

Application Number	17/0732/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	30th May 2017	Officer	Charlotte Burton
Target Date	25th July 2017		
Ward	Romsey		
Site	Land To The East Of 37 And To The Rear Of 27-37 Romsey Terrace Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3NH		
Proposal	Erection of two new dwellings with associated car parking, landscaping, and infrastructure.		
Applicant	Robinson College C/O Agent		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>The proposal would have an acceptable impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties;</p> <p>The proposal would not harm the street scene or the setting of the conservation area.</p>
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The site is located to the rear of Nos. 27-35 Romsey Terrace. It comprises part of the garden space of these properties and a car parking area to the south east adjacent to No. 37 Romsey Terrace. The site has an existing access from Romsey Terrace.
- 1.2 Romsey Terrace is a modest and compact residential cul-de-sac characterised mainly by two storey terrace dwellings on the back edge of the pavement and on street parking. Nos. 27-35 and 37 are latter additions to the street. Nos. 27-35 are a two storey terrace fronting Romsey Terrace, while Nos. 37 is a two storey detached property orientated side-on to the street.

- 1.3 There are no boundaries between the gardens at the rear of Nos. 27-35, instead this area is currently laid out as communal open space, which was used as such by the students who previously occupied the properties. The communal space includes a grass area at the rear of the properties and an area of hardstanding on eastern part of the site. There is a covered cycle shelter along part of the south-east boundary.
- 1.4 There is a timber fence which defines the side boundary of the communal space and runs along the northern side of the access. The car parking area to the south east adjacent to No. 37 is laid out as a large area of hardstanding, which is used as a private car parking area.
- 1.5 At the southern end of Romsey Terrace is an earlier residential housing complex consisting of 17 dwellings; single storey and two storey compared to Romsey Terrace. This development is less formal than the original terraces and consists of bungalows and two storey terraces properties.
- 1.6 To the east of the site are the properties in Coleridge Road which are mainly two storey semi-detached dwellings with generous rear gardens in terms of depth. Many of the rear gardens contain ancillary outbuildings but to the rear of no.6 & 8 Coleridge Road is a pair of single storey pitched roof bungalows known as 6a and 6b Coleridge Road.
- 1.7 The site is located outside the Conservation Area which skirts along the south-west boundary of no.25 Romsey Terrace. There are no Listed Buildings or Buildings of Local Interest within close proximity of the site such that would be affected. The site is outside the controlled parking zone.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposal is for the erection of 2 no. dwellings with associated car parking, landscaping, and infrastructure. The units would be 3-bed and would be market housing.
- 2.2 The dwellings would be located on the southern part of the site facing towards the north, and would be stepped forward of No. 37 Romsey Terrace. The dwellings would be two storeys with an asymmetric pitched roof, constructed of grey brick with timber cladding on the ground floor, and zinc cladding on the

first floor and roof. The properties would have rear gardens including bike and bin storage accessed via a side passage.

- 2.3 The car parking would be at the rear of Nos. 27-35 Romsey Terrace on the eastern part of the site adjacent to the boundary with Nos. 6a and 10-16 Coleridge Road. There would be 10 no. spaces including 2 no. visitor spaces, one of which would be an accessible space. Soft landscaping would include a planting bed on the northern boundary and 2 no. trees on the eastern part of the site.
- 2.4 During the course of the application, revised plans were submitted which included:
- ☐ The existing 1.8m high brick wall on the northern, eastern and southern boundaries to be retained or rebuilt depending on stability, and an additional 0.6m high trellis to be erected on the southern boundary.
 - ☐ Amendments to the cycle parking arrangements to provide access and storage facilities in accordance with standards and in response to Landscape Officer's comments.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

- 3.1 The planning history for the site consists of the following:

Reference	Description	Outcome
15/2355/FUL	Proposed development of four dwellings - two semi-detached three-bedroom dwellings and two semi-detached two bedroom dwellings and associated amenity space and facilitating development.	APPEAL DISMISSED
14/0476/FUL	Proposed development of five dwellings - two semi-detached three-bedroom dwellings and three terraces two-bedroom dwellings and associated amenity space and facilitating development.	WITHDRAWN
C/95/0809	Erection of 6 houses.	APPROVED

C/95/0538 Erection of 8 two storey houses REFUSED
with associated car parking.

