comprised of two rows of single-storey garages and associated hardstanding situated in the residential

area of Wiles Close, owned by the City Council. The site backs onto the gardens of properties along Lavender Road, Wiles Close and St Kilda Avenue. The majority of residential development in the surrounding context is two-storeys in scale and formed of terraced or semi-detached properties.

1.2 There are no site constraints.

## **2.0 THE PROPOSAL**

2.1 The proposal, as amended, seeks planning permission for the erection of three dwellings following the demolition of two garage blocks. The proposed dwellings would be situated on the land associated with the eastern-most row of garages. The dwellings would be established as a row of three terraced properties, each with their own parking space, garden and waste/ cycle storage areas. The proposed dwellings would be two-storeys in scale and constructed with tiled pitched roofs measuring approximately 5.2m to the eaves and 8.6m to the ridge. The walls would be constructed in red brick.

2.2 The row of western-most garages would be demolished and replaced with an open car parking area to provide 20no. car parking spaces with landscaping.

2.3 The proposed dwellings would be owned and let out by Cambridge City Council for affordable housing.

## **3.0 SITE HISTORY**

3.1 There is no planning history

## **4.0 PUBLICITY**

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

## **5.0 POLICY**

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

## 5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

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

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework March 2012 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014 Circular 11/95
Supplementary Planning Guidance	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012) Affordable Housing (January 2008) Planning Obligation Strategy (March 2010)
Material Considerations	<u>City Wide Guidance</u> Arboricultural Strategy (2004) Cambridge City Nature Conservation Strategy (2006)

	Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)
--	---

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

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

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

## 6.0 CONSULTATIONS

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

- 6.1 The development may displace parking demands upon the on-street parking on the surrounding streets and, whilst this is unlikely to result in any significant adverse impact upon highway safety, there is potentially an impact upon residential amenity which the Planning Authority may wish to consider when assessing this application. No highway safety objection subject to conditions.

### **Environmental Health**

- 6.2 No objection subject to conditions.

### **Refuse and Recycling**

- 6.3 No objection.

## **Urban Design Team**

6.4 No objection subject to conditions.

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

6.5 No objection.

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

6.6 No objection subject to conditions.

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

6.7 No objection subject to condition.

## **Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Nature Conservation Officer)**

6.8 No objection.

## **Disability Consultative Panel (Meeting of 30 August 2016)**

6.9 The Panel felt these homes were particularly small, and although described as 'Lifetime Homes compliant' details of the accessible unit are not specified (although the inclusion of a bathroom hoist is noted). Consultation with an Occupational Therapist is recommended regarding the 'Lifetime' standards. Sliding doors are recommended for the bathrooms, particularly if space is limited. It was also not clear from the plans as to how parking provision would be allocated. With the loss of so many garages as a result of these schemes, the Panel questioned what the overall loss of parking provision would be.

6.10 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:

- 14 St Kilda Avenue
- 20 St Kilda Avenue
- 22 St Kilda Avenue
- 24 St Kilda Avenue
- 26 St Kilda Avenue

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Loss of light/ overshadowing
- Impact on wildlife
- Insecurity of rear gardens due to creation of narrow passage way
- Light pollution and disturbance
- Overlooking/ Loss of privacy
- Maintenance of road due to increased comings and goings.
- Noise and disturbance from comings and goings.
- Contaminated land concerns.
- Increased parking pressure on surrounding streets
- Proposed houses too close to neighbouring properties.

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

## **8.0 ASSESSMENT**

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

1. Principle of development
2. Context of site, design and external spaces
3. Disabled access
4. Residential amenity
5. Ecology
6. Drainage
7. Refuse arrangements
8. Highway safety
9. Car and cycle parking
10. Third party representations
11. Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

## **Principle of Development**

- 8.2 Policy 5/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) allows for residential development from windfall sites, subject to the existing land use and compatibility with adjoining uses. The site is located within a residential context. Therefore, the proposed redevelopment of the site to three new dwellings is acceptable in principle.
- 8.3 In my opinion, the principle of the development is acceptable and in accordance with policy 5/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

