

Application Number	18/0618/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	20th April 2018	Officer	Charlotte Burton
Target Date	15th June 2018		
Ward	Cherry Hinton		
Site	Land Adjacent To 22 Mill End Close		
Proposal	Proposed development of a pair of semi-detached dwellings: 1no. one bed and 1no. two bed, with associated landscaping, parking, bin and cycle storage.		
Applicant	Mr Franklin c/o PiP Architecture		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>The proposal would provide an additional two units within an established residential area;</p> <p>The proposal would have an acceptable impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties;</p> <p>The proposed design respects the character of the area.</p>
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The site is land adjacent to No. 22 Mill End Road which is an area of vacant land currently fenced off from the curtilage of No. 22.
- 1.2 The site is located at the end of a cul-de-sac which is characterised by semi-detached residential properties.

1.3 To the north are the residential properties along Wedgewood drive. To the west is a detached bungalow in a back-land position accessed from Mill End Road.

1.4 The site is not within a conservation area and is outside the controlled parking zone. There are no relevant site constraints.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

2.1 The proposal is for a pair of semi-detached dwellings comprising one 1-bed unit and one 2-bed unit, with associated landscaping, parking, bin and cycle storage.

2.2 The building would be two storey with single storey rear elements and would be constructed in brick and render with a plain tile hipped roof and green flat roof elements.

2.3 The units would be accessed via a shared driveway which would provide car parking spaces for each of the units. Separate bin and bike stores would be provided.

2.4 The units would have private gardens to the rear.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

3.1 The relevant site history comprises:

Reference	Description	Outcome
17/1857/FUL	Construction of a pair of semi-detached, two storey dwellings with associated landscaping, parking and bin & cycle storage.	Withdrawn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 3/3 3/4 3/7 3/10 3/11 3/12
		4/13
		5/1
		8/2 8/6 8/10
		10/1

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

Central Government 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 No objection.

Environmental Health

- 6.2 No objection subject to standard conditions to control construction hours and piling.

Urban Design and Conservation Team

- 6.3 No objection. The building reads as a suburban house and appears less bulky than previous proposals. The living areas of the dwellings have direct access to amenity space, in what appears as an 'extension' to the main house which is acceptable in design terms. The cycle stores appear to be too small and do not meet the Council's Cycle Parking for New Residential Developments, however there is sufficient amenity space to meet this guidance - this should be updated.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

- 6.4 No objection. Driveway and parking bay areas should be constructed with permeable paving and recommend that this is clarified prior to determination in order to avoid the use of a hard landscape condition. All soft landscape proposals are acceptable. Recommend standard condition for boundary treatments.

Waste and Recycling Team

- 6.5 No comment received.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Officer)

- 6.6 No comment received.
- 6.7 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:

- ☐ 20 Mill End Close
- ☐ 21 Mill End Close
- ☐ 31 Wedgewood Drive
- ☐ 32 Wedgewood Drive
- ☐ The Bike Depot, 140 Cowley Road (Camcycle)

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- ☐ Angle of building would be out of character
- ☐ Proposal for 1 and 2-bed properties would be out of character with the area where all houses have at least three bedrooms.
- ☐ Overdevelopment and disproportionate to the site which is out of character
- ☐ The site is more suited to a single storey building.
- ☐ Overbearing impact on garden of 20 Mill End Close
- ☐ Overlooking rear garden of 31 Wedgewood Drive, block out light and encroachment.
- ☐ Blocking sunlight to side windows on ground and first floor of 32 Wedgewood Drive
- ☐ Noise and disturbance from two new properties
- ☐ General feeling of being crowded in
- ☐ Lowering value of neighbouring properties.
- ☐ Unable to independently access two parked bicycles
- ☐ Inadequate access to cycle parking blocked by parked cars
- ☐ Two car parking spaces for plot 2 exceeds Council's adopted standards
- ☐ Poor cycle parking provision and excess car parking provision will lead to an unacceptable transport impact
- ☐ Increased traffic and pressure on car parking with impact on pavement users and safety. Parking controls on Mill End Close would be welcome.
- ☐ Impact of contractor's vehicles on access

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. Car and cycle parking
5. Refuse arrangements
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) supports residential development on windfall sites, subject to the existing land use and compatibility with adjoining uses. The site is already in residential use and is situated within an established residential area, and therefore I consider that additional dwelling units on this site could be supported.

8.3 The site is fenced off from No. 22 however is considered to have formerly formed part of the curtilage. I have therefore reasonably applied policy 3/10 for the sub-division of existing plots. 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.

