

Application Number	18/0560/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	11th April 2018	Officer	Charlotte Burton
Target Date	6th June 2018		
Ward	Arbury		
Site	1 Redfern Close		
Proposal	Erection of 1 x 3bed detached dwelling, with associated access and landscaping, following the demolition of the existing garage of No.1 Redfern Close.		
Applicant	GU & SUN C/O Agent		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>The proposal would respond positively to the character of the area;</p> <p>The proposal would respect the amenity of neighbouring properties and provide a high quality living environment for the future occupants;</p> <p>The proposal complies with the Council's adopted maximum car parking standards and would not have a significant adverse impact on the local highway network.</p>
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site is situated on the north-west corner of a crossroads at the junction of Brimley Road with Redfern Close, Wynborne Close and Durnford Way. The existing dwelling is semi-detached with an attached single garage to the side and a conservatory to the rear.

- 1.2 Redfern Close is a cul-de-sac and comprises a mixture of pairs of semi-detached and detached dwellings. The site is not within a conservation area and the site falls outside the controlled parking zone. There are no other relevant site constraints.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposal is for the erection of a detached 3-bed dwelling (111sqm gross internal floor area), with associated access and landscaping, following the demolition of the existing garage of No.1 Redfern Close. The new dwelling would be separated from the existing dwelling by a gap of 1m.
- 2.2 The dwelling would have a pitched roof and would be similar in appearance to the existing dwelling. The materials would be brick and pantiles. There would be a porch on the front elevation and chimney stacks.
- 2.3 The dwelling would have a garden to the rear of the site. The existing brick wall at the front of the site, and brick wall and close boarded fence along Brimley Road would be retained. A new 1.8m high close boarded fence would be retained.
- 2.4 The existing vehicular access from Redfern Close would be widened to provide a car parking space for the new unit and the existing dwelling. Bin storage would be provided at the rear accessed via a gap of 1m between the dwelling and the site boundary.
- 2.5 During the course of the application, updated plans were submitted showing the location of recently removed trees on the site, the proposed boundary treatments and permeable paving, an updated internal layout, and a cycle store within the rear garden.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
17/1850/FUL	Two storey side and front extension and change of use to a 7 person HMO (House in Multiple Occupation).	Withdrawn

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 Local Plan 2006		3/1 3/4 3/7 3/10 3/11 3/12
		4/4 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 – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014 Circular 11/95 (Annex A) Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard – published by Department of Communities and Local Government March 2015 (material consideration)
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> Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (November 2010) Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2005) Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan (2011) Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)

5.4 Status of Proposed Submission – Cambridge Local Plan

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

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

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

- 6.1 The proposal should have no significant impact on the public highway, should it gain the benefit of planning permission, subject to the incorporation of the conditions and informatives for no unbound material, no gates to be erected, access construction, adequate drainage, visibility splays, and no obstruction.

Environmental Health

- 6.2 No objection subject to standard conditions and informatives to control construction/demolition hours, a dust informative and piling condition.

Urban Design Team

- 6.3 No objection.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

Initial comment

- 6.4 The three attractive birch trees in the corner of the frontage should be afforded every chance to be retained in the proposed application. No indication of existing landscape has been shown on the plans or identified for removal or retention. Please include a site plan which shows retained and removed landscape. A tree protection plan is needed to ensure protection for any retained trees.
- 6.5 Secure cycle storage needs to be included in the scheme. If the cycle store is to be in the rear garden, the side access is required to be increased to 1200mm minimum. A street light exists in the general vicinity of the driveway widening. This needs to be shown on the plans and relocating it may be required.

Comment on response from applicant and confirmation that trees have been removed

- 6.6 No objection

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Officer)

- 6.7 Part of the site is shown to be at risk of surface water flooding. An assessment of the surface water flood risk is required to ensure that the proposed development will not be at risk of surface water flooding and will not increase the flood risk elsewhere.

UK Power Networks

Initial response 24.04.2018

- 6.8 Objection. UK Power Networks is the owner/occupier of the electricity substation location within 6m of the proposed works. The appropriate protective measures and mitigation solutions should be agreed and a Party Wall Notice should be served*.

* Officer note: the Party Wall Notice is not a planning matter.