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

- 8.4 The existing garages on the site do not have any positive impact on the character and appearance of the area. The majority of these garages are in poor condition and set back a considerable distance from the road. They do not offer any means of active frontage or surveillance along Wiles Close. In my opinion, the demolition of these structures is acceptable and this aspect of the proposed works would not detrimentally impact on the character and appearance of the area.
- 8.5 The proposed dwellings would be set back from and front onto Wiles Close in a similar manner to that of nos.5 – 8 Wiles Close to the west of the site. The building line would be recessed marginally further back from the road frontage than that of the adjacent property in order to accommodate parking at the front. In my opinion, there is not an established pattern of development or strict building line in the context of the area. Wiles Close properties are orientated at different angles and the wider area is fairly mixed in terms of the urban grain and layout. The proposal footprint, layout and building line all adequately respect the character and appearance of the area. There would be ample space around the proposed development and it would, in my view, read comfortably within its plot.
- 8.6 The proposal would have the appearance of a row of three terraced properties which would be in keeping with the pattern of development in the surrounding area. It would be designed with a strong active frontage with a consistent fenestration of doors and windows. The use of red brick with a pitched tiled roof would match some of the properties in the surrounding

area. The two-storey scale proposed is appropriate and is informed by the built form in the area. The use of timber paneling and modern door and window detailing would give the building a contemporary feel compared to the post-war style housing in the immediate vicinity but I consider this would help rejuvenate the appearance of the area and provide a successful yet subtle contrast. The Urban Design Team has recommended a condition regarding material samples and this has been included accordingly.

- 8.7 The proposed dwellings would have two main points of access. There would be a front door and path adjacent to the proposed car parking spaces which would connect to Wiles Close .There would also be gates at the side of the dwellings which would likely be used when future occupants are accessing the cycle stores or taking out bins. I consider the proposed arrangement of car parking and main routes into the proposed dwellings would be acceptable from a design perspective.
- 8.8 There are two large trees in the gardens of St Kilda Avenue and Wiles Close adjacent to the site. Neither of these trees are protected. The Tree Officer has assessed the information provided and has raised no objection to the proposal due to the separation distance of the proposed works from these trees.
- 8.9 The proposed replacement of the garages on the western-side of the site with an open car parking area is considered to be acceptable by the Landscape Team. This part of the land is currently covered by hard standing and the proposal would introduce pockets of landscaping with tree planting to this space and remove the visually unattractive garages. In my opinion, the proposed works to this space would improve the visual amenity of this land and is acceptable.
- 8.10 In my opinion, subject to conditions, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12 and 4/4.

### **Disabled access**

- 8.11 The Disability Consultative Panel have sought clarification regarding the schemes compliance with the Lifetime Homes standard. The floorplans do demonstrate that there would be the ability for wheelchair turning areas in the majority of the



rooms and space for the possible provision of an internal lift in the corner of each of the living rooms up to the first-floor bedrooms. Any modifications needed to ensure that these dwellings would meet the Lifetime Homes standard would be restricted predominantly to internal works. I have recommended an informative to make the applicant aware of this

- 8.12 In my opinion, subject to informative, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12.

### **Residential Amenity**

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.13 The main consideration is the impact of the proposed works on the adjacent properties on Wiles Close, St Kilda Avenue and Lavender Road.

#### Impact on Wiles Close

- 8.14 The proposed dwellings would in my view only have a material impact on no.8 Wiles Close by virtue of their close proximity.
- 8.15 There would be first-floor bedroom windows from the nearest proposed dwelling to no.8 which would allow for oblique views across this neighbour's garden. However these views would be similar to the existing views between nos.6 and 8 Wiles Close and this mutual sense of overlooking is already experienced. As a result I do not consider any harmful loss of privacy would be experienced at this neighbouring property.
- 8.16 The proposed development would be situated roughly 2.6m away from the boundary of this neighbour and there would be a 3.7m wall-to-wall separation distance. The proposal would project roughly 4.6m beyond the rear building line of this neighbour. The proposed works would fall outside the 45<sup>0</sup> line of this neighbour's nearest ground-floor and first-floor windows and I am of the opinion that these outlooks would not be visually dominated. The garden of this neighbour would retain a relatively open outlook and I am of the view that the visual presence of the proposed dwellings would not enclose this outdoor space.