3.2 A copy of the Inspector's Decision letter in relation to the appeal is attached and an appendix to this report. In summary, the reasons for refusal related to:

- ☐ Privacy of the future occupiers of the northern units;
- ☐ Outlook for the existing and future occupiers of the northern units;
- ☐ Poor standard of external communal space for the future occupiers.

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

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

Central Government	National Planning Policy Framework March 2019
--------------------	---

Guidance	2012 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014 Circular 11/95 (Annex 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)

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 Initial comment

The transport statement states that one car parking space will be allocated to each of the new dwellings, presumably from the ten private car parking spaces within the site. As the application form states that there are 10 existing spaces and that this level of provision is retained, this would, effectively reduce the level of provision for existing demand.

As a result 2 spaces would be displaced from the site and it would seem likely that, as this is existing demand and there is no reason to believe that this demand will disappear as a result of the proposal, the demand for two displaced cars would be likely to reappear elsewhere, most likely on the nearest uncontrolled street.

The development may therefore impose additional 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.

6.2 Additional comment re. construction management plan

The Highway Authority has an obligation to provide reasonable access to users of the public highway, including the developer. The issue arising is that construction operations, access particularly, may have amenity impacts upon the residents and so, if that is the case, you may want to impose a requirement for a construction management plan, but the right to reasonable access will also impact upon what can reasonably be achieved. Such a requirement may, however, focus the contractor's attention on the issue and prompt a reasonable, considerate solution.

Environmental Health

6.3 No objection. Recommend conditions/informatives:

- ☐ construction hours
- ☐ collection during construction
- ☐ piling
- ☐ contaminated land conditions (all 6)
- ☐ site investigation informative
- ☐ remediation works informative
- ☐ materials chemical testing informative

Urban Design and Conservation Team

- 6.4 No objection. The proposal responds well to the surrounding context. The proposed scale and massing is considered appropriate to the site's context. The proposal adequately accommodates the functional storage requirements of the development. The scheme has the potential to create a contemporary addition to the southern area of Romsey Terrace that will enhance the street. The proposed smoky grey brickwork provides a good base to the dwellings and is complemented by the Anthra zinc cladding. Well placed timber accents provide warmth around entrances. Recommend conditions for materials samples and cycle parking facilities.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

- 6.5 Initial comment

Additional information / amendments required regarding the side access passageways to the rear gardens, size of the cycle stores and visitor cycle parking.

- 6.6 Revised comment

Acceptable. Recommend condition for boundary treatments.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Tree Team)

- 6.7 No comments received.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Officer)

- 6.8 No objection. Recommend condition for a surface water drainage scheme.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Archaeology)

- 6.9 The site lies within an area of high archaeological potential. Recommend a condition for a programme of site investigation and recording.
- 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:

Objection

- ☐ 28 Romsey Terrace

Neutral

- ☐ 25 Romsey Terrace
- ☐ 2 Greville Road
- ☐ 10 Coleridge Road

- 7.2 The Romsey Road Residents Association has also commented on the proposal (32 Romsey Terrace).

- 7.3 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- ☐ Current scheme is more appropriate in terms of scale, massing, layout, form and parking provision compared to previous scheme;
- ☐ Applicant/agent has taken a positive approach to consultation with neighbours.
- ☐ Design, construction and materials (grey bricks and zinc cladding) is out of character with the surrounding area and adjacent Conservation Area;
- ☐ Timber cladding likely to deteriorate if not well maintained.
- ☐ Existing boundary walls should be retained. The revised plans showing landscaping and boundary treatments welcomed, however repairs to boundary wall should be discussed with local residents beforehand.