Response to additional information from the applicant 26.04.2018

- 6.9 Objection removed following confirmation of the distances between the proposed development and the UK Power Networks asset.
- 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 objecting to the proposal:

- ☐ 2 Redfern Close
- ☐ 3 Redfern Close
- ☐ 4 Redfern Close

- ☐ 5 Redfern Close
- ☐ 7 Redfern Close
- ☐ 8 Redfern Close
- ☐ 11 Redfern Close
- ☐ 14 Redfern Close
- ☐ 23 Redfern Close
- ☐ 88 Coleridge Road
- ☐ The Bike Depot, 140 Cowley Road (Camcycle)
- ☐ 39 Durnford Way
- ☐ 1 Eden Street
- ☐ 6 Montgomery Road
- ☐ 18 Montgomery Road
- ☐ 1 Wynborne Close
- ☐ 5 Wynborne Close
- ☐ 6 Wynborne Close
- ☐ 77 High Street, Longstanton

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Character

- ☐ Not in keeping with how houses have been modernised in Redfern Close
- ☐ Will set precedent for similar development in the area
- ☐ Control over further extensions to the properties
- ☐ Degradation of garden space
- ☐ Removal of trees of high amenity value has already occurred
- ☐ No replacement trees proposed.
- ☐ Existing dwelling should be modernised but not with a new dwelling

Residential amenity

- ☐ Loss of privacy and overlooking neighbouring properties
- ☐ Loss of light to bedroom windows and loss of privacy affecting No. 2 Redfern Close
- ☐ Removal of utility room for host dwelling will increase noise on No. 3 Redfern Close.

Parking and highway safety

- ☐ Insufficient car parking
- ☐ Transport assessment is required
- ☐ The proposed increase in density is too great

- ☐ Parking, access and highway safety concerns resulting from additional on-street parking
- ☐ Redfern Close is too narrow to allow on street parking opposite a driveway, and manoeuvring around the corner from Brimley Road if there is a car trying to exit Redfern Close is already difficult
- ☐ Would make entering and leaving neighbouring properties including No. 2 Redfern Close dangerous or impossible
- ☐ Impact of additional parked cars on children cycling around the corner due to decreased visibility.
- ☐ Development gain money should be used to add double yellow lines to prevent blocking neighbouring driveways
- ☐ Likely to be occupied as a house in multiple occupation (HMO) as evidenced by previous application, which would attract more vehicles.
- ☐ Likely to be a transient renting population across the two properties
- ☐ Occupant should be discouraged from owning more than one car
- ☐ The owners would not control how many cars are parked there.
- ☐ Heavy congestion
- ☐ More ugly street verge parking.

Other

- ☐ No affordable housing
- ☐ Inadequate cycle parking which provides no alternative to car ownership
- ☐ Additional strain on the local water and sewage
- ☐ Impact on local water pressure
- ☐ Loss of street lamp will impact on safety
- ☐ Safety of building so close to the electricity substation
- ☐ Applicant does not live locally and has failed to engage with local residents

7.3 Councillor Sheil has requested that the application is called in to the planning committee unless officers are minded to refuse the application. No grounds for the call in have been provided. However, the application is automatically referred under the Scheme of Delegation as objections have been received.

- 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
3. Residential amenity
4. Refuse arrangements
5. Car and cycle parking
6. Highway safety
7. Surface water drainage
8. Third party representations

Principle of Development

- 8.2 Policy 5/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) states that proposals for housing development on windfall sites will be permitted subject to the existing land use and compatibility with adjoining land uses. The site is within an existing residential area and therefore the proposal for an additional unit is compatible with this.
- 8.3 The site forms part of the curtilage of No. 1 Redfern Close and therefore policy 3/10 for the sub-division of existing plots applies. This supports residential development within the garden area or curtilage of existing properties unless it will:
- a. Have a significant adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties through loss of privacy, loss of light, an overbearing sense of enclosure and the generation of unreasonable levels of traffic or noise disturbance;
 - b. provide inadequate amenity space, or vehicular access arrangements and parking spaces for the proposed and existing properties;

- c. detract from the prevailing character and appearance of the area;
- d. adversely affect the setting of Listed Buildings, or buildings or gardens of local interest within or close to the site;
- e. adversely affect trees, wildlife features or architectural features of local importance located within or close to the site; and
- f. prejudice the comprehensive development of the wider area of which the site forms part.

