

Application Number	17/2198/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	22nd December 2017	Officer	Mary Collins
Target Date	16th February 2018		
Ward	West Chesterton		
Site	Annexe 29 Garden Walk Cambridge CB4 3EW		
Proposal	Single storey extension and alterations to existing annexe to allow change of use to separate dwelling, with provision of bin and cycle store for both properties.		
Applicant	Ms G St.John-Ives Annexe , 29, Garden Walk CAMBRIDGE CB4 3EW		

<p>SUMMARY</p>	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> It would not have a significantly adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties through loss of privacy, loss of light, an overbearing sense of enclosure and generation of unreasonable levels of traffic or noise nuisance; <input type="checkbox"/> it would provide adequate amenity space, or access arrangements and parking spaces for the proposed and existing properties; <input type="checkbox"/> it would enhance the prevailing character and appearance of the area. <input type="checkbox"/> it would not adversely affect trees, wildlife features or architectural features of local importance.
<p>RECOMMENDATION</p>	<p>APPROVAL</p>

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site is situated on the western side of Garden Walk and is to the side and rear of 29 Garden Walk.
- 1.2 29 Garden Walk is a detached, three storey property with the first and second floor to the side over an open carriage entrance providing access to the rear of the property.
- 1.3 A detached two storey building is situated at the bottom of the garden of 29 Garden Walk. It is constructed on the boundary with 27 Garden Walk which lies to the south and is set in from the rear boundary with residential properties in Stretten Avenue.
- 1.4 It has been used as an annexe to the existing dwelling with ancillary living accommodation for sleeping purposes. The building is believed to have been on the site since the late 19th century and has undergone alterations and extension over time.
- 1.5 The existing building has a footprint of 10.7 metres by 4.1 metres and is 4.7 metres to eaves level with a shallow pitched roof and ridge height of 6.4 metres. It is brick built with a pitched roof covered in corrugated metal sheeting.
- 1.6 The site falls within the Castle and Victoria Road Conservation Area. The site falls outside the controlled parking zone.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 Planning permission is sought for the extension, alteration and change of use of the existing two-storey annexe to form a separate independent dwelling.
- 2.2 The proposed separate dwelling would have a bedroom at either end with a central bathroom at first floor and with a living room and kitchen at ground floor level.
- 2.3 To the North elevation, a single storey extension is proposed to provide an entrance porch with WC and utility room. This would be sited at the eastern end of the existing building and would be 3.7 metres wide by 2.5 metres deep. It would have a flat Green roof and would be 2.5 metres high.

2.4 The proposal includes:

- Elevational changes including addition of larger windows in the north elevation and addition of new bathroom window.
- Infilling of windows and rendering of entire south elevation
- The South wall would be rendered (self-coloured to reduce the need for maintenance).
- The West and East gable walls will be partly rendered and partly vertical timber boarded.
- The North wall will be rendered at ground floor level, with vertical timber boarding above.
- The existing corrugated sheet metal roof covering will be retained.
- The existing garden would be subdivided and a 1.8 metre high fence erected.

2.5 Access to the separate dwelling would be through the archway to the side of 29 Garden Walk.

2.6 During the course of the planning application, revised plans were received showing the high level window in the western end of the building obscurely glazed, fixed and non-openable and the doors to the kitchen changed to a window instead.

2.7 A concurrent application was submitted for works to the frontage dwelling (No.29), including partial demolition of a single-storey rear extension, raising the ridge height, and alterations to the materials and fenestration. This has recently been determined (approved) under delegated powers.

2.8 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:

1. Design Statement
2. Drawings

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
18/0036/FUL	Alterations to existing dwelling house [No.29] including partial demolition of single storey rear extension, raising of ridge height	Permitted

and installation of new zinc-effect roof, installation of new rooflight to rear roof pitch, new cladding to parts of front and rear elevations and alterations to fenestration

C/89/0417	Alterations to outbuilding to form studio accommodation.	Refused 02.05.1989
C/81/0865	Alterations to existing building to form No. 2 residential flats with parking facilities	Refused: 02.02.1982

4.0 PUBLICITY

4.1	Advertisement:	Yes
	Adjoining Owners:	Yes
	Site Notice Displayed:	Yes

5.0 POLICY

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

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN		POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Plan 2006	Local	3/1 3/4 3/7 3/10 3/14 4/11 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	National Planning Policy Framework March 2012 National Planning Policy Framework –
-----------------------------------	---

	<p>Planning Practice Guidance March 2014</p> <p>Circular 11/95 (Annex A)</p> <p>Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard – published by Department of Communities and Local Government March 2015</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>
Material Considerations	<p><u>City Wide Guidance</u></p> <p>Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)</p> <p><u>Area Guidelines</u></p> <p>Castle and Victoria Road Conservation Area Appraisal (2012)</p>

5.4 Status of Proposed Submission – Cambridge Local Plan

5.5 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.