8.17 The proposed built form would be situated to the south-east of this neighbouring property and consideration as to the impacts of overshadowing needs to be made. The applicant has provided a shadow study to demonstrate the likely impacts at 09:00hrs, 13:00hrs and 17:00hrs at each of the relevant equinoxes. There would be a slight increase in overshadowing during the autumnal/ vernal equinox over part of this neighbour's garden during the morning and midday hours. However this overshadowing would be limited to the south-eastern boundary of this neighbour and there would still be more than sufficient levels of light reaching this adjacent garden for the majority of the day. In the summer there would not be a significant impact on the levels of light reaching this neighbour. In the winter the proposal would overshadow some of this neighbour's garden up until approximately 13:00hrs as the sun would be at its lowest point. Nevertheless the BRE Site Layout Planning For Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice (2011) recommends that 50% of neighbour gardens should receive at least 2 hours of sunlight during the autumnal/ vernal equinox. As the proposal would be in keeping with this guidance I do not anticipate the overshadowing caused during the winter months would have an adverse impact on this neighbour's amenity.

#### Impact on St Kilda Avenue

8.18 It is acknowledged that a concern has been raised from one of the neighbouring properties along St Kilda Avenue regarding overlooking. The east facing first-floor side window of the nearest dwelling would serve a bathroom and I have therefore recommended a condition to ensure this window is obscure glazed and not fully openable. The rear and front facing first-floor windows would not face directly towards these adjacent properties and would only have oblique views across the latter parts of gardens. Consequently, I am of the opinion that the privacy of these neighbours would be retained.

8.19 I do not consider the proposal would visually enclose these neighbouring occupiers. There would be a separation distance of approximately 16.5m wall-to-wall between the proposed development and the rear elevations of these neighbours. In my opinion, this separation distance is adequate to ensure that the rear windows of these neighbours would not be visually enclosed by the proposed works. At present the garages adjoin

onto the rear boundaries of these neighbours, effectively forming a wall of roughly 2.2m in height. The removal of this long wall would provide a degree of benefit to these properties in terms of visual outlook. The introduction of the two-storey gable end at the end of these neighbours' gardens would clearly be noticeable from the gardens of these neighbours, particularly at nos.20 and 22 St Kilda Avenue. Nevertheless I do not anticipate the physical mass would visually dominate these neighbour's garden as they would still have outlooks to the north-east and south-west that would be unaffected by the proposed works. Overall, I do not consider the visual enclosure experienced would be significant enough to warrant refusal of the application.

- 8.20 It is acknowledged that concerns have been raised from properties along St Kilda Avenue in terms of loss of light. The proposed works would be situated to the west and north-west of these neighbours and so any overshadowing would likely be limited to the late afternoon. There would be a degree of overshadowing over the latter parts of these neighbours' gardens in the late afternoon. Notwithstanding this, the levels of light reaching these neighbours' gardens in the morning and early afternoon would remain similar to that of present and I therefore do not consider the impact would be significant enough to have an adverse impact on these neighbours' amenities.

#### Impact on Lavender Road

- 8.21 Nos.1 and 3 Lavender Road back onto the site of the proposed dwellings from the north-east.
- 8.22 The proposed dwellings would be situated roughly 11.5m away from the rear boundaries of these neighbours and there would be a wall-to-wall separation distance of over 27m. Given this level of separation distance I do not anticipate the proposed works would visually enclose these neighbours. In addition, the views from the first-floor windows of the proposed dwellings would be far enough away to ensure that the privacy of these neighbours is respected. Furthermore, the shadow studies do not demonstrate any harmful impact in terms of overshadowing and I do not consider this to be an issue either.

## Noise and disturbance

- 8.23 In my opinion, the proposed residential use of the site should not of itself introduce any harmful noise or disturbance to neighbouring properties. The site is situated in a residential context and the use of the gardens, movement of bins and bikes and parking of cars would not be dissimilar to that of existing properties in the surrounding area. The site of the proposed dwellings is currently used for car parking and storage and the removal of this function from the backs of neighbour's garden would be an improvement.
- 8.24 I do not anticipate the intensification of car parking spaces in the north-western area of the site from 14no. spaces to 20no. spaces would harmfully impact on the amenity of nearby properties in terms of vehicle movements. This parcel of land is already used for car parking purposes and the additional six vehicle movements that the proposal would generate would not be significantly different to that of present in my view.

