

<b>Application Number</b>	17/1080/FUL	<b>Agenda Item</b>	
<b>Date Received</b>	29th June 2017	<b>Officer</b>	Michael Hammond
<b>Target Date</b>	24th August 2017		
<b>Ward</b>	Trumpington		
<b>Site</b>	15 Rutherford Road Cambridge CB2 8HH		
<b>Proposal</b>	Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of replacement dwelling.		
<b>Applicant</b>	Mr & Mrs E Killoughery C/O Agent		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed development would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area.</li> <li>- The proposed development would respect the amenities of neighbouring properties.</li> <li>- The proposal would provide a high quality living environment for future occupants.</li> </ul>
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

**1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT**

- 1.1 The application site is comprised of a two-storey detached property situated on the western side of the cul-de-sac of Rutherford Road. The existing property is constructed in grey brick with a pitched tiled roof. The general character of the area is of two-storey detached properties set back from the road and set within spacious plots.
- 1.2 The western end of the garden is covered by a group tree preservation order.

## 2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposal, as amended, seeks planning permission for the demolition of the existing dwelling and replacement with a new dwelling.
- 2.2 The proposed replacement dwelling would be two-storeys in scale and would occupy a larger footprint than that of the original dwelling. It would be designed in a contemporary manner with large planes of glazing, use of render and mono-pitched roofs. The proposed dwelling includes two on-site car parking spaces within a garage and a large garden to the rear. A basement level is also proposed.
- 2.3 The proposal has been amended to show the footprint of the building being pulled approximately 0.75m away from the northern and eastern boundaries.

## 3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
17/0533/FUL	Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of replacement dwelling	Refused – Appeal in progress.
16/0774/FUL	Erection of new dwelling following demolition of existing dwelling on site.	Refused

- 3.1 Planning permission reference 16/0774/FUL was refused on 21 October 2016 for the following reason:

*“The scale, bulk and design of the proposal would result in a dominant built form that would appear overly prominent and incongruous within the street scene. The width and bulk of the front elevation is out of keeping with existing dwellings on Rutherford Road and the lack of space around the dwelling, and the limited scope for soft landscaping, will further harm the quality and character of the area. In addition, the design poorly reflects and inadequately relates to the pattern of detached pitched roof dwellings within Rutherford Road. The result is a replacement dwelling which would constitute an overdevelopment of the site, would harm the visual quality of the street scene and fail to respond to its context or draw upon*

*key characteristics of the surroundings. As such the proposal conflicts with policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and guidance within paragraph 64 of the NPPF (2012).”*

3.2 Planning permission reference 17/0553/FUL was submitted in an attempt to respond to the previously refused application 16/0774/FUL. The main amendments to the proposal were as follows:

- Reduction in footprint;
- Alterations to roof form and massing;
- Reduction in overall height by approximately 1.1m; and
- Changes to fenestration of building

3.3 Planning permission 17/0553/FUL was refused on 2 June 2017 for the following reason:

*“The scale, bulk and design of the proposal would result in a dominant built form that would appear overly prominent and incongruous within the street scene. The width and bulk of the front elevation is out of keeping with existing dwellings on Rutherford Road and hard landscaping around the dwelling would leave limited scope for soft landscaping which will further harm the quality and character of the area. In addition, the design poorly reflects and inadequately relates to the pattern of detached pitched roof dwellings within Rutherford Road. The result is a replacement dwelling which would constitute an overdevelopment of the site, would harm the visual quality of the street scene and fail to respond to its context or draw upon key characteristics of the surroundings. As such the proposal conflicts with policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and guidance within paragraph 64 of the NPPF (2012).”*

3.4 It is pertinent to note that an appeal has been lodged on the decision to refuse planning permission 17/0553/FUL. At the time of writing this report, officers have prepared and submitted a statement of case to defend the reason for refusal to the planning inspectorate. The appeal is not likely to be determined until after the determination of this application.

#### 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 4/4 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 (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)

	Planning Obligation Strategy (March 2010)
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 No objection.

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

6.2 No objection subject to drainage conditions.

### **Landscape Team**

6.3 An alternative tree species should be considered along the narrow space between the site boundary and the development.