5.6 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 off-street parking provision is made for the new separate household. The development is therefore likely to 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.

Environmental Health

6.2 The development proposed is acceptable subject to the imposition of the condition outlined below.

In the interests of amenity, I recommend the standard construction hours condition CC63 – construction hours.

Contaminated Land

I have checked our database and would confirm that I have no concerns with regards to potential contamination of the land proposed for the single storey extension.

Waste strategy

Environmental health does not comment on waste/recycling matters. Please contact the waste strategy team.

Urban Design and Conservation team

6.3 It is considered that there are no material Conservation issues with this proposal.

6.4 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 Councillor O'Reilly has requested that the application be referred to Committee if Officers are minded to support the proposal. Her representation can be summarised as follows:

- The existing 'annexe', as described in the application, was originally a storage facility, and was never intended to be used as a permanent dwelling. A previous application to convert the building was refused, and it is understood there is no historic consent to use the building as a residential annexe. This has a material effect on any decision and the lawfulness of the building needs to be established.
- A separate house would require at least 1 parking space. Garden Walk is a very narrow road with limited parking provision, and it would not be possible to park on the site itself. The proposal would therefore impose additional parking demands in an area where parking is already in very short supply, which would harm the amenities of other residents in the street.
- The proposal would harm the character of the area.
- The house would overlook several neighbours' properties.
- The development would be contrary to Local Plan policies 3/10, 3/14 and 4/11.

7.2 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations:

- Camcycle
- 12 Stretten Avenue (including Cheffins on behalf of the owner of this property)
- 50 Metcalfe Road

7.3 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- The application does not specify the layout of the cycle parking, in contravention to 2006 Local Plan policy 8/6. If the application is to go forward, please attach a condition that prior to construction the layout of the cycle parking with sufficient number of spaces is submitted and checked against the 2006

Local Plan Appendix D or the Cycle Parking Guide for new residential developments.

- Two applications were previously refused on this site, in 1982 and 1989, for separate residential use of the outbuilding on the grounds of overlooking, loss of privacy and increased noise and disturbance to neighbouring properties.
- Over development of the site - The proposed development would have an overbearing impact on neighbouring properties and would not be in keeping with the surrounding area. The proposal would represent over development on a small site which impacts upon the amenity of neighbours and adversely affects the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the wider area and would also not constitute sustainable development.
- Design and loss of privacy - The use of the building as a residential property and the subsequent extension would visually dominate neighbouring properties, in particular no.12 Stretten Avenue. Use of this building would unreasonably overlook, overshadow and would have a significant and unacceptable impact on privacy for both the residents and the occupants of the annexe. Whereas the annexe would have had limited occupation, i.e. the residents would have utilised the main dwelling, this proposal would result in an independent residential dwelling. As such, the proposals are contrary to NPPF para. 58 and policies 3/10 and 3/14 of the Local Plan.
- Access and parking - The proposed access and parking arrangements are wholly unsafe, dangerous and unacceptable. One parking space is proposed for the two dwellings, i.e. none is being proposed for the two-bedroom annexe.
- Noise and disturbance - The application would not comply with Policy 3/10 as the use of the building as a residential dwelling would give rise to significant and unacceptable noise and disturbance to 12 Stretten Avenue, the application property and the main property at no. 29 Garden Walk.
- Visual and residential amenity - Due to the proximity and proposed use of the building, the proposed development would lead to an unacceptable impact on residential and visual amenity for 12 Stretten Avenue, the application property and the main property at no. 29 Garden Walk.
- There will be a loss of privacy and light for 6a and 6b Stretten Avenue.
- There will be an increase in the noise and disturbance caused to the occupants of 6a and 6b Stretten Avenue.

- There is an inadequate number of parking spaces for the development.
- It is noted that the existing annexe is not permanently occupied as claimed by the applicant.