8.4 For the reasons given below, I consider that the proposal has an acceptable impact on neighbouring properties, provides a good level of amenity for the future occupants, is appropriate to the character of the area, and complies with policy 3/10.

8.5 Thus the principle of development is acceptable in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 5/1 and 3/10.

Context of site, design and external spaces

8.6 The existing dwelling is a semi-detached two storey property constructed in red brick with pantiles. There is a relative consistency of design along Redfern Close and within the wider estate, however some properties have been extended and altered, and there is some variation in form, such as the bungalow at No. 2 Redfern Close opposite the site. The proposed dwelling has been designed to fit in with No. 1. The new dwelling would be on the same building line as No. 1, continuing the same pattern of driveways and front gardens along Redfern Close. The eaves and ridge height would be consistent with No. 1. The elevation would have a similar arrangement and proportion of windows, front door and porch. The materials would match the host property and I have recommended a condition to secure this. In my opinion, this is an appropriate design response which would fit in with the streetscene and the character of the area.

8.7 The proposed dwelling's position within the garden of a spacious corner plot would result in the loss of openness on this corner. These spacious corner plots are common within the area, such as Montgomery Road and Brimley Road. However, I do not consider that the loss of this openness would be harmful to the street scene. There is enough variety of building lines

within the area so that the spacious corner plots do not define the character of the area. Moreover, since the scale and design of the property would be in-keeping with the other properties along Redfern Close and the wider area, I do not consider it would be unduly prominent. The side elevation would be set off the boundary by 1m and behind the existing boundary treatment along Brimley Road which would be retained. The existing street trees along Brimley Road would soften the appearance of the building.

8.8 Third parties have raised concerns about trees that have recently been removed on the site following the withdrawal of the previous application. The applicant has updated the site plan to show the location of those trees that were removed, including birch trees at the front of the site and others along the Brimley Road side of the site. These trees were not protected and therefore the Council had no control over their removal or recourse to require their replacement. The proposed site plan shows planting within the front garden and at the rear of the site which would provide a garden setting for the new dwelling appropriate to the character of the area. There are two mature street trees and a recently planted specimen on the Brimley Road verge. In my opinion, these street trees would soften the visual appearance of the proposed dwelling. The landscape officer has no objection to the proposal.

8.9 For these reasons, in my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/10, 3/11, 4/4 and 3/12.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

8.10 I have assessed the impact on the host dwelling (No. 1 Redfern Close), the bungalow opposite (No. 2 Redfern Close) and the property to the rear (No. 2 Montgomery Road) and the wider area in the sections below.

. No. 1 Redfern Close

8.11 This is a 3-bed property within a large corner plot. The proposed dwelling would occupy the side garden, however the property would retain a good sized garden to the rear which

would be a similar size to other properties along Redfern Close. This would provide a good level of amenity.

- 8.12 The two storey element of the proposed building would be on the same building line and of a similar scale to No. 1. The single storey rear element would project 3m from the rear elevation along the new boundary to be created with the host dwelling. The eaves of the single storey element would be 2.5m high and the highest part of the sloped roof would be 3.3m. This would not have a significant impact on the ground floor kitchen and dining room windows of No. 1 or this property's amenity space.
- 8.13 There are no windows on the existing side elevation that would be affected. The property would retain a parking space in front of the dwelling and a 1m wide gap between the existing dwelling and the new boundary would provide access to the rear. While this passageway is less than 1.1m wide for bin and bike access, there would be space for the occupants to store these within the front garden if they wish to.

. No. 2 Redfern Close

- 8.14 This is a detached bungalow on the opposite side of Redfern Close to the application site. The bungalow has a driveway at the front. I understand from the objection submitted by the owner/occupant that there is a bedroom window on the front elevation and concerns have been raised that the proposal would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy and loss of light. The proposed dwelling would introduce new windows facing towards No. 2. This includes on the first floor one large bedroom window and two smaller windows serving a bathroom which is not a habitable room. The distance between the proposed front elevation to the front elevation of No. 2 would be approximately 26m. While I appreciate that the windows on the proposed dwelling would have more direct views towards No. 2 than the existing windows on No. 1 which are more oblique, in my opinion the separation distance is similar to the relationship between other properties on opposite sides of Redfern Close and would not result in an unacceptable loss of privacy. This property has private amenity space to the rear so views from the proposed first floor windows would not have a significant impact on residential amenity. The proposed dwelling would be to the east of No. 2 and due to the separation distance would

not have a significant impact in terms of loss of light. In this regard, again the impact is similar to other properties along Redfern Close.

