

PLANNING COMMITTEE

29th August 2019

Application Number	18/0806/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	18th May 2018	Officer	Charlotte Burton
Target Date	17th August 2018		
Ward	Queen Ediths		
Site	291 Hills Road Cambridge CB2 8RP		
Proposal	Residential development containing 14 flats comprising 8 x 2-bed units and 6 x 1-bed units, along with access, car parking and associated landscaping following demolition of the existing buildings.		
Applicant	N/A C/O Agent		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>The current proposal has responded to the reasons for refusal on the previous scheme (17/1372/FUL) which is a material consideration;</p> <p>The proposal raises no new material issues in terms of the impact on residential amenity, response to context, transport or other matters.</p>
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The site comprises No. 291 Hills Road which is a detached property within a generous plot on the north western corner of the junction with Queen Edith's Way, also known as 'Raylands' The existing property is a substantial Edwardian building currently in use as a single dwellinghouse. Hills Road forms a major route into the city. The character of this part of Hills Road is predominantly residential.

- 1.2 The existing dwelling is not a Listed Building and is not a Building of Local Interest. The site is not within a conservation area. There is a tree preservation order on the site which covers 11 trees on the southern and northern sides. The site is outside the controlled parking zone and the air quality management zone. There are no other relevant site constraints.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposal is for residential development containing 14 flats comprising 8 x 2-bed units and 6 x 1-bed units, along with access, car parking and associated landscaping following demolition of the existing buildings. Flat 1 would be an accessible unit.
- 2.2 The proposed building would take the form of two 'villas' with a glazed link. The main entrance to the units would be within the glazed link fronting Queen Edith's Way, with a secondary entrance on the Hills Road frontage. Externally, the scheme would substantially have the same appearance as the previously refused scheme 17/1372/FUL (see planning history below). I have outlined the differences below.
- 2.3 The 'villas' would be predominantly two storeys plus a pitched roof storey above. There would be lower one-and-a-half and two storey elements on the northern and eastern sides. The design includes recessed balconies, roof terraces and green roofs, as well as mock chimney stacks and a projecting 'turret' of balconies on the south west corner. The materials would be red/brown brick with hung tiles and glazing.
- 2.4 Vehicular access would be via Queen Edith's Way and a pedestrian/cycle access taken from the existing access off Hills Road. A covered ramp would provide access into the basement which provides 14 residents' car parking spaces (including one disabled space for Flat 1) and two visitor spaces, (including one disabled space). One accessible visitor car parking space would be provided at the surface level close to the main entrance.
- 2.5 A cycle store would be integrated into the ground floor close to the main entrance to the building. It would provide space for 26 cycles on Sheffield hoops. 8 visitor cycle parking spaces would be provided with four spaces provided on Sheffield hoops close to the main entrance and four spaces provided near to the secondary

entrance. A timber bin store would be provided close to Queen Edith's Way with capacity for 6 x 1100 litre bins.

- 2.6 The landscaping scheme includes the retention of 11 mature trees on the site and replacement planting on the boundaries. The site would be laid out to provide informal communal spaces around the building. A wire grid for climbing plants is shown on the northern elevation.
- 2.7 The main differences between the current proposal and the previous application (17/1372/FUL) are listed below and covered in more detail in the assessment section of this report:
- Reduction in the number of units from 15 to 14 dwellings.
 - Rearrangement of the residents' cycle parking from the basement to ground level. Associated alterations to the external elevations to include obscure glazing on ground floor elevation.
 - Increase in the floor space of small units.
 - Visitor car parking space at surface level.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

3.1 The planning history comprises:

Reference	Description	Outcome
18/0715/DEMDDET	Prior notification of the demolition of a two storey detached dwelling.	Prior approval required as to the method of demolition and site restoration
17/1372/FUL	Residential development containing 15 flats comprising 8 x 2-bed units and 7 x 1-bed units, along with access, car parking and associated landscaping following demolition of the existing buildings	Refused
C/90/0371	CHANGE OF USE (FROM RESIDENTIAL DWELLING HOUSE (C3) TO GUEST	Withdrawn

	HOUSE (C1)).	
C/65/0515	Erection of detached house or bungalow with garage	Permitted