Revised plans

- 12 Stretten Avenue (& Cheffins)
- Do not consider the conversion of this building in a conservation area into a separate family dwelling is acceptable.
- The approval at 71a Garden Walk should not be viewed as a precedent as that consent was for a single-storey dwelling and followed a previously refused scheme in 1994 for a two-storey property.
- In light of the recent appeal decision at 34 Mill Road, the Council should ensure internal space standards of the proposed dwelling are satisfactory.

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

Principle of Development

8.1 As the proposal is for the subdivision of an existing residential plot, Local Plan policy 3/10 is relevant in assessing the acceptability of the proposal. Policy 3/10 allows for the subdivision of existing plots, subject to compliance with specified criteria. However, in this instance, Section d and f of the policy are not relevant as the proposal would not adversely affect the setting of a listed building (d) and would not prejudice the comprehensive development of the wider area (f).

Residential development within the garden area or curtilage of existing properties will not be permitted if it will:

- a) have a significantly adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties through loss of privacy, loss of light, an overbearing sense of enclosure and generation of unreasonable levels of traffic or noise nuisance;
- b) provide inadequate amenity space, or access arrangements and parking spaces for the proposed and existing properties;

c) detract from the prevailing character and appearance of the area.

e) would not adversely affect trees, wildlife features or architectural features of local importance.

Context of site, design and external spaces and impact on conservation area

8.2 The two storey detached building already exists and has been subject to planning applications in the past to use the building as an independent dwelling. These previous applications were refused on the grounds that the proposal would be detrimental to the amenities of surrounding residential properties by reason of overlooking and loss of privacy. The 2nd application was also refused due to the absence of parking within the curtilage of the property. Neither of these proposals were refused for character reasons.

8.3 There are views of the existing building from the private rear gardens of properties in Garden Walk and Stretten Avenue. There are limited views of the building from the public realm and wider Conservation Area with a glimpsed view obtained from outside the Conservation Area through the gap in the frontage between numbers 6 and 12 Stretten Avenue.

8.4 The existing visual impact of the current building on the Conservation Area is acceptable, however the appearance of the building would be enhanced through improvements to its external finish such as timber cladding, render and brickwork to match and this would preserve the character and appearance of the Castle and Victoria Road Conservation Area and is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/14 and 4/13.

8.5 The proposed use of an existing building is considered to be a sustainable form of development and is not considered to detract from the prevailing form of development.

Residential amenity of new separate dwelling

8.6 The back to back distance between 29 Garden Walk and the proposed separate dwelling would be 15 metres. The existing window currently in the end elevation facing the host dwelling is a high level obscurely glazed window which would not cause a

detrimental loss of privacy. This will be changed for a high level clearly glazed window (1.7 metres to cill level). As this would still be a high level window, this will ensure that there is no loss of privacy through inter-visibility between windows.

- 8.7 There is the potential for overlooking into the private amenity space allocated for the separate dwelling from the first floor windows of the host dwelling. However, the proposed property has been designed to be laid out such that the outdoor amenity spaces are located on the north and east sides, with a new single-storey extension on the north side providing privacy to the main patio area. I am therefore of the opinion that this would not result in a detrimental loss of privacy.
- 8.8 The future occupiers of the independent dwelling would need to have a proper outlook and an acceptable quality of accommodation. Partial frosting of the windows would provide an adequate outlook from the bedroom windows whilst ensuring the protection of neighbours' privacy.
- 8.9 New larger bedroom windows are proposed to increase the amount of light reaching these north facing windows. The bedroom windows would be obscurely glazed to a height of 1.5 metres above finished floor level with clear glass above this. At each gable end a high level slit window, 1.7 metres above finished floor level is proposed.
- 8.10 The proposed dwelling has an internal floorspace of 74m². For a 2-storey, 2-bedroom property, as proposed here, the Technical Housing Standard ranges from 70m² if occupied by 3 people to 79m² with 4 occupants. I consider that, even in the worst-case scenario, the amount of internal space is broadly consistent with the levels quoted in the standards and emerging Local Plan Policy, and that the scheme would provide an acceptable quality of internal living space for further occupiers.
- 8.11 The level of outdoor amenity space allocated for this separate dwelling is in excess of 80m² and is considered to be acceptable.