. No. 2 Montgomery Road

- 8.15 This is a two storey semi-detached property fronting Montgomery Road with a side and rear garden which backs on the garden of No. 1 Redfern Close, albeit with the electricity substation in between. The proposed dwelling would introduce new first floor windows facing towards No. 2 and its rear garden, however the relationship would be similar to the existing situation. The distance between the proposed first floor windows and the garden of No. 2 would be approximately 18m. I am satisfied the proposal would not have a significant impact on the amenity of the occupants of this property.

. Wider area

- 8.16 I am not concerned about the impact on No. 42 Brimley Road to the west due to the separation distance of over 21m between the side elevation of the proposal and the front elevation of the dwelling. The area at the front of this property does not provide private amenity space. The proposed drawings show the first floor windows on the side elevation would be obscured.
- 8.17 The Environmental Health team has recommended conditions and informatives to control construction and demolition hours, piling and dust in order to protect the amenity of residents within the wider area. These conditions are necessary and reasonable in my opinion.
- 8.18 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, 3/7 and 3/10.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

- 8.19 The floor space of the proposed unit would be 111sqm. This significantly exceeds the 87sqm standard for a 3-bed (4 person) dwelling within the 'Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard' published by Department of

Communities and Local Government (March 2015) (THS) which is a material consideration. Using the THS as guidance, I am satisfied that the proposal would provide a good quality living environment. The unit would have a good-sized garden which would provide amenity space that is a similar size to other units along Redfern Close and appropriate for the size of the unit and the level of amenity that the future occupants moving into this area would expect.

- 8.20 The revised site plan shows bin and bike storage within the rear garden. The access from the front of the site along the side of the property to the rear garden would be 1m wide which is too narrow to comply with the Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010). However, a side gate would provide access from the footpath on Brimley Road, which would be a more convenient arrangement.
- 8.21 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

- 8.22 As above, bins would be stored within the rear garden in a convenient location. Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012). In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12 in this regard.

Car and Cycle Parking

- . Car parking

- 8.23 The garage to the existing dwelling would be lost, however the host dwelling would retain one car parking space on the driveway in front of the property. The new dwelling would also have one car parking space. This is in accordance with the Council's adopted maximum car parking standards and complies with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/10.

8.24 Third parties have raised concerns about the proposed car parking levels and the impact of additional demand for on-street parking. In my opinion, there would be no sound policy basis on which to recommend refusal of the application on parking grounds. The proposal provides off-street parking for both units. The Highways Authority has raised no concerns about additional demand for on-street car parking spaces impacting on highway safety.

. Cycle parking

8.25 As above, updated plans show a cycle store within the rear garden which would provide space to park two cycles in accordance with the Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010). The store would be accessible from the street via a side gate onto Brimley Road. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/6.

Highway Safety

8.26 Third parties have raised strong concerns about parking, access and highway safety resulting from additional demand for on-street parking and increased traffic congestion. As explained above, the proposed car parking levels comply with the Council's adopted maximum car parking standards. The Highways Authority has not advised me that there would be reasonable grounds on which the proposed parking arrangements or additional traffic generated would have a significant impact on highway safety. I accept their advice. I have addressed the specific concerns of residents on this matter in the section below. Visibility splays would be provided within the site for the widened vehicle access. The Highways Authority has recommended conditions to secure acceptable arrangements for the access. Subject to these conditions, in my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Surface Water Drainage

8.27 The Sustainable Drainage Engineer has advised that part of the site is shown to be at risk of surface water flooding. An assessment of the surface water flood risk is required to ensure that the proposed development will not be at risk of surface

water flooding and will not increase the flood risk elsewhere. I am satisfied that this can be resolved through conditions due to the large permeable areas within the site which provide sustainable drainage options.

