

Application Number	17/0847/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	19th May 2017	Officer	Sav Patel
Target Date	14th July 2017		
Ward	West Chesterton		
Site	57 Highworth Avenue Cambridge CB4 2BQ		
Proposal	Demolition of Bungalow and construction of 2No 4 Bedroomed semi-detached houses, car and cycle parking and landscaping proposals.		
Applicant	Mr & Mrs Kevin Handley 57, Highworth Avenue CAMBRIDGE CB4 2BQ		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The principle of residential development on the site is acceptable2. The proposal would not materially harm the character and appearance of the area3. The proposed development would not have a significant impact on neighbour amenity
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The site is currently occupied by a white rendered detached hipped bungalow adjacent to the northern boundary with no.59. There are also two detached pitched roof outbuildings. The bungalow has been extended at the rear with two single storey flat roof extensions. The site is bound by a combination of a 1.8 metre high timber fence and small trees and shrubs. The flank elevation of the outbuilding to no.55 defines part of the southern boundary.

- 1.2 The bungalow (no.57) is set back from the road and located within a large plot. However no.57 is the only single storey dwelling within this part of the cul-de-sac. The most notable features in this part of the cul-de-sac are the two mature street trees (Horse Chestnut) located within the footpath either side of the road. The trees dominate the site and frame no.57 and no.59 from the road, which are white rendered dwellings. The built form of the area is characterised mainly by two and two ½ storey detached dwellings, which are set back from the road with verdant frontages. To the rear of the site are the properties in Hurst Park Avenue which are mainly two storey semi-detached dwellings with narrow deep gardens. The site is located within a predominantly residential context.
- 1.3 The site is not within a Conservation Area and there are no listed buildings within close proximity to the site.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposal is for the demolition of the existing bungalow and construction of 2no. four bed semi-detached dwellings. The proposal also includes car and cycle parking, bin storage and landscaping.
- 2.2 Plot 1 would be a 2 ½ storey dwelling and plot 2 would be a 1 ½ storey dwelling. Plot 1 would be located on the footprint of the existing bungalow and plot 2 would be located adjacent to the common boundary with no.55 Highworth Avenue.

Background

- 2.3 This is the third planning application submitted for this site for two dwellings on this site. The proposals in both previous applications, which were for two, 2 ½ storey dwellings (detached in the 1st application and semi-detached in the 2nd application) were considered unacceptable due to the scale and cramped form and impact on the residential amenity of the adjoining neighbours. However no formal decision was made on the two previous applications, as the applicant appealed to the Inspectorate against non-determination. Both appeals were dismissed by the Inspector. I have attached a copy of both appeal decisions in Appendix 2.

2.4 The first planning application (15/2157/FUL) was for two 2 ½ storey detached dwellings. The main reasons the Inspector dismissed the appeal was due to:

- The form and mass of the proposal would be at odds with the spacious setting of its neighbours;
- Appear cramped on the narrow frontage of the site;
- The awkward front elevation of plot 2 which appears shoe horned into the site behind plot 2;
- Scale and form of the proposal would appear cramped and detract from the overall spacious appearance of the neighbouring properties and attractive street scene;
- Harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area;
- The flank wall of plot 2 would appear imposing from the rear garden of no.55 Highworth Avenue;
- Significantly harm the living condition of no.55 by loss of outlook from the garden area;

The Inspector did not consider the proposal would have a harmful impact on the residential amenity of no.59 Highworth Avenue

2.5 The second planning application (16/1521/FUL) was for two 2 ½ storey semi-detached dwellings. The main reasons the Inspector dismissed the appeal was due to:

- The Inspector gave significant weight to the previous appeal decision due to there being no changes to the development plan;
- The proposal would introduce a significant additional bulk of development to the street scene;
- The narrow frontage, angled windows on the front elevation and complicated stepped roof of Plot 2 would draw attention to the dwelling;
- The dwellings would appear noticeably cramped within their setting and harm the spacious character and appearance of the area;

The Inspector concluded that the revised flank elevation of Plot 2 would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of no.55 Highworth Avenue, and did not raise any concerns with the impact on the occupiers of no.59;

2.6 Following the dismissal of the previous schemes the applicant applied for pre-application advice to work with the Officers to try and agree an acceptable solution. As a result of the pre-application discussion the proposed scheme was conceived. The issues raised in the previous appeal decisions were material to the consideration of the proposed scheme.