- ☐ Loss of garden (green space) and mature trees should be mitigated in terms of landscaping and biodiversity. Loss of gardens to car parking is regrettable but it is accepted it is necessary for the development as there is already a major problem with parking in the street.
- ☐ Barrier protection should be erected along the boundary wall to protect against damage and injury.
- ☐ Existing houses have been boarded up demonstrating lack of need for new houses.
- ☐ Impact of traffic and parking.
- ☐ Noise and disturbance and general disruption to the surrounding area during construction.
- ☐ Request a specified completion date and condition for details of construction hours, waste disposal, delivery and collection hours.
- ☐ Request public consultation on materials, landscaping and construction management details to be approved through conditions.

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

8.0 ASSESSMENT

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

1. Principle of development
2. Context of site, design and external spaces / Impact on the setting of the conservation area
3. Residential amenity
4. Highway safety
5. Car and cycle parking
6. Refuse arrangements
7. Third party representations

8.2 The Inspector's decision on the previous appeal on the site is a material consideration which I have given appropriate weight to in my assessment below. A copy of the appeal decision is provided within the appendix to this report.

Principle of Development

- 8.3 Policy 5/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 allows for residential development on windfall sites, subject to the existing land use and compatibility. The existing site comprises part of the gardens of Nos. 27-35 and an area of private car parking. The loss of these uses would be acceptable. The surrounding area is residential and thus the proposed use is compatible. I have assessed the impact on residential amenity in the relevant section below. In summary, I find this to be acceptable.
- 8.4 The Inspector's decision on the previous appeal did not raise an issue with the principle of development. The current proposal is for a lower number of units than the previous proposal. The proposed car parking area would be a re-provision of existing car parking. In my opinion, the principle of development is acceptable in accordance with policy 5/1.

Context of site, design and external spaces / Impact on setting of the conservation area

- 8.5 The site is outside the conservation area, however is adjacent to it on the northern boundary, where the conservation area encompasses the northern part of Romsey Terrace. This area is characterised by the original terraced properties on either side of the road, which are identified as 'Positive Unlisted Buildings' in the Mill Road Conservation Area Appraisal (MRCAA). At the southern end of Romsey Terrace (beyond Nos. 24 and 25), are more recent developments including Robinson Terrace (Nos. 27 - 35 and No. 37), and Romsey Mews, which consist of a mixture two storey and single storey properties. The pattern of development south of Nos. 24 and 25, particularly on the western side is arranged in a less formal and uncharacteristic layout. Whereas Robinson Terrace (Nos.27 to 37), which is a later development, has tried to continue the line of the existing terrace which is characteristic of the street pattern.
- 8.6 The proposed dwellings would be orientated to front the access road and would be read as a continuation of No. 37. The Urban Design team has commented that this would positively define the entrance into the site and provide surveillance towards the proposed car parking to the rear Nos. 27-35. The units would step forward of the frontage of No 37 by 1.4m, however this is

not considered harmful in townscape terms and will provide interest from views into the site. The width of the plots would be similar to No. 37 and the grain of the conservation area. The Urban Design team has commented that the overall layout is considered compatible with the surrounding context. The eaves and ridge height of the proposed units would be similar to No. 37, so in my opinion the scale and massing would be acceptable.

- 8.7 Third parties have raised concerns about the contemporary design and materials for the proposed units. The units would have an asymmetric pitched roof and projecting bay windows, with grey bricks on the ground floor and zinc cladding on the first floor and roof. The Inspector for the previous scheme concluded that as the units would be outside the conservation area and there would be no significant views from the public realm, 'the development would be in a location able to accommodate some variation in the appearance of buildings and would not therefore result in significant harm to the character of the existing street scene' (appeal decision paragraph 28). The units have been redesigned since the previous scheme, and in my opinion, the design would be high quality. The Urban Design team supports the proposal and I have accepted their recommended condition for materials samples to be submitted for approval.
- 8.8 With regard to the impact in the setting of the conservation area, the Inspector goes on to say that the key aspect of the character of the conservation area is the neat traditional terraced frontages and that this is essentially experienced from the public realm within the conservation area. From outside the conservation area, this is experienced from further along the street to the south. The Inspector concludes that development on this site would not interrupt views towards the conservation area, and thus the proposal would not harm its setting (paragraphs 29-31). I have no reason to come to a different conclusion to the Inspector.
- 8.9 The layout of the car parking area to the rear of Nos. 27-35 would be a functional arrangement. In terms of landscaping, the proposal includes hard landscaping of the parking area with some planting on the northern boundary, tree planting on the eastern side of the site and buffer planting in front of the units, including enhancing the landscaping in front of No. 37. The