3.2 The recent application 17/1372/FUL was refused by committee on the following grounds:

1. The proposal fails to provide affordable housing to meet housing needs in accordance with the requirements of policy 5/5 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and Paragraph 30 of the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (2008) which requires the threshold for providing affordable housing (as set out in policy 5/5) to be considered as the gross number of dwellings proposed where the site consists of the site of a single dwelling.
2. The proposal would provide inconvenient and poorly accessible residents' cycle parking which fails to comply with the Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010) and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6, 3/7 and 3/12.
3. The proposal would provide cramped accommodation which fails to provide a high quality living environment for the future occupants contrary to Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/7 and paragraph 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).
4. The proposed site layout design fails to provide arrangements for visitor car parking contrary to Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/10, which would create an inconvenient and poorly accessible situation for visitors contrary to Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7, 3/11 and 3/12.

3.3 The refused application is a material consideration that is relevant in the assessment of the current application. I have referred to the refused application in the assessment section of my report below.

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 3/8 3/11 3/12 4/3 4/4 4/9 4/13 5/1 5/10 5/14 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 July 2018 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014 Circular 11/95 (Annex A)
Supplementary Planning Guidance	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012) Affordable Housing (January 2008) Planning Obligation Strategy (March 2010)

Material Considerations	<p><u>City Wide Guidance</u></p> <p>Arboricultural Strategy (2004)</p> <p>Biodiversity Checklist for Land Use Planners in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (March 2001).</p> <p>Cambridge Landscape and Character Assessment (2003)</p> <p>Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (November 2010)</p> <p>Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2005)</p> <p>Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan (2011)</p> <p>Cambridge City Council (2011) - Open Space and Recreation Strategy</p> <p>Balanced and Mixed Communities – A Good Practice Guide (2006)</p> <p>Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)</p>
-------------------------	---

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. The proposal should have no significant impact on the public highway. Recommend conditions for unbound material, removal of permitted development rights for gates, construction specification, access drainage, visibility splays, access and manoeuvring areas, removal of redundant vehicle crossover, and construction traffic management plan; and accompanying informatives.

Environmental Health

- 6.2 No objection subject to conditions on construction hours, collection during construction, piling, dust and noise insulation. Adequate ventilation can be provided by use of whole house mechanical ventilation. This will allow the future occupiers to be able to control internal thermal comfort and cooling without compromising acceptable internal noise levels. Noise mitigation is required for the proposed balconies, which should be secured through the noise insulation condition. The proposed hammer driven / impact piling is not recommended in residential locations and alternative methods should be sought through the piling condition.

Refuse and Recycling

- 6.3 No objection.

Urban Design and Conservation Team

- 6.4 No objection to minor changes compared to the previous scheme which are considered to be acceptable in urban design terms.

Senior Sustainability Officer (Design and Construction)

- 6.5 No objection. Recommend conditions for renewable energy implementation and water efficiency.

Access Officer

6.6 No further comments to the Disability Panel's response.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Tree Team)

6.7 No comments received on the current application.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

6.8 No objection. The outline landscape treatments are generally acceptable. Recommend a condition for hard and soft landscaping details, boundary details and a landscape management and maintenance plan. It is unclear how the hedge treatment around the periphery of the site is to be completed and/or installed. Detailed information regarding planting methodology and how the existing vegetation is to be either integrated or replaced needs to be provided within any condition submission information. Highly invasive methods such as trench planting will be unlikely to be supportable in respect of protecting retained trees and/or vegetation.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Walking and Cycling Officer)

6.9 No comments received.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Flood and Water Management)

6.10 No objection subject to condition for surface water drainage scheme and maintenance arrangements.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Officer)

6.11 No objection subject to condition for surface water drainage scheme. All new or altered external surfaces within the site boundary should be of permeable construction. The geocellular storage may need to be moved further north to ensure a gravity outfall can be achieved.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Public Art Officer)

6.12 The development should require a public art proposal.

Environment Agency

6.13 No objection. Refer to Flood Risk Standing Advice.

Anglian Water

6.14 The surface water strategy/flood risk assessment submitted with the planning application relevant to Anglian Water is unacceptable. No evidence has been provided to show that the surface water hierarchy has been followed. Recommend a condition for a surface water management strategy.

Cambridgeshire Constabulary (Architectural Liaison Officer)

6.15 No objection. There has been some consideration to crime prevention. Concerns regarding visitor cycle storage which appears to be away from the main part of the development and should be moved closer to the visitor car parking. Recommend a condition for external lighting.