Context of site, design and external spaces

- 8.5 Mill End Close is a cul-de-sac characterised by semi-detached properties with hipped roofs. The palette of materials is predominantly red brick on the ground floor and brickwork quoining, with render on the upper floors and plain tiles. The properties are set back from the road on a consistent building line with driveways and front gardens. The end of the cul-de-sac is occupied by a semi-detached pair (including No. 22) which have been extended on both ends. To the north is later residential development on Wedgewood Drive and to the west is a detached bungalow.
- 8.6 The proposed semi-detached units have been designed to have the appearance of a detached dwelling. There would be a single entrance on the front elevation to Plot 1 and the entrance to Plot 2 on the side (east) elevation. There would be a single shared driveway. While the cul-de-sac is characterised by semi-detached properties, in my opinion this approach would not be out of keeping with the character of the area. The proposed building would occupy a corner plot with a narrower street frontage than the traditional semi-detached pairs, which – in visual terms - would be more appropriate for a single dwelling. The proposed building would have the appearance of this and hence would not over-crowd the street scene. In addition, the building would be set back from the road by approximately 12m and behind the building line of the neighbouring properties, so that it would not dominate the corner of the cul-de-sac.

- 8.7 The building has been designed to reflect the character of the neighbouring dwelling, with brickwork and render on the front elevation, brick quoining, a brickwork porch on the front elevation similar to neighbouring properties, a plain tile hipped roof and central chimney stack. The side elevations would be buff brick similar to the neighbouring properties, including No. 20. The single storey elements would be in buff brick with a flat roof, which would have the appearance of a contemporary extension. The Urban Design team supports the proposal and in my opinion, the proposal is a sensitive and creative design which responds positively to its context. I have recommended a condition for brick samples to be submitted for approval to ensure a high quality design.
- 8.8 In terms of landscaping, the space in front of the building would be used for a shared driveway and parking, which would be similar to other properties within the cul-de-sac. This area would be block paved and the landscape officer has requested that this should be permeable paving. Planters have been placed against the front elevation and against the eastern boundary with No. 20. However, in my opinion the large areas of hard surfacing could lead to levels of car parking that exceed the adopted car parking standards (see below) which would be visually dominant within the street scene. Further soft landscaping at the front of the site would break up the hard surfaced area and soften the appearance of the site, which would be more appropriate to the character of other properties within the cul-de-sac. As such, I have recommended a condition for a hard and soft landscaping scheme to be submitted, which would also secure details of the permeable paving. The landscape officer has recommended a condition for details of boundaries to be submitted, however I am satisfied that the information on the proposed plans is sufficient. The plans show the existing fences along the eastern, northern and western boundaries would be retained, as well as the boundary with the garden of No. 22. The fence along the boundary with No. 22 at the front of the site would be lowered to 1.1m.
- 8.9 Subject to the recommended conditions, in my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/10, 3/11 and 3/12 and the guidance on good design within the NPPF.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.10 The neighbouring properties are Nos. 20 and 22 Mill End Close, No. 32 Wedgewood Drive and N. 52 Mill End Road. I have assessed the impact on these properties and the wider residential area below. I am not concerned about the impact on any other properties.

☐ No. 22 Mill End Close

- 8.11 This is a semi-detached two storey property that has a two storey side extension and single storey lean-to elements on the northern elevation. There are no windows on the side elevation facing towards the application site. The proposed two storey element would be set away from No. 22 and would not cut the 45 degree line taken from the centre of the first floor window on the front elevation. The rear elements of the proposal would be single storey. I am satisfied that the proposal would not have a significant enclosing, overbearing or loss of light impact on No. 22. The first floor windows on the rear elevation of the proposal would be angled towards the garden of the neighbouring property but would serve a landing and corridor into the bedroom, and would not have a significant adverse impact in terms of actual or perceived overlooking. The property would retain a good size area of amenity space within the rear garden.

☐ No. 20 Mill End Close

- 8.12 This is a semi-detached property to the east of the application site, which has a two storey side extension and a rear garden. There are ground and first floor windows on the rear elevation serving a kitchen and bedroom. I have visited this property. The two storey element of the proposal would be orientated at an angle to the shared boundary so that the distance between the two storey side elevation and the rear garden of No. 22 would be between 4-6m. The two storey element would project approximately 5m from the rear elevation of No. 20 which is approximately half the length of the garden, and would angle away from the garden. In my opinion, this relieves the sense of enclosure and overbearing on the neighbouring garden such that it would not have a significant adverse impact on residential amenity. I am not concerned about the impact of the single

storey element. The building would be to the east of No. 20 and would not result in significant overshadowing or loss of light. In terms of overlooking, there would be two first floor windows on the side elevation – one serving a landing and one serving a corridor window into the bedroom. During the course of the application, the plans were amended to reduce the size of the landing window in order to minimise the actual and perceived overlooking, such that this would not harm the residential amenity of No. 22. I am not concerned about the impact of the proposal on the windows on the front elevation as the proposed building would be set back into the site to the north of these windows, and the window on the side elevation is obscure glazed.