Tree pit details also required. Hard and soft landscaping and boundary treatment conditions recommended.

### **Environmental Health Team**

6.4 No objection subject to dust, piling and construction hours conditions.

6.5 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:

- 5 Rutherford Road
- 9 Rutherford Road

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Consultation with neighbours by the developer prior to submitting an application would have been helpful.
- Request that south-facing windows are obscure glazed to prevent overlooking of no.9 Rutherford Road.
- Concerned that the new property with white render finish will dominate northern aspect from no.9.
- Construction noise and traffic from proposed works.
- This would be the first complete demolition of an existing 1958 Robertson and Gimbel house thereby setting a precedent for future development.
- Overdevelopment of the plot.
- The material and form of the proposed roof is out of keeping with other properties.
- Potential damage to public spaces (verges and green island) from contractor movements.
- Construction traffic would pose a threat to cycle safety given proximity to nearby cycle route.

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. Residential amenity
4. Refuse arrangements
5. Highway safety
6. Car and cycle parking
7. Third party representations
8. Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

### **Principle of Development**

8.2 The provision of extra housing within the city is supported in the Cambridge Local Plan (2006). As policy 5/1 points out, proposals for housing development on windfall sites will be permitted, subject to the existing land use and compatibility with adjoining uses. The principle of developing the site for residential purposes is considered acceptable and conforms to the provisions set out in the development plan.

8.3 It is acknowledged that objections have been raised to the demolition of the existing dwelling due to its conformity to the character of the area. Whilst I agree that the original building is in keeping with the character of the area, it is not statutorily protected and there is no policy basis on which to resist the principle of demolition. Provided that the replacement built form on the site is acceptable in design terms, I consider the demolition to be acceptable.

8.4 In my opinion, the principle of the development is acceptable and in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 5/1.

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

8.5 The application site occupies a prominent location at the end of the cul-de-sac of Rutherford Road. Rutherford Road is characterised by two-storey detached properties which sit

comfortably within their respective plots and benefit from generous gardens.

8.6 The proposal seeks to address the previous reason for refusal on planning permission reference 17/0553/FUL through the following changes from the previous submission:

- Re-positioning of the footprint approximately 0.75m away from the eastern and northern boundaries; and
- Removal of first-floor element above garage in south-eastern corner.

8.7 In my opinion, the revised scheme has reduced the level of scale and massing to overcome the previous reason for refusal and it acceptable in this respect. When read from the main street elevation to the north, the proposal would now integrate successfully into the surrounding context. This would be achieved through the noticeable reduction in width of the two-storey element that was proposed under previous applications. The result of this reduction in two-storey footprint is that the proposed dwelling would appear of a scale and mass that better reflects the defined character of the area.

8.8 The re-siting of the proposed dwelling further away from the site boundaries helps to provide a more comfortable degree of breathing space from the edges of the site and I no longer consider the replacement dwelling to represent an overdevelopment of the plot. This is particularly evident when coupled with the significant reduction in two-storey width and the proposed development would, in my view, portray a level of development that fits successfully into its surrounding context and is in keeping with the character and appearance of the area. The shifting of the footprint also enables a more robust landscaping scheme to be integrated into the proposed scheme. It is acknowledged that the Landscape Team has requested further information regarding tree species and tree pit details but I am of the view that these details can be agreed through the appropriate landscaping conditions rather than prior to determination.

8.9 It is acknowledged that the overall form of the proposal, particularly the lack of orthodox pitched roofs, is still present on this revised scheme which was cited amongst the previous reason for refusal. However, I am of the view that this particular



reference in the previous reason for refusal was as a part of a cumulative impact and that it was the siting, scale, massing and roof form that combined to form this reason for refusal. Consequently, in light of the noticeable reduction in massing proposed, I do not consider that the fact that the proposal does not conform to the defined roof form in the surrounding is a reason for refusal in of itself. There is scope for a more contemporary approach that successfully contrasts with the surrounding context to be incorporated in the area. In my opinion, the unique roof form, when viewed in the overall contemporary design approach, would provide a successful contrast with the general vernacular of architectural design present in Rutherford Road. I have recommended a materials sample condition to ensure the materials are appropriate for the surrounding context.

- 8.10 In my opinion, subject to condition, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12 and 4/4.