Developer Contributions Monitoring Unit

6.16 See section below headed Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement).

Disability Panel meeting on 31 July

6.17 The scheme is described as 'compliant with current Approved Document Part M of the Building Regulations. External surfaces will be paved in a smooth hard material suitable for use by wheelchairs. All doors are to have level thresholds which will be of a sufficient width to facilitate wheelchair access. An internal lift is to be provided of sufficient size (internal car size 1800x1800mm) for use by a wheelchair user and attendant. Control buttons are to be at a height suitable for wheelchair users and will include tactile indications. The lift will also incorporate a visual and audible indication of the floor reached. One unit, provided at ground floor level, is to be fully accessible and WC accommodation in all flats has been designed for use by the visiting disabled. Light switches,

electrical socket outlets and intercom door entry systems are to be located at a height suitable for disabled use.’ This is encouraging for a scheme of this scale, as larger developments often fail to meet appropriate standards. Further consideration could nevertheless be given to the design of the accessible unit, such as quality of the bathroom space, the style of door used (the Panel would recommend a sliding door) and the relationship between the bedroom and bathroom which ideally should be an ensuite for maximum convenience. Look to Lifetime Homes compliance for flexibility and adaptability.

6.18 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:

- 15 Almoners Avenue
- 11 Alwyne Road
- 2 Babraham Road
- 24 Baldock Way
- 21 Bowers Croft
- 2B Cavendish Avenue
- 4 Chalk Grove
- 3 Corfe Close
- 42 Devonshire Road
- 6 Golding Road
- 16 Grantchester Road
- 24 Green Street
- 14 Hartington Grove
- 77 Hartington Grove
- 10 Hills Avenue
- 209 Hills Road
- 224 Hills Road
- 248 Hills Road
- 250 Hills Road
- 251 Hills Road
- 267 Hills Road
- 269 Hills Road
- 271 Hills Road
- 272 Hills Road
- 276 Hills Road
- 277 Hills Road
- 278 Hills Road
- 282 Hills Road
- 284 Hills Road
- 289 Hills Road
- Dwelling to rear of 289 Hills Road
- 292A Hills Road
- 295 Hills Road
- 296 Hills Road
- 301 Hills Road
- 25 Holbrook Road
- 83 Holbrook Road
- 5 Knightly Avenue
- 8 Queen Edith’s Way
- 1a Queen Edith’s Way
- 12 Queen Edith’s Way
- 23 Queen Edith’s Way
- 67 Queen Edith’s Way

- 222 Queen Edith's Way
- 234 Queen Edith's Way
- 67 Rock Road
- 35 Selwyn Gardens
- 1 Stansgate Avenue
- 29 Urwin Gardens
- 1 Pearson Court, Milton

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Principle

- No justification for demolition. The building appears to be in good condition. The developer has not explored any options to retain, convert and/or extend the building.
- Loss of family housing. Proposed flats would not meet housing demand.
- The proposal avoids affordable housing contributions by reducing the number of units.
- Concerns about use as house in multiple occupation.

Character

- The existing dwelling has architectural, historical and social importance as well as group value.
- The proposal would be out of character with the area, in terms of scale and massing, architectural style and materials, and would be a characterless and bland proposal that would not have a positive impact on such a prominent location on major route into the city.

Transport impact

- Impact on highway safety and congestion, pollution and accidents.
- Impact of demand for parking on roads, cycle lane and pavement.
- Traffic at the junction needs modelling.
- Impact of construction traffic on highway safety and contractors parking on verge
- The site is in an unsustainable location.
- Plans do not show the entrance to the Devonshire House Dental Practice opposite the proposed entrance.

Environment

- Loss of trees and greenery on the character of the area and amenity value.
- Impact on the long term health and future of the trees retained or planted.
- Damage to trees during construction, in particular excavation of the basement.
- Impact on biodiversity.
- Impact on climate change resilience.
- The proposal includes few sustainable features to reduce carbon emissions and save water.
- Demolition of existing dwelling is unsustainable.