2.7 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:

1. Design Statement
2. Plans

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
15/2157/FUL	Demolition of bungalow and construction of 2No detached houses.	Non-determination – Appeal dismissed
16/1521/FUL	Demolition of Bungalow and construction of 2no 4 bedroomed semi-detached houses, car and cycle parking and landscaping proposals.	Non-determination – Appeal dismissed

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 3/10 3/11 3/12 4/13 5/1 8/2 8/6 8/10

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

Central Government Guidance	<p>National Planning Policy Framework March 2012</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014</p> <p>Circular 11/95</p> <p>Ministerial Statement (1 December 2014) by Brandon Lewis Minister of State for Housing and Planning (Department of Communities and Local Government)</p>
Supplementary Planning Guidance	<p>Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007)</p> <p>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012)</p> <p>Planning Obligation Strategy (March 2010)</p>
Material Considerations	<p><u>City Wide Guidance</u></p> <p>Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)</p>

5.4 Status of Proposed Submission – Cambridge Local Plan

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

For the application considered in this report, there are no policies in the emerging Local Plan are of relevance.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Control)

6.1 No adverse impact on the operation of the highway network.

Landscape

6.2 It is not possible to comment on the proposed development and the following additional information is required:

- The side passage of Plot 1 must be 1.5 metres wide to comply with the cycle parking standards;
- Cycle store for plot 2 should be located closer to the access gate;
- Details of the surface treatment for the front drives need to take into consideration use of wheelie bins, cycles and wheelchairs – could be provided as part of a condition.
- Bin storage for plot 1 would constrain the use of the side access gate so it should be moved to allow better access/circulation;
- All other matters could be provided as part of conditions

Drainage

- 6.3 The proposed development is acceptable subject to a surface water drainage condition.

Waste - Shared Service

- 6.4 No objections to the proposal.

Environmental Services

- 6.5 The proposal is acceptable subject to the following conditions:

- Construction hours;
- Demolition/construction collection and delivery hours;
- Piling
- Dust and dust informative

No concerns regards to the potential for contaminated land.

- 6.6 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:

- 22 Highworth Avenue;
- 30 Highworth Avenue;
- 51 Highworth Avenue;
- 53 Highworth Avenue;
- 55 Highworth Avenue;
- 59 Highworth Avenue;
- 61 Highworth Avenue;
- 63 Highworth Avenue;
- 42 Hurst Park Avenue;
- 46 Hurst Park Avenue;
- Cambridge Cycling Campaign;

The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations on the amended plans:

- 55 Highworth Avenue;
- 61 Highworth Avenue;

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Design, scale and layout;

- Sub-division of this irregular shape plot would appear out of character with the area and set an unwelcome precedent;
- Poor design and unsympathetic to the area;
- Overdevelopment of the site due to the size of the dwellings and also with regards to the site frontage in terms of cycle parking, bin storage, car parking and landscaping;
- The proposed dwellings located so close to the side boundaries and would appear as a very large out of scale property, jammed in against the neighbouring properties;
- The development is unsympathetic to the existing nature of the cul-de-sac which is of well-spaced detached dwellings;
- The openness adjacent to no.55 will be closed down and dominated by a large south side elevation of Plot 2;
- Would not object to a single substantial family home being built on the site away from the side boundaries with sufficient garden space and off street parking;
- The proposed dwellings due to their design and garden sizes could make them suitable for HMO use which could have an impact on the character of the neighbourhood and cause car parking congestion;
- The previous inspectors acknowledged the spacious and verdant character of the area;

Residential amenity

- Clarification on the precise position and glazing nature of the north facing windows on plot 1 particularly the living room and laundry room;
- Clarification on the type and height of the fence between the proposed properties and neighbours;
- The revised scheme reduces the overbearing appearance in terms of its vertical form but does nothing to reduce the horizontal form;
- Due to the proximity of Plot 1 to the boundary, it will obscure some southern sunlight from no.59 and will impact the amenity, privacy and openness of their garden;

- Loss of outlook due to Plot 2 running almost full length along the garden boundary;
- Overlooking of bedroom window in the side elevation from the first floor windows in Plot 2
- Overlooking of the gardens in Hurst Park Avenue and Orchard Avenue;

Car and cycle parking

- Object on the grounds of inadequate cycle parking and storage provision and no details of the access routes;
- Width of side access below that recommended in the cycle parking standards;
- The car parking arrangement would make access difficult for bikes, pushchairs, wheelchairs to squeeze past parked cars;
- Size of dwellings will increase car parking and likely to lead to on street parking;