Impact on host dwelling - 29 Garden Walk

- 8.12 The proposed boundary fencing to segregate the two plots would provide privacy to the main dwelling and proposed

independent dwelling. The host dwelling has three existing windows in the side elevation at ground floor level which serve the kitchen and dining area. These windows would face the pedestrian access serving the new independent dwelling to the rear and the proposed 1.8 metre high close boarded fence would be approximately one metre from these side facing kitchen windows. Although in close proximity, the windows would still receive adequate light and outlook and I am of the opinion that this would not result in an oppressive outlook from these windows.

- 8.13 The shared use of the passageway by both properties is not considered to be detrimental to the host dwelling which has its main entrance door and study window which face into the passage way. There would be a degree of coming and going from the occupier of the independent dwelling passing back and forth to access their property. This is not considered to result in a detrimental loss of privacy to the occupier of the dwelling at 29 Garden Walk. It is considered this would result in a similar situation to a property constructed on the back edge of the pavement with passers-by in close proximity to windows. In this instance, the future occupier would be aware of this and the pedestrian movements would be limited to the occupiers of the independent dwelling to the rear.
- 8.14 The bin store to serve the independent property is situated to the rear and bins would need to be wheeled to the front of the property on bin collection days past the front entrance to 29 Garden Walk. This has the potential to cause nuisance to the occupier of 29 Garden Walk. Bin collections comprise green and blue bins fortnightly alternating with a black bin fortnightly. So, there would be no more than two instances at a time per week of bins being wheeled through this shared space and this level is not considered to be detrimental to amenities of the occupier of 29 Garden Walk.
- 8.15 In my opinion the proposal would leave adequate private amenity space for the occupier of 29 Garden Walk, which would be similar in size to that proposed for the rear dwelling. I have recommended a condition to ensure that the subdivision of the site is carried out and retained in accordance with the plans to ensure that both properties have the benefit of sufficient outdoor amenity space.

8.16 I have also considered the proposal against the recently approved plans for No.29, and am satisfied that, if that scheme is implemented, it would not have a material impact upon the relationship between the existing and proposed dwellings.

Amenity of adjoining properties

8.17 The building is existing and currently there are first floor windows to all elevations of the existing building with most of these already obscurely glazed.

8.18 The adjoining gardens are situated at 6a, 6b and 12 Stretten Avenue to the rear and 27 and 31 Garden Walk to either side.

8.19 The proposed first floor bedroom windows would be obscurely glazed to a height of 1.5 metres above finished floor level with clear glass above this. At each gable end a high level slit window, 1.7 metres above finished floor level is proposed.

8.20 The windows to the side elevation on the boundary with 27 Garden Walk are to be infilled and given there would only be a high level window facing the rear elevation of this property, I am of the opinion that this property would not be detrimentally affected by the proposal.

8.21 The main outlook from the new separate dwelling would be facing the amenity space to the side with views across the adjoining garden at 31 Garden Walk. There is already potential for the garden of this property to be directly overlooked by an existing first floor window to a bedroom in the existing annexe.

8.22 Three windows are proposed at first floor level in the northern elevation which are proposed to be partially obscurely glazed. A condition would be imposed to ensure that the north facing windows are also restricted in their opening to 45 degrees to allow for ventilation but to prevent a loss of privacy through an open window. This would ensure that there is no detrimental loss of privacy through overlooking into the bottom section of the rear garden of 31 Garden Walk and towards the rear elevation and private amenity space to the rear of this property. The obscurely glazed restricted opening windows would also deflect views away from the rear gardens of the adjoining property at 12 Stretten Avenue.

- 8.23 The first floor window in the northern end facing the properties in Stretten Avenue would be fitted with obscure glass and non-openable and would be a high level slit window providing light only to the bedroom. There would be no views out of this window towards the adjoining properties in Stretten Avenue and as such a detrimental loss of privacy through overlooking should not arise.
- 8.24 The use of the building as a residential dwelling would introduce more activity at the bottom of the existing garden in close proximity to adjoining residential properties. The plans have been amended to alter previously proposed rear patio doors to windows and the main outdoor space for the property is to the north side rather than rear. However, there is nothing to stop the current occupier of 29 Garden Walk from constructing a terraced area to the far end of the garden in close proximity with neighbouring properties and using this area more intensively for outside recreation. As such I am satisfied that the residential use as garden in close proximity to neighbouring properties would not cause any undue disturbance.
- 8.25 The dwelling is situated within the conservation area and therefore permitted development rights would be restricted and there will be no permitted rights for extensions to the roof or to the side and front of the property. With respect to outbuildings, there would be restrictions on the construction of outbuildings to the front and side of the dwelling. To ensure that the amenities of neighbouring properties are protected in the future, I recommend that conditions are attached restricting the insertion of additional openings at first floor level and in the southern elevation of the dwelling.
- 8.26 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, 3/14 and 4/13

Refuse arrangements

- 8.27 Adequate arrangements for the storage of three bins for household waste for the existing dwelling and the new separate dwelling have been made and these comply with the RECAP Waste Management and Design Guide 2012.