boundaries have been shown on the drawings as retaining the existing walls along the northern, eastern and southern site boundaries, with additional trellis on the southern boundary. A close boarded fence would be erected along the rear of Nos. 27-35. The Landscape Officer supports the proposal and I have recommended conditions for details of boundary treatments to be submitted for approval. Third parties have raised an interest in the soft landscaping for visual and amenity reasons, and I have recommended a condition for a soft landscaping scheme to be submitted for approval.

- 8.10 In summary, the Inspector for the previous scheme did not consider that the southern units and a contemporary approach to the design of the units would harm the character and appearance of the conservation area in principle. The Urban Design team and Landscape Officer support the current proposal subject to conditions. I share this view and in my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12 and 4/11.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.11 The nearest residential properties are Nos. 25-37 Romsey Terrace to the west, Nos. 6-20 Coleridge Road (including Nos. 6a and b) to the east, and Nos. 2-6 Greville Road to the south.
- 8.12 The previous scheme on the site was refused on the grounds that the units proposed on the northern side of the site would have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties. The impact of the units on the southern part of the site was not a reason for dismissing the appeal. The current proposal removes the northern units and in my opinion, resolves the amenity concerns from the previous scheme.
- 8.13 The nearest properties to the southern units are Nos. 2-6 Greville Road which have long rear gardens approximately 35m deep. The two storey rear elevation would be a minimum of approximately 3.9m from the boundary and a maximum of approximately 6m. There would be one unobscured bedroom window on the first floor rear elevation. The revised plans include retention of the existing 1.8m wall with an additional 0.6m high trellis. I have recommended a condition requiring this

boundary treatment to be installed prior to first occupation of the unit. Subject to this, in my opinion, there would be no significant loss of privacy for the occupants of Greville Road properties.

- 8.14 There would be two first floor windows on the front elevation facing northwards towards the rear garden of No. 35. The separation gap would be approximately 5m. There would be some views into the rear garden, however as these are bedroom windows, in my opinion the degree of overlooking would not have a significant loss of privacy. This is a similar arrangement to the previous scheme, and this was not considered by the Inspector to be unacceptable. I have no reason to come to a different conclusion to the Inspector on this matter. Similarly, in terms of overshadowing, while the proposed units would be to the south of the garden of No. 35, the applicant's shadow diagrams show that there would not be significant overshadowing of the amenity space. Moreover, this was also not a reason for dismissing the previous scheme.
- 8.15 The proposed parking would be at the rear of Nos. 25-35 and would adjoin the rear garden of No. 27. These properties would retain a garden approximately 3.8-5.6m deep. The eastern boundary of the parking along the eastern boundary would adjoin the rear gardens of Nos. 10-14 Coleridge Road approximately 30m deep, with the exception of the bungalow at No. 6a which is within a smaller plot. I do not consider that the parking area would have a significant adverse impact on the residential amenity of the occupants of the Romsey Terrace or Coleridge Road properties due to the limited number of spaces. I have recommended a condition for details of external lighting to be submitted for approval prior to installation.
- 8.16 The occupants of Nos. 27-35 currently have access to communal gardens. The proposal would reduce the area of garden available. This area is currently used for cycle parking, so in my opinion, the loss of this area would not have a significant impact on their residential amenity. The plans show the communal garden would be subdivided, however this is outside the application site boundary, so does not form part of the proposal. Nonetheless, should the garden be subdivided in this way, in my opinion there would be an acceptable amount and quality of amenity space for the future occupants.