Representations to amendments

- Only addresses one problem with the proposal and does little to enhance the appearance of the development;
- The alterations to the dormer windows in Plot 2 do not prevent direct line of sight into our house it simply narrows the field of vision;
- The angled bay window serving Bedroom 4 in Plot 2 would directly face the side wall of Plot 1 introducing a very contrived design

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 The site has been the subject of two previous appeal decisions for two 2 ½ storey 4bed dwellings in a detached and semi-detached arrangement, respectively. The Inspectors' decisions on both appeals are therefore material to the consideration of this proposal. The assessment of the current proposal is based upon the issues raised by the Inspectors of the two previous appeal decisions (15/2157/FUL and 16/1521/FUL) which were both dismissed. The appeal decision letters are attached as Appendix 2 for convenience of reference. The main issues

raised by the Inspector were with the character and appearance and living conditions. I therefore have assessed the current proposal against these two issues.

Character and appearance

- 8.2 The Inspector acknowledged that the residential cul-de-sac contained a mix of semi-detached and detached dwellings of varied styles set back from the road and space between the buildings. With regards to the previous scheme, the Inspector raised concerns with the introduction of significant bulk into the street scene in place of the existing single storey dwelling.
- 8.3 The proposed development is for two 4bed dwellings in a semi-detached arrangement. Plot 2 has been materially altered and is now proposed to be set back from the frontage of plot 1 and has been reduced in height and bulk. Plot 2 has been reduced to a single storey dwelling with rooms in the roof space (1 ½ storey). Plot 1 is maintained as a 2 storey dwelling with rooms in the roof space. The variation in height and scale between the two gives Plot 2 a subservient appearance in context with Plot 1. Plot 2 reads more as a subservient addition to Plot 1, particularly from the front elevation. Both dwellings have been designed so that front elevations are regular in appearance with no prominent awkward angles. The dormer windows in the roofscape of Plot 2 have been revised so that they angle away from the side elevation of no.55. However, the angled windows are not considered to adversely affect the external appearance of the overall development. The proposal has addressed the Inspector's concerns and due to the revisions made from the previous scheme would fit comfortably within the site and would appear as a sympathetic addition to the street scene.
- 8.4 The appeal Inspector for both previous proposals raised concerns about the scale of the development on such a narrow frontage creating a cramped form of development. Whilst the current proposal would extend the width of the frontage with approx 1 metre gaps each side, the revised design and reduced scale of Plot 2 and setting back from the frontage of Plot 1 contributes towards reducing the cramped appearance of the frontage. The layout of both proposed dwellings fit more comfortably within the narrow frontage without appearing as a cramped form of development. The proposal also allows views through the site towards the trees at the rear of the site. The

hipped roof of Plot 2 helps to create a wide gap between no.55 which maintains a sense of spacing between properties.

- 8.5 The proposed development has addressed the main concerns raised by the inspector in the previous appeal scheme. The proposal would appear as a positive addition to the street scene and maintain the spacious character of the area.
- 8.6 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/10, 3/11, 3/12 and 5/1.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.7 The Inspector of the previous appeal proposal (16/1521/FUL) did not raise any concerns with regards to residential amenity of the adjoining neighbours. However the proposal has been amended to try and address the Inspector's principal concern which was with the cramped scale and form of development on the site. The applicant has reduced the scale of Plot 2 by reducing its height, hipping the roof and setting it back from the front elevation of Plot 1 giving it a more subservient appearance from the street scene. The Inspector did not raise any concerns with the potential impact of Plot 1 on occupiers of no.59. As a result Plot 1 has not been materially altered from the previous scheme.
- 8.8 Due to the alterations to Plot 2, concerns were raised regarding the potential impact from overlooking and the window to window distance from the two dormer windows in the front elevation of Plot 2 on the side elevation of no.55. The first floor dormer windows would face two windows in the side elevation of no.55 at ground and first floor. The ground floor window serves as a second window into an open plan kitchen dining room. The first floor window serves a bedroom and is the only window serving the bedroom. Having visited no.55 to assess the potential impact from both windows, I raised concerns with the applicant over this potential overlooking and window to window distance (less than 10 metres) issue. I requested the applicant response to this issue. The applicant submitted amended plans which showed the proposed dormer windows angled away from the side elevation so that they face the road. Whilst very oblique views of the side elevation of no.55 may still be visible, I do not

consider the impact from this to be significant enough to warrant refusal. This amendment has in my opinion overcome the overlooking impact and is therefore an acceptable solution. The revised plans were consulted on.