Impact on neighbours

- Adverse impact on the amenity of the immediate neighbours through loss of privacy, perception of overlooking, overbearing sense of enclosure, light pollution from the atrium, in particular No. 289 and the dwelling to the rear of No. 289
- Deciduous trees offer only partial screening and do not extend along the entire boundary with the neighbouring properties.
- Even narrow windows would result in loss of privacy to neighbouring properties.
- The dwelling to the rear of No. 289 is a separate dwelling and pays Council Tax as such.

Amenity of future occupiers

- Inadequate noise assessment.
- Inaccessible cycle parking. No provision for non-standard bicycles, such as cargo cycles.

Other

- Concerns about pre-determined outcomes and transparency.
- Developer profit. No benefits to the local community.

7.3 The Hills Road Area Residents Association and Queen Edith's Way Residents Association have submitted detailed representations objecting to the proposal on the following grounds: no justification for demolition, out of character with the area, impact

on the amenities of neighbouring properties, concerns about trees, impact on traffic congestion, accidents, noise and air pollution, and meeting housing needs.

7.4 The application has been called-in to the planning committee by Councillors McGerty (Ward Councillor) on the grounds of the impact on the safety and congestion of the highway. Cllrs McGerty and Pippas (Ward Councillor) have submitted a joint representation objecting on the same grounds as raised by the residents' associations.

7.5 A petition for a Development Control Forum (DCF) was received. The lead petitioner was 248 Hills Road and the petition was supported by 27 signatories objecting to the proposal. The petitioners' grounds for requesting the DCF can be summarised as:

- There is no case for demolishing "Raylands" (policy 5/4 of CLP 2006).
- The plans do not safeguard environmental character (policy 3/3 of CLP 2006).
- The application does not respond to the local context (policy 3/4 of CLP 2006).
- Cramped living accommodation (policy 3/7 of CLP 2006).
- The development would have a significant adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties, provide inadequate amenity space, detract from the prevailing character and appearance of the area, and adversely affect trees (policy 3/10 of CLP 2006).
- A negative impact on the local setting (policy 3/12 of CLP 2006).
- Damage to trees (policy 4/4 of CLP 2006).
- Adverse effects on health and the environment (policy 4/13 of CLP 2006).
- No provision for affordable housing (policy 5/5 of CLP 2006).
- Unacceptable transport impact (policy 8/2 of CLP 2006).

7.6 The DCF was held on 8 August. A copy of minutes is attached as an **appendix** to this report. I have responded to the petitioners grounds above in the 'Third Party' section of my assessment below. During the DCF, the following queries were also raised by

Cllr McGerty (Ward Councillor), which I have also responded to in my assessment.

- Is the applicant able to provide a Tree Protection Method statement as part of the planning application?
- Is the applicant able to provide a detailed plan of new planting and make this a firm undertaking during the planning process?
- Could the grass verges on Queen Edith's Way be protected with Heras fences during construction?

7.7 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 Due to the substantial similarities between the current scheme and the previous scheme (17/1372/FUL), the previous decision is a material consideration that I must give significant weight to. As such, I must concentrate my assessment on the changes that the applicant has made to overcome the previous reasons for refusal. These are in summary affordable housing provision, cramped living accommodation, inadequate residents' cycle parking, and inadequate visitor car parking. I have assessed these first below.

8.2 Other matters such as the impact on the character of the area and the impact on residential amenity – which were previously considered to be acceptable and not reasons for refusal - I must consider in terms of the changes that are proposed under the current application and whether these have an unacceptable impact compared to the previous scheme. For completeness, I have provided a full assessment of the material considerations in the second section below.

Assessment against reasons for refusal 17/1372/FUL

Affordable housing

8.3 The reason for refusal on the previous application stated:

The proposal fails to provide affordable housing to meet housing needs in accordance with the requirements of policy 5/5 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and Paragraph 30 of

the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (2008) which requires the threshold for providing affordable housing (as set out in policy 5/5) to be considered as the gross number of dwellings proposed where the site consists of the site of a single dwelling.