### **Residential Amenity**

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.11 The main considerations in my opinion are the impacts of the proposed works on nos.9, 11 and 17 Rutherford Road

#### Impact on no.9 Rutherford Road

- 8.12 No.9 Rutherford Road is a detached property situated to the south-east of the application site with a large garden that borders the application site from the south.
- 8.13 The proposed development would be approximately 7.6m away from this neighbour's garden boundary. There are also three large trees along the southern boundary of the application site that are all proposed to be retained.
- 8.14 The proposed works would be situated to the north of this neighbour and would be set a considerable distance away. As a result, I am confident that no significant loss of light would be experienced at this neighbouring property. It is acknowledged that this neighbour has raised a concern regarding the visual dominance of the proposed development from their garden. I do

not consider the proposed dwelling would visually dominate this neighbouring property. The south-eastern element would be single-storey only and the two-storey element would be over 8.6m from this neighbour's garden. The neighbour's garden is also very long and benefits from relatively un-restricted views in all other directions and any views of the development to the north would also be partially screened by the existing large trees. I have no issue with the proposed render finish.

- 8.15 I appreciate that the views out to the south from the proposed first-floor windows across this neighbour's garden would introduce views into what is currently a private space. Therefore, I have recommended an obscure glazing for all of the first-floor south-facing windows to be obscure glazed up to a height of 1.7m and with restricted openings.

#### Impact on no.11 Rutherford Road

- 8.16 No.11 is a detached property situated to the east of the application site. This neighbour does not have any side (west) facing windows that would look out towards the proposed development. The main windows and garden space of this neighbour are on the rear (south) of this neighbour's property. The proposed development would be outside the main lines of sight and I am confident that the proposal would not visually dominate this neighbour. In addition, the proposed two-storey mass is set behind the single-storey garage element and I therefore do not consider any harmful levels of overshadowing would be experienced in the late afternoon. There are only two windows proposed that face towards this neighbour, one of which is a bathroom window that could be obscure glazed and the other a hallway window. As such, I do not consider the proposed development would infringe upon the privacy of this neighbour.

#### Impact on no.17 Rutherford Road

- 8.17 No.17 Rutherford Road is situated to the north-west of the application site and is formed of a detached property.
- 8.18 The proposed development would introduce two side (north) facing windows at first-floor level but these would serve bathrooms and could be obscure glazed. The proposed first-floor rear windows would allow for oblique views out towards

this neighbour's garden but I do not consider these would offer any compromising views of this neighbour's private garden.

- 8.19 This neighbour does have a side (south) facing ground-floor window that would look out towards the proposed works. However, the room to which this window serves also benefits from a much larger set of rear (west) windows that would not be affected by the proposed development. Therefore, I do not consider the proposal would visually overbear this neighbour.
- 8.20 The proposed development would likely lead to a slight increase of overshadowing over the south elevation and part of the neighbour's garden. However, as there are no significant windows on this elevation and the vast majority of the neighbour's garden would remain unaffected in terms of light levels, I am of the view that no harmful overshadowing would arise from this proposal.

#### Construction activities

- 8.21 It is acknowledged that neighbour's have raised concerns with noise and disturbance from the construction process. I have consulted the Environmental Health team who have raised no objection subject to conditions regarding working hours, dust and piling, which I have recommended accordingly. I have also recommended a delivery hours condition as I am conscious that without this deliveries could occur long before and after the agreed working hours. I have also included a considerate contractors informative.
- 8.22 The other concern regarding the construction that has been raised relates to contractor parking and movements from large vehicles. The Highway Authority has been consulted but does not consider a traffic management plan condition necessary in this instance. This is because of the location of the development at the end of a residential cul-de-sac and a considerable distance from the main public highway of Long Road to the south. There is also on-site parking and access onto the existing site which can utilised. Any damage that may occur to grass verges and any blocking of the highway during works is ultimately a matter for the Highway Authority to enforce and control.

- 8.23 In my opinion, subject to conditions, 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 and 4/13.