Car and cycle parking

- 8.28 The Council has standards for car parking and cycle parking provision set out within appendices C and D to the Cambridge Local Plan (2006). Also relevant is the Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010), which gives guidance on the nature and layout of cycle parking, and other security measures, to be provided as a consequence of new residential development.
- 8.29 Covered cycle parking is proposed although the number of stands required has not been shown on the submitted plan. Two cycle spaces are required for the independent dwelling.
- 8.30 In my opinion, subject to the imposition of a condition requiring cycle spaces to be provided, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10.
- 8.31 With regard to car parking the existing dwelling has four bedrooms and in this location, outside the controlled parking area the parking standards require a maximum of two spaces. The existing parking to the front of the application site is limited in depth and does not appear to be suitable to meet this standard and the proposal does not include any car parking provision for the independent dwelling. However, the car parking standards are a maximum and the application site does not fall within a controlled parking area and is within a sustainable location in close proximity to the city centre and bus routes. As such I am of the opinion that there is no requirement to provide parking and in my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10.
- 8.32 I am of the opinion that the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/10 as it would not have a significantly adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties through loss of privacy, loss of light, an overbearing sense of enclosure and generation of unreasonable levels of traffic or noise nuisance, and that it would provide adequate space for the existing dwelling and the proposed dwelling. The proposal would not detract from the prevailing character and appearance of the area.

Third Party Representations

- 8.33 Objections have been raised that the proposed development would have an overbearing impact on neighbouring properties and would visually dominate neighbouring properties and overshadow them. It is considered that in this instance as the building already exists, that the visual impact of the building would not be materially different from the existing situation on site and that there would be no additional harm through the use of the building as a separate dwelling rather than an annexe.
- 8.34 The two storey detached building has been subject to planning applications in the past to use the building as an independent dwelling. These were refused on the grounds that the proposal would be detrimental to the amenities of surrounding residential properties by reason of overlooking and loss of privacy. This planning application has addressed the impact on neighbouring properties through overlooking and loss of privacy.
- 8.35 Neighbours have raised concern that there is the potential for future use such as AirBnB, student accommodation or a house of multiple occupancy. Planning permission would not be required for the use as a house of multiple occupancy for up to six occupants and given that there are only two bedrooms in the dwelling, it is considered that this should not result in harm to amenities of adjoining neighbours. Any future disturbance caused by the occupiers of the property would be dealt with by Environmental Health if a statutory nuisance.
- 8.36 With regard to the potential future use for AirBnB, there is no statutory guidance however it is considered by Officers that depending on the degree and frequency of usage, that planning permission may be required to use the dwelling for this purpose and that this would be assessed on its own merits.

9.0 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. No development shall commence until details of facilities for the covered, secure parking of two number bicycles for use in connection with the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The approved facilities shall be provided in accordance with the approved details before use of the development commences.

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

5. Before first occupation of the dwelling, hereby permitted, the first floor windows in the existing building shall be modified/removed to accord with the details shown on drawing number 17/994/08C. Where obscure glazing is specified, windows shall be obscure glazed to a minimum level of obscurity to conform to Pilkington Glass level 3 or equivalent and, in the case of the first floor north elevation windows, shall have restrictors to ensure that the windows cannot be opened more than 45 degrees beyond the plane of the adjacent wall. The windows shall be retained in accordance with these details thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/10 and 3/14).

6. Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Classes A and C 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 further windows or openings shall be inserted at or above first floor level in any elevation of the dwelling 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 3/14).

7. The curtilage (garden) of the proposed property as approved shall be fully laid out and finished in accordance with the approved plans prior to the occupation of the proposed dwelling or in accordance with a timetable otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter remain for the benefit of the occupants of the proposed property.

Reason: To avoid a scenario whereby the property could be built and occupied without its garden land, which is currently part of the host property (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies, 3/4, 3/7, 3/10)