- 8.4 The refused scheme proposed 15 units following the loss of a single dwelling on the site, resulting in a net gain of 14 units. Policy 5/5 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) states that developments on sites of 0.5 hectares or more and all developments including an element of housing which have 15 or more dwellings will only be permitted if they provide an agreed mix of affordable housing types to meet housing needs. The Council will seek as affordable housing 40% or more of the dwellings or an equivalent site area.
- 8.5 The Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (2008) provides further guidance on the interpretation of policy 5/5. Paragraph 30 of the SPD states:

In considering whether a development meets the threshold for providing affordable housing, it is the net increase in the number of dwellings on a site that will be considered, except where the site consists of the site of a single dwelling (discounting any subsidiary dwellings such as those for a dependent relation or domestic assistant), when the gross number of new dwellings will be considered. The intention is to lessen the financial penalty involved in the redevelopment of existing housing areas and buildings, which are often built to low sustainability standards and which often use land inefficiently, but not to incentivise the loss of large single-family dwelling houses which are limited in numbers within the City.

- 8.6 The Committee gave weight to paragraph 30 of the SPD when applying policy 5/5 on the previous application and as the previous scheme provided a gross number of 15 new dwellings, was refused on the basis that it failed to provide affordable housing to meet housing needs.
- 8.7 The current proposal would provide 14 units following the demolition of the existing dwelling. Thus the gross number of new dwellings would be 14 (rather than 15). In accordance with

paragraph 30 of the SPD, this would not trigger the requirement for affordable housing contributions under policy 5/5.

8.8 Paragraph 31 of the SPD goes on to say:

New housing developments should make efficient use of land. Where developments use land inefficiently to avoid having to provide any affordable housing, planning permission is likely to be refused. Regard will be had to the density recently achieved in comparable development elsewhere in Cambridge and to the 30 dwellings per hectare (dph) net national indicative minimum in making this assessment.

8.9 In my opinion, the current proposal does not represent an inefficient use of land. The revised scheme has responded to the concerns raised in the other reasons for refusal by using more ground floor space for cycle parking and increasing the size of the units. The proposal has retained the same building envelope as the previous scheme, so the need to respond to these other issues has reduced the number of units. The site area is 0.2ha and the proposal would have a density of 70 dph, not taking into account the constraints of the site in terms of maintaining the mature trees and character of the site which reduce the developable area.

8.10 For these reasons, in my opinion the current proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 5/5 and 10/1 and the Affordable Housing SPD (2008).

Cramped living accommodation

8.11 The reason for refusal on the previous application stated:

The proposal would provide cramped accommodation which fails to provide a high quality living environment for the future occupants contrary to Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/7 and paragraph 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

8.12 The Council has no adopted space standards, however the national Technical Housing Standards (2015) (THS) are a material consideration and provide guidance on acceptable living accommodation and residential amenity for the future occupants.

8.13 For reference, I have provided the floor spaces from the previous scheme which were considered by the Committee to be unacceptable below:

Unit	Beds	Floor space (sqm)	THS (sqm)	Difference (sqm)
Flat 1	1-bed (2 persons)	44	50	-4
Flat 2	1-bed (2 persons)	45	50	-5
Flat 3	2-bed (3 persons)	64	61	+3
Flat 4	1-bed (2 persons)	54	50	+4
Flat 5	2-bed (3 persons)	60	61	-1
Flat 6	2-bed (3 persons)	71	61	+10
Flat 7	2-bed (3 persons)	58	61	-3
Flat 8	1-bed (2 persons)	45	50	-5
Flat 9	2-bed (3 persons)	64	61	+3
Flat 10	1-bed (2 persons)	58	50	+8
Flat 11	2-bed (3 persons)	59	61	-2
Flat 12	1-bed (2 persons)	56	50	+4
Flat 13	2-bed (3 persons)	79	61	+18
Flat 14	2-bed (3 persons)	75	61	+14
Flat 15	1-bed (2 persons)	62	50	+12

8.14 I have provided the floor spaces for the current proposal below, including the external amenity spaces. The floor spaces meet the THS or are within 1 sqm. In my opinion, the floor space would provide a good level of residential amenity, particularly combined with the external amenity space for each unit and the quality of the internal spaces in terms of light and outlook.