#### Amenity for future occupiers of the site

- 8.24 The proposal would provide a large four-bedroom dwelling with a spacious garden in an established residential area. The proposal includes a bin storage area to the side of the house and there would be adequate room to accommodate cycle parking on the site. There would be two car parking spaces and the site is within close proximity to bus stops along Trumpington Road and Long Road.
- 8.25 In my opinion the proposal provides a high-quality living environment and an appropriate standard of residential amenity for future occupiers, and I consider that in this respect it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12.

#### **Refuse Arrangements**

- 8.26 The proposal includes a waste storage area to the side (north) of the proposed dwelling which is within close proximity to the kerbside for collection days.
- 8.27 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

#### **Highway Safety**

- 8.28 Whilst I recognise the third party objection in relation to the cycle route, the Highway Authority has raised no objection to the proposed development.
- 8.29 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

#### **Car and Cycle Parking**

- 8.30 The proposal includes two car parking spaces which accords with the maximum car parking standards.

- 8.31 The application form does not include any details of cycle parking facilities. However, there is ample room to accommodate the necessary number of cycle parking spaces within the development and I therefore consider this can be controlled through a condition
- 8.32 In my opinion, subject to condition, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10.

### **Third Party Representations**

- 8.33 The majority of the third party representations have been addressed in the main body of this report.
- 8.34 It is acknowledged from the third party representations that this would be the first demolition of an existing 1958 'Robertson and Gimbel House'. However, I do not consider this would harm the character or appearance of the area given that this building is neither locally or nationally listed and has no significant architectural merit. The proposed replacement building would assimilate into its context in a similar vein and I do not consider there to be an issue with the principle of demolition.
- 8.35 Concerns have also been raised regarding the potential for the demolition to set a precedent of other demolitions in the area. However, I do not consider this to be the case and any future applications for replacement dwellings would be assessed on their own merits.
- 8.36 There is no obligation for the developer to contact neighbours prior to submitting a planning application and this lack of pre-consultation is a civil matter.

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

- 8.37 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.

8.38 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 is considered to successfully contrast with the fenestration and vernacular of housing types within the context of the area whilst also respecting the general pattern and massing of the character of the area. The proposal would respect the amenities of neighbouring properties and provide a high quality living environment for its future occupants.

## **10.0 RECOMMENDATION**

**APPROVE** subject to the following conditions:

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

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

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

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

3. No construction work or demolition work shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours and 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

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

4. 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)

5. 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)

6. 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

7. 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)

8. 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 treatments to be erected. The boundary treatment shall be completed before the use hereby permitted is commenced 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)



9. The first-floor windows serving the rooms labelled 'ensuite', 'landing', 'bedroom 4', 'bathroom' and 'master bedroom' on the east, south and north elevations as shown on drawing number 16 Rev 1 shall be obscure glazed to a minimum level of obscurity to conform to Pilkington Glass level 3 or equivalent prior to commencement of use and shall have restrictors to ensure that the window cannot be opened more than 45 degrees beyond the plane of the adjacent wall and shall be retained as such thereafter.

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

10. Prior to the commencement of development and with reference to BS 5837 2012, full details of the foundation design and all other protection measures and techniques to be adopted for the protection of trees on-site shall be submitted to the local planning authority for its written approval. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and safeguarding trees that are worthy of retention (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/4).

11. 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, 3/10 and 3/12).

12. Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class B 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 new windows or dormer windows (other than those expressly authorised by this permission), shall be constructed without the granting of specific planning permission.

Reason: To protect the amenity of adjoining properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/10 and 3/12).

13. Prior to commencement of development, large scale drawings of the overhang eaves and verge details from the vertical walls of the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and retained thereafter.
14. No development shall commence until details of wheel washing measures to be used during the demolition / construction period have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

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

**INFORMATIVE:** Dust condition informative

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

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

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

-Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction

[http://iaqm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/guidance/iaqm\\_guidance\\_report\\_draft1.4.pdf](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:** New development can sometimes cause inconvenience, disturbance and disruption to local residents, businesses and passers-by. As a result the City Council runs a Considerate Contractor Scheme aimed at promoting high standards of care during construction. The City Council encourages the developer of the site, through its building contractor, to join the scheme and agree to comply with the model Code of Good Practice, in the interests of good neighbourliness. Information about the scheme can be obtained from The Considerate Contractor Project Officer in the Planning Department (Tel: 01223 457121).