- 8.17 There is a first floor window on the side elevation of No. 37. This appears to serve a bedroom or study and is the only window serving this room. I do have some concerns about loss of light and enclosure of this window due to the proximity of the proposed units. However, the impact would be similar to the previous scheme, and this was not raised as an issue in the Inspector's decision. For this reason, in my opinion, the impact on this window would not be reasonable grounds to refuse the application. Moreover, I do not consider this would have a significant impact on the residential amenity of the occupants of this property, considering the proposal would not harm their amenity in other regards.
- 8.18 Third parties have raised concerns about the impact on traffic and parking within Romsey Terrace. The proposed units would be allocated one car parking space each, which is in accordance with the adopted car parking standards. The site is outside the controlled parking zone, so the future residents could park on street along Romsey Terrace. However, given the small number of units proposed and the sustainability of the location, this is likely to generate only a small additional demand for parking. In terms of traffic, the number of car parking spaces would be the same as existing and in my opinion is likely to generate a similar number of traffic movements to and from the site. The Inspector concluded that the previous scheme which proposed more units with fewer car parking spaces than the current proposal would not harm parking availability (paragraphs 23-26), and I have no reason to come to a different conclusion.
- 8.19 I have recommended conditions to control the construction and delivery hours as requested by the Environmental Health team. Third parties have raised concerns about the impact of construction deliveries on residential amenity due to the constrained access along Romsey Terrace, which is narrow and typically densely parked with cars. I have recommended a condition for a construction management plan to be submitted for approval in order to mitigate the impact on residential amenity.
- 8.20 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

- 8.21 The 3-bed houses would have private rear gardens between approximately 3.9-6m deep with bin and cycle storage at the rear. There would be a screen on the lower part of the ground floor living room window on the front elevation and some buffer planting. I am satisfied that the proposal provides a good level of amenity for the future occupants, and I consider that in this respect it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12.

Highway Safety

- 8.22 The proposal would use the existing access from Romsey Terrace. The Highways Authority has not objected to the proposal on highway safety grounds and I accept their advice. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Car and Cycle Parking

Car parking

- 8.23 There are 10 no existing car parking spaces on the site. The proposal includes the retention of the same number of spaces. Of these, 2 no. spaces would be allocated to the proposed units and 2 no. spaces would be provided for visitors (including one accessible space). The number of spaces provided for the proposed units would be in accordance with the adopted maximum standards. The remaining spaces would replace existing spaces so would be acceptable.

Cycle parking

- 8.24 The proposal includes cycle stores in the rear garden of the proposed units. During the course of the application, the proposed site plan was amended to widen the side passageway to 1.2m. No elevations of the cycle stores have been provided. I have recommended a condition for details to be submitted prior to installation.
- 8.25 The cycle stores shown in the rear gardens of Nos. 27-37 Romsey Terrace are outside the application site boundary and do not form part of the current application. The existing cycle

parking for these units would be lost as a result of the current proposal, however I am satisfied that adequate cycle parking could be re-provided for these units.

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

Refuse Arrangements

- 8.27 The proposal includes bin stores at the rear of the proposed units. I am satisfied that the access provides the width required for bins to be brought to the kerb for collection. No elevations of the cycle stores have been provided. I have recommended a condition for details to be submitted prior to installation.
- 8.28 The bin stores shown in the rear gardens of Nos. 27-37 Romsey Terrace are outside the application site boundary, however in my opinion, demonstrate an acceptable arrangement could be provided for these units.
- 8.29 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

Third Party Representations

- 8.30 I have addressed the third party representations as follows:

Representation	Response
Current scheme is more appropriate in terms of scale, massing, layout, form and parking provision compared to previous scheme;	Noted.
Applicant/agent has taken a positive approach to consultation with neighbours.	Noted.
Design, construction and materials (grey bricks and zinc cladding) is out of character with the surrounding area and adjacent Conservation Area;	The Inspector concluded that the site would be able to accommodate some variation in the appearance of buildings without harming the setting of the conservation area. The Urban Design team supports the proposal and has