Unit	Beds	Floor space (sqm) internal + external	THS (sqm)	Difference (sqm)
Flat 1	1-bed (2 persons)	53 + 7	50	+3
Flat 2	2-bed (3 persons)	60 + 4	61	-1
Flat 3	1-bed (2 persons)	60 + 4	50	+10
Flat 4	2-bed (3 persons)	60 + 4	61	-1
Flat 5	2-bed (3 persons)	72 + 4	61	+11
Flat 6	2-bed (3 persons)	61 + 7	61	0
Flat 7	1-bed (2 persons)	50 + 4	50	0
Flat 8	2-bed (3 persons)	61 + 4	61	0
Flat 9	1-bed (2 persons)	60 + 4	50	+10
Flat 10	2-bed (3 persons)	60 + 4	61	-1
Flat 11	1-bed (2 persons)	60 + 4	50	+10
Flat 12	2-bed (3 persons)	79 + 28	61	+18
Flat 13	2-bed (3 persons)	75 + 4	61	+14
Flat 14	1-bed (2 persons)	65 + 4	61	+4

8.15 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.

Inadequate residents' cycle parking

8.16 The previous scheme had residents' cycle parking within the basement car park. This was refused on the following grounds:

The proposal would provide inconvenient and poorly accessible residents' cycle parking which fails to comply with the Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010) and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6, 3/7 and 3/12.

8.17 The current proposal has relocated the residents' cycle parking to a store on the ground floor. The store includes space for 26 cycles, which exceeds the Council's adopted cycle parking standards by two spaces. The dimensions of the store and the spacing of the stands meets the Council's Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010). A 1.2m wide door would provide access to the store from the front elevation near to the main entrance. This would be a convenient location and I am satisfied the store would provide a useable facility. In my opinion, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/6.

Inadequate visitor car parking

8.18 The final reason for refusal of the previous scheme was as follows:

The proposed site layout design fails to provide arrangements for visitor car parking contrary to Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/10, which would create an inconvenient and poorly accessible situation for visitors contrary to Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7, 3/11 and 3/12.

8.19 The current proposal includes a visitor car parking space on the surface level close to the main entrance, as well as two additional visitor spaces within the basement car park. The surface space would be accessible for disabled visitors, and a further disabled space would be provided for the accessible unit (Flat 1) and one of the two visitor spaces within the basement would also be

accessible. In my opinion, the surface level visitor space would provide a convenient arrangement for drop-offs and deliveries. The basement spaces could be used for planned visitors. The proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/10.

Summary

8.20 For these reasons, in my opinion the current proposal has overcome the reasons for refusal on the previous application.

Other material considerations

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

1. Principle of development
2. Affordable housing / Housing mix
3. Context of site, design and external spaces
4. Disabled access
5. Residential amenity
6. Refuse arrangements
7. Transport Impact
8. Highway safety
9. Car and cycle parking
10. Trees
11. Ecology
12. Surface water drainage
13. Renewable energy and sustainability
14. Public Art
15. Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

Principle of development

8.22 The principle of development was not a reason for refusal of the previous scheme. The existing property is not a Listed Building and is not within a conservation area. The demolition of the existing building would be permitted development under Class B, Part 11, Schedule 2 of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), subject to prior approval from the local planning authority as to the method of demolition and any proposed restoration of the site.

Thus, the principle of demolition cannot be resisted and therefore is acceptable in principle.

8.23 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. I have assessed the compatibility of the proposal with adjoining uses in terms of the impact on neighbouring properties and the wider area in the relevant section of my assessment below. In summary, I find this to be acceptable and therefore the principle of development is compliant with policy 5/1.

8.24 Third parties have referred to policy 3/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) which relates to the sub-division of existing plots and to developments within the curtilage of existing properties. While the site is currently a single dwelling and the proposal would create multiple-dwellings, I do not consider that this policy strictly applies to the proposal, as the existing dwelling would not be retained alongside the proposed development. Nonetheless, the aims of policy 3/10 in terms of protecting the amenities of neighbouring properties, providing acceptable amenity for the future occupants, the impact on the character of the area, and impact on trees and wildlife have been fully assessed in my report below in relation to other policies within the development plan, and I find these to be acceptable.

Affordable housing / Housing mix

8.25 I have addressed the affordable housing in relation to the previous reason for refusal in my assessment above, and I consider this to be acceptable.

8.26 Third parties have objected to the proposed flats rather than family housing on the grounds that it does not meet local housing demand and that there is evidence of over-provision of flats within the area with several recent flatted developments standing empty. Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 5/10 requires housing development on sites of 0.5ha or more, or capable of accommodating 15 or more dwellings to provide a mix of dwelling sizes, measured in the number of bedrooms. As the current proposal is for 14 units and the site area is 0.2ha, this policy does not apply.