Third Party Representations

8.28 I have addressed the third party representations as follows:

Representation	Response
<u>Character</u>	
Not in keeping with how houses have been modernised in Redfern Close	I have provided my reasons in my assessment why in my opinion the proposal is in-keeping with the character of the area.
Will set precedent for similar development in the area	Proposals for similar developments within the area – should these come forward – would be assessed on their own merits.
Control over further extensions to the properties	The proposed dwelling would be in a relatively prominent position particularly in views towards the rear along Brimley Road. In my opinion, the proposal is acceptable because it has been sensitively designed to complement the existing street scene. I agree that later extensions and alterations – particularly to the roof form – could increase the scale and bulk of the building, making it more prominent within the street scene. I have therefore recommended conditions to remove permitted development rights for roof extensions and other extensions, which in my opinion are necessary and reasonable.

Degradation of garden space	I have provided my reasons in my assessment above why I consider that the loss of the side garden is acceptable.
Removal of trees of high amenity value has already occurred	These trees were not protected and the Council had not control over their removal. For the reason given in my assessment, the proposal is acceptable without replacement planting, due partly to the presence of street trees which provide greenery along Brimley Road. The landscape officer has not objected.
No replacement trees proposed.	
Existing dwelling should be modernised but not with a new dwelling	The application has to be assessed on the basis of the proposal submitted and not an alternative scheme.
<u>Residential amenity</u>	
Loss of privacy and overlooking neighbouring properties	See relevant section of assessment.
Loss of light to bedroom windows and loss of privacy affecting No. 2 Redfern Close	See relevant section of assessment.
Removal of utility room for host dwelling will increase noise on No. 3 Redfern Close.	I have no information on the relocation of the existing utility room within No. 1. Nonetheless, the potentially noise generating facilities within a utility room – presumably washing machines and the like – are domestic in nature and would not have an unacceptable impact.
<u>Parking and highway safety</u>	
Insufficient car parking	I have explained in my assessment that the proposal meets the Council's adopted maximum car parking standards and that in my
The proposed increase in density is too great	
Parking, access and highway safety concerns resulting from	

additional on-street parking	<p>opinion there are no reasonable grounds on which to recommend the proposed car parking would be unacceptable. The Highways Authority has not raised concerns that the proposal would have a significant impact on highway safety.</p>
Redfern Close is too narrow to allow on street parking opposite a driveway, and manoeuvring around the corner from Brimley Road if there is a car trying to exit Redfern Close is already difficult	
Would make entering and leaving neighbouring properties including No. 2 Redfern Close dangerous or impossible	
Impact of additional parked cars on children cycling around the corner due to decreased visibility.	
Heavy congestion	<p>Transport assessments are not normally required for proposals for single dwellings. The Highways Authority has not recommended one is necessary.</p>
Transport assessment is required	
Development gain money should be used to add double yellow lines to prevent blocking neighbouring driveways	<p>The Highways Authority has not requested planning obligations to mitigate the impact of the development, so this would not be sought.</p>
Likely to be occupied as a house in multiple occupation (HMO) as evidenced by previous application, which would attract more vehicles.	<p>Dwellings can be occupied as HMOs for up to 6 people under permitted development without the need for planning permission. In my opinion, I have no reasonable grounds to recommend that this permitted development right should be removed for the proposed unit, as I have no evidence that an HMO would have an unacceptable impact on residential amenity or highway safety.</p>

Likely to be a transient renting population across the two properties	The Council has no control over whether the properties are owner-occupied or rented. Nonetheless, the assessment of the impact is the same for both scenarios. I have no evidence that the occupation by renters would have a significant impact on the local highway network compared to owner-occupation.
Occupant should be discouraged from owning more than one car	The Council has no mechanism to discourage the future occupants from owning multiple cars, much like it does not have any powers to restrict any of the existing occupants of Redfern Close from purchasing cars. The existing competition for on-street parking would serve to discourage future occupants who rely on more than one vehicle from choosing to move into the units.
The owners would not control how many cars are parked there.	
More ugly street verge parking.	I have no reasonable grounds on which to take the view that the current proposal would result in significant levels of on-verge parking.
<u>Other</u>	
No affordable housing	The proposal for a single dwelling would not trigger the requirement to provide affordable housing under Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 5/5, which sets a threshold of 15 units or more, or sites of 0.5 hectares or more.
Inadequate cycle parking which provides no alternative to car ownership	Updated plans submitted during the course of the application show a cycle store in the rear garden of the