	recommended that the materials are agreed through a condition requiring submission of samples. I accept this recommendation.
Timber cladding likely to deteriorate if not well maintained.	The recommended materials condition would require a sample of the timber cladding to be submitted for approval, which would be reviewed by our Urban Design team, who would take this into consideration.
Existing boundary walls should be retained. The revised plans showing landscaping and boundary treatments welcomed, however repairs to boundary wall should be discussed with local residents beforehand.	The revised plans show the existing boundary walls to be retained and this would be secured through a condition. The Council cannot require the applicant to discuss the repairs to the wall with local residents, however would recommend this as good practice.
Loss of garden (green space) and mature trees should be mitigated in terms of landscaping and biodiversity. Loss of gardens to car parking is regrettable but it is accepted it is necessary for the development as there is already a major problem with parking in the street.	The proposed site plan shows replacement planting. I have recommended a condition for a detailed soft landscaping scheme to be submitted for approval.
Barrier protection should be erected along the boundary wall to protect against damage and injury.	In my opinion, this is not necessary or reasonable from a planning perspective; however, should the applicant consider it to be appropriate, this could be included within the landscaping scheme to be submitted for approval under the recommended condition.
Existing houses have been boarded up demonstrating	This comment refers to Nos. 27-35 Romsey Terrace which

lack of need for new houses.	are outside the application site. The use of these properties is not relevant to the current application.
Impact of traffic and parking.	See paragraph 8.18.
Noise and disturbance and general disruption to the surrounding area during construction.	I have recommended a condition to control construction hours in line with the Environmental Health team's advice.
Request a specified completion date and condition for details of construction hours, waste disposal, delivery and collection hours.	A specified completion date cannot be required. I have recommended conditions to control the construction matters.
Request public consultation on materials, landscaping and construction management details to be approved through conditions.	The Council does not normally formally publicly consult on applications to discharge planning conditions, however submissions are available to view on the public file and third parties are able to submit representations which would be taken into consideration.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The current proposal has removed the northern units compared to the previous scheme and therefore, in my opinion, has removed the element that was unacceptable. The appeal Inspector did not raise issues with development on the southern part of the site which was acceptable in terms of the principle of development, impact on the character of the area and impact on residential amenity. The southern units have been redesigned since the previous scheme and I have assessed the current proposal, however I have no reason to come to a different conclusion to the Inspector on these matters. The design would be high quality and the materials, landscaping and boundaries could be agreed through conditions. The impact on residential amenity during construction could be managed through standard conditions.

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. No demolition or construction works shall commence on site until a Construction Management Plan has been agreed with the Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

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

12. 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)

13. No demolition/development shall take place until a written scheme of investigation (WSI) for a programme of archaeological investigation has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, which shall include:

- a) the statement of significance and research objectives;
- b) the programme and methodology of site investigation and recording and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works
- c) the programme for post-excavation assessment and subsequent analysis, publication & dissemination, and deposition of resulting material.

Thereafter, the agreed WSI shall be fulfilled prior to commencement of demolition/development, or in accordance with an alternative programme set out in the agreed WSI.

Reason: In the interests of archaeology (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy)

14. Prior to commencement of the development hereby permitted (apart from demolition and site clearance), a surface water drainage scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This shall include the results of the 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 associated Guidance. The scheme 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:
- a. include the results of the 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 associated Guidance. The scheme 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
 - b. 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
 - c. 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.

Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted, the surface water drainage scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed details, and managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the agreed management and maintenance plan.

Reason: In the interests of surface water management.

15. No development shall take place (apart from demolition, site clearance and enabling works) 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, 3/17 and 3/12).

16. Prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted, a hard and soft landscaping scheme shall be implemented in accordance with details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to installation. Thereafter the landscaping scheme shall be retained in accordance with the approved details. This shall include:
- i) details of boundary treatments to include retention of walls;
 - ii) soft landscaping details, including planting plans;
 - iii) hard surfacing materials;
 - iv) detailed arrangements for covered secure bicycle parking;
 - v) detailed arrangements for bin storage.

Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12 and 8/6).

17. Prior to the installation of any external lighting, a detailed lighting scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall specify the method of lighting (including details of the type of lights, orientation/angle of the luminaries, the headgear cowling, the spacing and height of lighting columns), the extent/levels of illumination over the site and on adjacent land and measures to be taken to contain light within the curtilage of the site. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with approved details and shall thereafter be maintained as such.

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

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 20m³ 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.