8.9 Plot 1 is the same design and scale as in the previous appeal scheme. The Inspectors for both appeal schemes (15/2157/FUL and 16/1521/FUL) did not raise any concerns with the potential impact on residential amenity of the occupiers of no.59. Therefore I do not consider the development would have any significant adverse impact on the residential amenity of the adjoining neighbour at no.59 Highworth Avenue. The two storey element would not conflict with the 45 degree line from the first floor window in no.59 and there are no windows that would cause direct overlooking.

8.10 In my opinion the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and I consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/10 and 3/12.

Third Party Representations

8.11 I have addressed some of the issues raised in the third party representations in the above assessment. I set out below my response to the issues I have not directly referenced:

Representations	Response
<i>Design, scale and layout;</i>	
Sub-division of this irregular shape plot would appear out of character with the area and set an unwelcome precedent;	The revised scheme would in my opinion sit comfortably within the site when viewed from the road. The design and scale of the proposed development would reasonably integrate into the site without appearing unduly out of character. In terms of precedent, each planning application is considered on its own merits.
Poor design and unsympathetic to the area;	The design of the proposed development would reflect character of the existing built

	form. The Inspector did not raise any design concerns with the previous appeal.
Overdevelopment of the site due to the size of the dwellings and also with regards to the site frontage in terms of cycle parking, bin storage, car parking and landscaping;	The amended scheme has in my opinion addressed the concerns of the previous schemes. The proposal would fit better into the site in terms of layout and appearance. There is enough space within the site to accommodate the ancillary provisions.
The proposed dwellings located so close to the side boundaries and would appear as a very large out of scale property, jammed in against the neighbouring properties;	The proposed dwellings would be located approx. 1 metre off the side boundaries. No.59 is located a similar distance to the side (north) boundary and side elevation of Plot 2 would taper away from the side boundary with no.55.
The development is unsympathetic to the existing nature of the cul-de-sac which is of well-spaced detached dwellings;	The proposed development in my opinion would not have a significantly adverse impact on the character of the cul-de-sac such that it would warrant refusal of the application.
The openness adjacent to no.55 will be closed down and dominated by a large south side elevation of Plot 2;	The side elevation of Plot 2 has been reduced in height and tapers away from the side boundary with no.55 by between 1 metre at its nearest to 8.5 metres at its furthest.
Would not object to a single substantial family home being built on the site away from the side boundaries with sufficient garden space and off street parking;	The proposed development has been designed to appear as a single dwelling with an ancillary side element.
The proposed dwellings due to their design and garden sizes could make them suitable for HMO use which could have an impact on the character of the neighbourhood and cause car	My assessment of the proposal is based upon two private dwellings. I do not consider it appropriate to speculate on alternative uses which may require a separate

parking congestion;	application in any event. Any alternative use will be assessed on its own merits.
The previous inspectors acknowledged the spacious and verdant character of the area;	The applicant has proposed to introduce landscaping at the front of the site which would contribute towards the verdant character of the area. the reduced height of Plot 2 also increases the level of spacing with no.55.
<i>Residential amenity</i>	
Clarification on the precise position and glazing nature of the north facing windows on plot 1 particularly the living room and laundry room;	The windows in the north elevation of Plot 1 serve a utility, w/c and sitting room on the ground floor and an en-suite at first floor. I do not consider any of the ground floor windows are required to be obscure glazed. Whilst the en-suite window would face the side gable of no.59 there may be some oblique views of the rear garden of no.59. I have therefore recommended a condition for this window to be obscure glazed.
Clarification on the type and height of the fence between the proposed properties and neighbours;	I have recommended a boundary treatment condition so that details of the type and height of the side boundary treatment are provided for consideration.
The revised scheme reduces the overbearing appearance in terms of its vertical form but does nothing to reduce the horizontal form;	The reduced vertical scale of the proposed development and set back of Plot 2 has in my opinion addressed the concerns of the proposal appearing a cramped.
Due to the proximity of Plot 1 to the boundary, it will obscure some southern sunlight from no.59 and will impact the amenity, privacy and openness	The previous Inspector did not raise any concerns with the proposal in terms of its impact on the residential amenity of no.59. I therefore do not