□ No. 32 Wedgewood Drive

- 8.13 This is a two storey semi-detached property to the north of the application site. The front elevation faces eastwards and the property has a rear garden. There are small ground and first floor windows on the side elevation facing towards the application site, which appear to be obscure glazed. The two storey element of the proposal would be between 5.5-7m from the side elevation. The 3.1m high single storey element would be 2m from the side elevation. I appreciate that there would be some visual enclosure on these windows, however I do not consider this would have a significant adverse impact on residential amenity. There is currently a single storey outbuilding on the boundary to the south of these windows which has some degree of enclosure on the ground floor window. The proposed dwelling would be to the south of the windows. However, due to the separation distance, in my opinion this would not result in a significant loss of light or overshadowing. The proposal is likely to overshadow part of the rear garden, however as the two storey element is at least 7m from the garden boundary, this is unlikely to have a significant impact.

□ No. 52 Mill End Road

- 8.14 This is a detached bungalow to the east of the application site with gardens that wrap around the property. The two storey element of the proposal would be at least 13m from the boundary and I am not concerned about the single storey rear elements of the proposal. The first floor windows on the rear

elevation of the proposed building facing towards this property would not serve habitable spaces. I have visited this property and the area between the dwelling and the boundary is not used as a principle area of the garden for residential amenity. There are no windows serving habitable rooms on the eastern elevation of the bungalow facing towards the application site. For these reasons, I am not concerned about overlooking from the proposal towards this property or enclosure having a significant adverse impact on residential amenity

☐ Wider area

- 8.15 The Environmental Health team has recommended a condition to control construction hours and piling, which I accept is necessary and reasonable in order to protect the amenity of the wider residential area. I am not concerned about noise and disturbance from the occupation of the proposed two units as this would be a residential use within a residential area. I accept that there would be an increased intensity of use on the site, but this would not be unreasonable.
- 8.16 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, 3/10 and 3/12.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

- 8.17 The floor spaces of the proposed units are provided in the table below. The Council has no adopted space standards, however the 'Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard' published by Department of Communities and Local Government March 2015 (THS) are a material consideration for assessing the quality of the living accommodation. The proposed units would significantly exceed the THS and would provide a high quality living environment for the future occupants. The units would have private amenity space which would provide a good level of residential amenity.

Unit	Beds (persons)	Floor space (sqm)	THS (sqm)
Plot 1	1-bed (2p)	72	58
Plot 2	2-bed (4p)	88	79

- 8.18 The planter in front of the ground floor bedroom window to Plot 2 provides a buffer to protect the privacy of the occupants from overlooking from the shared driveway. This would be secured through the proposed landscaping condition. The arrangements for bin and bike storage are unsatisfactory as described in more detail below, however I am satisfied that alternative arrangements can be agreed as part of the landscaping condition.
- 8.19 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, 3/10 and 3/12.

Car and Cycle Parking

☐ Car parking

- 8.20 The proposed plans show three car parking spaces. This exceeds the Council's adopted maximum car parking standards which seek to promote sustainable transport modes. I have recommended that a revised hard and soft landscaping scheme is required in order to reduce the areas of hard landscaping which would soften the appearance of the site and ensure that it is not dominated by car parking. This would reduce the space available for car parking to levels that comply with the standards. Subject to this, in my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/10.

☐ Cycle parking

- 8.21 The proposal includes individual stores for each of the units, showing two spaces per unit. The store for Plot 1 is shown attached to the southern elevation of the building, and the store for Plot 2 would be adjacent to the northern boundary. These stores are inadequate in my opinion and fail to provide a convenient facility. The store doors open outwards and provide no space to stand in front of the store holding a bike. I am satisfied that there is enough space within the plots for alternative facilities to be provided in accordance with the Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010). For example, a store within the rear garden of Plot 1 or within the area shown as a second car parking space for Plot 2. These

details would be secured through the condition I have recommended for a hard and soft landscaping scheme. Subject to this, in my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/6.

Refuse Arrangements

- 8.22 Bin stores would be provided for each of the units which meet the Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012). Notwithstanding this, as the proposed bin stores have been integrated in to the cycle stores, the applicant may wish to relocate these together. As such, I have allowed details of the bin stores to be submitted under the recommended hard and soft landscaping condition. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

Highway Safety

- 8.23 Vehicle access would be provided via a shared entrance driveway from the cul-de-sac. The Highways Authority has raised no concerns on highway safety grounds to the access arrangements or the impact on the public highway. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Surface Water Drainage

- 8.24 I received no comments from the Sustainable Drainage Engineer on the current application. However, comments on the previously withdrawn application requested evidence that the proposed development can be drained in principle, including a desktop study investigating the percolation ability of the site geology and an agreement in principle from Anglian Water to discharge to the public surface water sewer. This information has not been submitted with the current application. However, in my opinion, it is likely that a surface water drainage scheme can be agreed through conditions, as the proposed site plan includes hard and soft landscaping areas which could be permeable. I have recommended a condition for a surface water drainage scheme.