## Car Parking

- 8.25 The application form states there are at present 22no. car parking spaces. The design and access statement explains that 11 of each row of the garages are used for car parking and the remaining four garages are used for storage only.
- 8.26 The proposal would provide 20no. car parking spaces in the new parking court area to the north-west and three car parking spaces on the site of the proposed dwellings.
- 8.27 As a result, there would be a net increase of one car parking space on site. The proposed three dwellings could increase parking pressure on the surrounding streets but I do not consider this additional pressure would be significant enough to harm residential amenity. Each of the proposed dwellings would have their own dedicated car parking space and the City Council has maximum car parking standards. The proposed dwellings are two-bedrooms in size and if ownership exceeds this the impact on-street would be minimal.
- 8.28 In my opinion, subject to condition, the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the

constraints of the site and I consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/12 and 8/2.

#### Amenity for future occupiers of the site

- 8.29 The proposal would provide three affordable dwellings in a suburban location. The proposed dwellings would have their own private outdoor amenity space, bin storage area, bike store and car parking space. All of the habitable rooms would have acceptable visual outlooks and the dwellings would have an internal area of roughly 72m<sup>2</sup>. The Campkin Road Local Centre is within 150m of the application site and there are bus stops along Campkin Road and King Hedges Road, both within walking distance.
- 8.30 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.

#### **Ecology**

- 8.31 A concern was raised from one of the neighbours along St Kilda Avenue regarding the potential impact of the development on wildlife. The applicant has provided an ecology report which demonstrates that the proposed redevelopment of the garages would not have a detrimental impact on wildlife. The garages were not deemed suitable for roosting bats and no roosting features were identified. The report did recommend that the privet hedge may be used by nesting birds and that clearance of this feature should be conducted outside of the breeding bird season. I have therefore recommended a condition to this effect. The Nature Conservation Project Officer has raised no objection to the proposed works.
- 8.32 In my opinion, subject to condition, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 4/3.

#### **Drainage**

- 8.33 The Drainage Officer has raised no objection to the proposed works subject to condition which I agree with.

8.34 The proposal is compliant with paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

### **Refuse Arrangements**

8.35 Bins would be stored at the end of each of the proposed gardens and there would be individual access points for bins to be wheeled out to the kerbside on collection days. The Waste Team has raised no objection to the proposed works.

8.36 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

### **Highway Safety**

8.37 The Highway Authority has raised no objection to the proposed works subject to conditions.

8.38 In my opinion, subject to conditions, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

### **Car and Cycle Parking**

8.39 The application form does not specify how many cycle parking spaces each of the stores at the end of the gardens would provide. Notwithstanding this, there appears to be adequate room to accommodate the necessary number of minimum cycle parking spaces and I have recommended a condition to control this.

8.40 In my opinion, subject to condition, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10.

### **Third Party Representations**

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

<b><u>Comment</u></b>	<b><u>Response</u></b>
Loss of light/ overshadowing	This has been addressed in the main body of this report.
Impact on wildlife	This has been addressed in paragraph 8.31 of this report.

Insecurity of rear gardens due to creation of narrow passage way	The proposed passage way would be gated and I do not consider this would compromise the security of neighbouring gardens.
Light pollution and disturbance	The Environmental Health Team has raised no objection to the proposal on light pollution/disturbance grounds. I do not anticipate light associated with each of the dwellings would be any worse than that of other residential properties in the surrounding area.
Maintenance of road due to increased comings and goings.	This is a matter for the Highway Authority and not a planning consideration.
Noise and disturbance from comings and goings.	This has been addressed in paragraphs 8.23 and 8.23 of this report.
Contaminated land concerns.	Contaminated land conditions have been recommended in accordance with Environmental Health advice.
Increased parking pressure on surrounding streets	This has been addressed in paragraph 8.27 of this report.
Proposed houses too close to neighbouring properties.	The proposed houses are not considered too close to neighbouring properties. This has been covered within the residential amenity section of this report.

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

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

Ministerial Statement of 28 November 2014 and should be taken into account.

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

## **9.0 CONCLUSION**

- 9.1 The proposed development adequately respects neighbouring occupiers in terms of overlooking, overshadowing and visual dominance. The use of one of the garage sites for residential development would not adversely displace car parking on the surrounding streets. The proposal would be in keeping with the character of the area, would provide a high quality living environment for future occupants and would help meet affordable housing need.

## **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 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 policy4/13

13. No unbound material shall be used in the surface finish of the driveway within 6 metres of the highway boundary of the site.

Reason: To avoid displacement of loose material onto the highway in the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2).

14. Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 2, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no fences, gates, walls or other means of enclosure forward of the principal elevation shall be erected within the curtilage of the dwellinghouse(s) without the granting of specific planning permission.

Reason: To protect the visual amenity of the neighbourhood and in the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 8/2).

15. The access shall be constructed with adequate drainage measures to prevent surface water run-off onto the adjacent public highway.

Reason: To prevent surface water discharging to the highway (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2)

16. 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 and 3/12).

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

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

18. The windows serving the bathrooms on drawing number 1441-P-001 Rev A on the elevations labelled B and D shall be obscure glazed to a minimum level of obscurity to conform to Pilkington Glass level 3 or equivalent prior to use of the rooms and shall have restrictors to ensure that the windows 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).

19. Facilities for the covered, secure parking of at least 2 bicycles per house shall be provided prior to the occupation of each house and retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure appropriate provision for the secure storage of bicycles (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/6).

20. Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), the enlargement, improvement or other alteration of the dwellinghouse(s) shall not be allowed without the granting of specific planning permission.

Reason: To protect the amenity of adjoining properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 3/12).

21. The clearance of the privet hedge, as shown on drawing no.1441-P-901 Rev A, shall only take place outside of the bird breeding period of March - August in any calendar year, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To avoid disturbance to nesting birds (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/3).

22. No building hereby permitted shall be occupied until surface water drainage works have been implemented in accordance with details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Before these details are submitted an assessment shall be carried out of the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system in accordance with the principles set out in The National Planning Policy Framework and associated Guidance, and the results of the assessment provided to the local planning authority. The system should be designed such that there is no surcharging for a 1 in 30 year event and no internal property flooding for a 1 in 100 year event + 40% an allowance for climate change. The submitted details shall:
- i. provide information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters; and
  - ii. provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.

iii. The surface water drainage scheme shall be managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the agreed management and maintenance plan.

Reason: To minimise flood risk (Paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012)).

**INFORMATIVE:** The Disability Consultative Panel felt these homes were particularly small, and although described as 'Lifetime Homes compliant' details of the accessible unit are not specified (although the inclusion of a bathroom hoist is noted). Consultation with an Occupational Therapist is recommended regarding the 'Lifetime' standards. Sliding doors are recommended for the bathrooms, particularly if space is limited.

**INFORMATIVE:** This development involves work to the public highway that will require the approval of the County Council as Highway Authority. It is an OFFENCE to carry out any works within the public highway, which includes a public right of way, without the permission of the Highway Authority. Please note that it is the applicant's responsibility to ensure that, in addition to planning permission, any necessary consents or approvals under the Highways Act 1980 and the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 are also obtained from the County Council. No part of any structure may overhang or encroach under or upon the public highway unless licensed by the Highway Authority and no gate / door / ground floor window shall open outwards over the public highway.

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

**INFORMATIVE:** Dust condition informative

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

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

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



-Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction

[http://iaqm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/guidance/iaqm\\_guidance\\_report\\_draft1.4.pdf](http://iaqm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/guidance/iaqm_guidance_report_draft1.4.pdf)

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

[http://www.iaqm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/guidance/monitoring\\_construction\\_sites\\_2012.pdf](http://www.iaqm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/guidance/monitoring_construction_sites_2012.pdf)

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

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

**INFORMATIVE:** The site investigation, including relevant soil, soil gas, surface and groundwater sampling should be carried out by a suitably qualified and accredited consultant/contractor in accordance with a quality assured sampling, analysis methodology and relevant guidance. The Council has produced a guidance document to provide information to developers on how to deal with contaminated land. The document, 'Contaminated Land in Cambridge- Developers Guide' can be downloaded from the City Council website on <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/land-pollution>.

Hard copies can also be provided upon request

**INFORMATIVE:** Approved remediation works shall be carried out in full on site under a quality assurance scheme to demonstrate compliance with the proposed methodology and best practice guidance.

**INFORMATIVE:** Any material imported into the site shall be tested for a full suite of contaminants including metals and petroleum hydrocarbons prior to importation. Material imported for landscaping should be tested at a frequency of 1 sample every 20m<sup>3</sup> or one per lorry load, whichever is greater. Material imported for other purposes can be tested at a lower frequency (justification and prior approval for the adopted rate is required by the Local Authority). If the material originates from a clean source the developer should contact the Environmental Quality Growth Team for further advice.