of their garden;	consider it necessary to reassess the impact as part of this proposal as Plot 1 has not been amended.
Loss of outlook due to Plot 2 running almost full length along the garden boundary;	The previous Inspector did not consider the outlook of the occupiers of no.55 would be adversely affected by the previous proposal which was for a much larger dwelling. I have addressed the impact of Plot 2 on no.55 in the above assessment.
Overlooking of bedroom window in the side elevation from the first floor windows in Plot 2	See para 8.8
Overlooking of the gardens in Hurst Park Avenue and Orchard Avenue;	The previous Inspectors did not raise any concerns with the impact of overlooking on the occupiers in Hurst Park Avenue and Orchard Avenue. In my view, the proposal would not have any overlooking impact due to the level of separation.
<i>Car and cycle parking</i>	
Object on the grounds of inadequate cycle parking and storage provision and no details of the access routes;	The applicant has revised the cycle parking provision for both plots. Two cycle stands are now proposed at the front of Plot 1 so as to avoid having to travel along the side passage. For Plot 2 the cycle store has been brought closer to the side access gate. These amendments are acceptable.
Width of side access below that recommended in the cycle parking standards;	The side access width (1 metre) for both plots is 200mm below that recommended in the cycle parking standards. The standards recommend a minimum of width of 1.2 metres over 10 metres for an

	access. The applicant has relocated the cycle parking for Plot 1 to the front and the cycle store for Plot 2 is located approx. 3.5 metres from the side gate. Therefore, the cycle parking provision is acceptable.
The car parking arrangement would make access difficult for bikes, pushchairs, wheelchairs to squeeze past parked cars;	There is enough space at the front of each plot to ensure access for all is provided.
Size of dwellings will increase car parking and likely to lead to on street parking;	The proposal includes two on plot car parking spaces for each plot which is compliant with the car parking standards

9.0 Conclusion

- 9.1 The proposal is for the redevelopment and sub-division of an existing residential plot on which is located a single storey bungalow. The proposal is for two 4bed dwellings in a semi-detached arrangement. The site has been subject to two previous schemes for residential development both for two 2 ½ storey detached and semi-detached dwellings (respectively). However, both schemes were dismissed at appeal by the Inspector. The previous appeal scheme was dismissed solely based upon the impact on the character and appearance of the area in terms of introducing significant bulk into the street scene and creating a cramped frontage setting.
- 9.2 The proposed scheme is for two dwellings in a semi-detached arrangement. Plot 1 would be a traditional two ½ storey with matching eaves and ridge height to the neighbouring dwelling at no.59. Plot 2 would be a 1 ½ storey hipped roof dwelling set back from the frontage of Plot 2. Plot 2 has been designed to appear as a subservient addition to Plot 1 so as to reduce the bulk of the development from within the street scene. The reduced height of Plot 2 has also increased the size of the gap between it and no.55 Highworth Avenue. Therefore, the form and layout of the proposed development would in my opinion better integrate into the site than the two previous schemes and would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the

area. The proposal has in my opinion addressed the concerns that were raised by the previous Inspectors.

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE, subject to the following conditions:

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. 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)

5. 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)

6. 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)

7. 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)

8. In the event of the foundations for the proposed development requiring piling, prior to the development taking place the applicant shall provide the local authority with a report / method statement for approval detailing the type of piling and mitigation measures to be taken to protect local residents from noise and/or vibration. Potential noise and vibration levels at the nearest noise sensitive locations shall be predicted in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228-1&2:2009 Code of Practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Due to the proximity of this site to existing residential premises and other noise sensitive premises, impact pile driving is not recommended.

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

9. 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

10. Prior to the commencement of the first use the vehicular access where it crosses the public highway shall be laid out and constructed in accordance with the approved drawing and retained free of obstruction thereafter.

In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy 8/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

11. The driveway hereby approved shall be constructed using a bound material for the first 6m from the back of the adopted public highway, to prevent debris spreading onto the adopted public highway. Once constructed the driveway shall thereafter be retained as such.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy 8/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

12. Prior to occupation of the development hereby approved, the cycle parking and bin storage provision shall be implemented in accordance with the details shown on drawing no.29723/12 Rev B unless otherwise agreed in writing. The provision shall be retained in accordance with the approved details thereafter.

Reason: To ensure sufficient cycle and bin storage provision for both plots (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 3/10 and 8/6).

13. Prior to the commencement of development a scheme for surface water drainage works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details shall include an assessment 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 the National Planning Policy 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 + an allowance for climate change. The submitted details shall include the following:

- 1) 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;

2) 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 for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.

The approved details shall be fully implemented on site prior to the first use/occupation and shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure appropriate surface water drainage. (National Planning Policy Framework 2012).

14. The driveway hereby approved shall be constructed so that its falls and levels are such that no private water from the site drains across or onto the adopted public highway. Once constructed the driveway shall thereafter be retained as such.
Reason: for the safe and effective operation of the highway in accordance with Policy 8/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

15. The window on the north elevation of Plot 1 at first 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, 3/10 and 3/12).

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: 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 applicants 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: 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.