	proposed unit which meets the Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Development (2010).
Additional strain on the local water and sewage	The recommended surface water drainage condition would ensure that surface water is suitably drained. Connection into the sewerage network would require consent from Anglian Water.
Impact on local water pressure	This is a civil matter and not a planning matter.
Loss of street lamp will impact on safety	Consent would be required from the Highways Authority for the removal of the street lamp and the impact on safety would be a consideration in determining whether this is acceptable or requires relocation of the street lamp.
Safety of building so close to the electricity substation	UK Power Networks who own/occupy the substation have advised that the proposal is acceptable due to the distance between the proposed dwelling and the substation. The Environmental Health team has raised no concerns about the substation for the future occupants.
Applicant does not live locally and has failed to engage with local residents	The abode of the applicant is not a relevant planning matter, however it is regrettable that the local residents feel that the applicant has failed to engage with them as this is encouraged in the National Planning Policy Framework.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 In summary, I acknowledge the strong local opposition to this proposal primarily based on parking and highway safety

concerns. However the proposed car parking complies with the Council's adopted maximum car parking standards and the Highways Authority has advised me that there would be no highway safety grounds on which to recommend refusal. I accept this advice. In my opinion, the proposal would make good use of the site to provide an additional dwelling with a good level of residential amenity for the future occupants. The proposal complies with the adopted development plan and - in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development at the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) - the officer recommendation is for approval subject to 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. 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. 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)

5. Prior to commencement of the development hereby permitted (other than demolition), a surface water drainage scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This 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, 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 (National Planning Policy Framework 2012).

6. Prior to the commencement of use of the widened access hereby approved, the vehicular access where it crosses the public highway shall be laid out and constructed in accordance with the Cambridgeshire County Council construction specification. The access and parking areas shall be constructed with adequate drainage measures to prevent surface water run-off onto the adjacent public highway. No unbound material shall be used in the surface finish of the driveway within 6 metres of the highway boundary of the site. Thereafter, the access and parking areas shall be retained in accordance with the approved plans and free of obstruction.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2).

7. Prior to the commencement of use of the widened vehicle access hereby approved, two 2.0 x 2.0 metre visibility splays shall be provided as shown on the approved drawings. Thereafter this area shall be retained and kept clear of all planting, fencing, walls and the like exceeding 600mm high.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2).

8. Notwithstanding the provision of Class A of Schedule 2, Part 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, (or any order revoking, amending or re-enacting that order) no gates shall be erected across the approved vehicular access unless details have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2).

9. 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 character of the area (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/12).

10. 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 character of the area (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/12).

11. The materials used in the construction of the external elevations of the dwelling hereby permitted shall match those used on the original dwelling at No. 1 Redfern Close in terms of the type, colour and texture.

Reason: To ensure the proposal responds to the context (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/12).

12. Prior to the first occupation of the dwelling hereby permitted, the curtilage (garden) of the dwelling shall be fully laid out in accordance with the approved plans. This shall include the erection of curtilage boundaries in accordance with the approved plans. Thereafter the curtilage shall remain for the benefit of the occupants of the proposed property and the boundaries shall be retained.

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, 3/11 and 3/10).

HIGHWAYS INFORMATIVE: This development involves work to the public highway that will require the approval of the County Council as Highway Authority. It is an OFFENCE to carry out any works within the public highway, which includes a public right of way, without the permission of the Highway Authority. Please note that it is the applicant's responsibility to ensure that, in addition to planning permission, any necessary consents or approvals under the Highways Act 1980 and the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 are also obtained from the County Council.

No part of any structure may overhang or encroach under or upon the public highway unless licensed by the Highway Authority and no gate / door / ground floor window shall open outwards over the public highway.

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

DUST INFORMATIVE: As the proposal involves demolition of a garage, the applicant should have regard to:

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

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

- Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction

http://iaqm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/guidance/iaqm_guidance_report_draft1.4.pdf

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

http://www.iaqm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/guidance/monitoring_construction_sites_2012.pdf

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

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