Third Party Representations

8.25 I have addressed the third party representations as follows:

Representation	Response
Angle of building would be out of character	See context assessment above. The proposed building has been orientated to address the street and 'turn the corner' at the end of the cul-de-sac. It would front onto the street in a similar way to neighbouring properties.
Proposal for 1 and 2-bed properties would be out of character with the area where all houses have at least three bedrooms.	I do not agree that the number of bedrooms would harm the character with the area. The building would have the appearance of a single larger dwelling which would be in keeping with the character of the street scene. The smaller units would add to the mix of dwellings within the area.
Overdevelopment and disproportionate to the site which is out of character	See context assessment above. In my opinion the appearance as a single dwelling ensures the proposed units would not have a cramped appearance. I am satisfied that the landscaping can be enhanced with an alternative scheme to be agreed through conditions.
The site is more suited to a single storey building.	I have to assess the proposal that has been submitted. For the reasons given in my report, I consider the two storey semi-detached pair would be acceptable.
Overbearing impact on garden of 20 Mill End Close	I have assessed this in my report.
Overlooking rear garden of 31	I have assessed the impact

Wedgewood Drive, block out light and encroachment.	on No. 31 in my report and I do not consider that the proposal would have a significant impact on No. 31
Blocking sunlight to side windows on ground and first floor of 32 Wedgewood Drive	I have assessed this in my report.
Noise and disturbance from two new properties	I have assessed this in my report.
General feeling of being crowded in.	For the reasons I have previously given, in my opinion the proposal would not have an unacceptable enclosing impact on neighbouring properties and would not appear as a cramped form of development. I consider this to be acceptable.
Lowering value of neighbouring properties.	This is not a planning matter.
Unable to independently access two parked bicycles	I agree that the proposed cycle stores are inadequate and I have recommended that the landscaping condition includes alternative details to be provided for the cycle store.
Inadequate access to cycle parking blocked by parked cars	As above.
Two car parking spaces for plot 2 exceeds Council's adopted standards	The proposed car parking levels exceed the standards. However, an alternative landscaping scheme to reduce the areas of hard landscaping would reduce the area available for parking.
Poor cycle parking provision and excess car parking provision will lead to an unacceptable transport impact	This is addressed in my comments above.
Increased traffic and pressure on car parking with impact on	The Highways Authority has not advised of highway safety

pavement users and safety. Parking controls on Mill End Close would be welcome.	concerns. The level of trips generated from the proposed dwelling would be similar to the other properties within Mill End Close and would not have a significant impact on the public highway network or on-street car parking.
Impact of contractor's vehicles on access	This impact would be temporary. The Highways Authority has not recommended that a construction traffic management plan is required, so in my opinion there are no reasonable grounds on which to request one.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 In summary, in my opinion the proposal is a high quality design which has carefully responded to the site constraints both in terms of the character of the development and the impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties. I am satisfied that the concerns relating to bin and cycle stores and car parking can be resolved through a landscaping condition. Subject to this, the proposal is acceptable and would provide an additional two units, in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 5/1 and the presumption in favour of sustainable development at the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

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, a surface water drainage scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The submitted details shall:

- a) include the results of the assessment of the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system, in accordance with the principles set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and associated Guidance. The scheme should be designed such that there is no surcharging for a 1 in 30 year event and no internal property flooding for a 1 in 100 year event + 40% an allowance for climate change
- b) provide information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters; and
- c) provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.

Prior to first occupation of the dwellings hereby permitted, the surface water drainage scheme shall be fully 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.

- 6. Prior to the commencement of external brickwork, samples of the bricks shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure the development respects the character of the area (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/4 and 3/12).

- 7. Prior to first occupation of the dwellings hereby permitted (or in accordance with an alternative timescale agreed in writing by the local planning authority) and notwithstanding the approved plans, a hard and soft landscaping scheme shall be fully implemented in accordance with details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The hard and soft landscaping plan shall include:
 - a) details of hard and soft landscaping proposals within the site;

- b) details of permeable hard surfacing materials;
- c) car parking layouts including allocation of spaces;
- d) details of the cycle and bin stores for each unit including the elevations and materials;
- e) for the shared entrance driveway and communal areas other than private gardens as shown on the approved plans, a schedule of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate and an implementation programme.

Development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/10, 3/11 and 3/12).