8.27 Nonetheless, the supporting text to policy 5/10 explains that the purpose is to create mixed and inclusive communities offering a choice of housing and lifestyle. In my opinion, the proposed mix of 1 and 2-bed flats would be suitable for a range of occupiers, including individuals, couples, small families or small house-shares. The surrounding area is characterised by detached family houses. In my opinion, the proposal would complement rather than contrast with the existing housing stock to achieve a mix of dwelling types within the area. In my opinion, the diversification of the housing types from predominantly detached houses to include smaller properties would enhance the community rather than detract from the area, in accordance with the aims of policy 5/10.

Context of site, design and external spaces

8.28 The external appearance of the proposal remains substantially the same as the previous scheme, and the impact of the proposal on the character of the area was not a reason for refusal. The main changes are the obscure glazing of windows on the south (Queen Edith's Way) elevation for the bike store and changes to the landscaping scheme to provide space for surface level visitor car parking. I do not consider these to have a material impact on the appearance of the site compared to the previous scheme, and therefore the scheme provides an acceptable response to the local context for the reasons given below, and is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12 in this respect.

- Response to context

8.29 The site occupies a prominent position on the busy Hills Road junction, which is a main route into the city. The site has frontages onto Hills Road and Queen Edith's Way which are both predominantly residential, albeit the latter has a more suburban character. Hills Road is the subject of the 'Cambridge Suburbs and Approaches: Hills Road' (March 2012) study which provides an overview of the character of the area. However this document has no statutory status and should only be used as a starting point for a wider assessment of the character of the area, which also takes account of recent developments on both Hills Road and Queen Edith's Way.

- 8.30 The site currently has a verdant character dominated by mature trees and planting along the frontages and within the site. The existing dwelling is largely screened from view, as are the neighbouring properties along this side of Hills Road. The site is overgrown, however the existing vegetation contributes to the 'bosky' character of this part of Hills Road, and is important for setting the character of the road as it moves northwards into the city. However, the Suburbs and Approaches study highlights the recent development of three dwellings on the opposite side of the junction which are more visible behind boundary planting and more prominent in views from the junction.
- 8.31 The existing dwelling – known as 'Raylands' – is a redbrick detached Edwardian villa which is characteristic of this part of Hills Road. To the north of the junction, the character of Hills Road is set by large detached or semi-detached villas dating from the early decades of the 20th century. Building styles and materials vary considerably although render and brown/red brick with a tiled roof is perhaps the most common combination, but used in a variety of architectural approaches from more historical styles to Arts and Crafts. However, there has been some later infilling or redevelopment, notably on the northeast side – which are interspersed between the villas.
- 8.32 Queen Edith's Way is characterised by detached properties usually dating from later than the villas on Hills Road. There is arguably less consistency in design than on Hills Road and, again, there are examples of infill development. There are examples of higher density flatted developments - Dean Court and Wessex Court – as well as Editha House. Contemporary designs have been supported within the immediate vicinity including 6 no. dwellings at Nos. 3-5 Queen Edith's Way (16/2135/FUL) which was approved in June 2017.
- 8.33 While I accept that the existing building is characteristic of this part of Hills Road and that there is local support for retaining the building, for the reasons I have given, the demolition of 'Raylands' cannot be resisted in planning terms. I have assessed the proposed replacement building in terms of how the layout, scale and massing, design and materials, and landscaping provide an appropriate response to the surrounding context.

- Layout

8.34 The proposal is for two linked 'villas'. The building has been set back into the site, retaining a similar building line on Hills Road and Queen Edith's Way, albeit with a projecting gable and 'turret' element on the south western corner. In terms of access, the proposal addresses both frontages. The existing vehicle access from Hills Road would become a pedestrian and cycle access, and a new access would be created from Queen Edith's Way, similar to other accesses along this road. There is open space for landscaping around the building so that it would not appear a cramped form of development and does not represent over-development of the site in visual terms.

- Scale and massing

8.35 The 'villas' would be separated by 4.7m with the linking element recessed between 5.1-6.2m from the front elevation. The use of glazing on the front elevation of the link with a void behind would ensure this element is visually light weight. The 'villas' themselves would have slightly longer frontages than the neighbouring traditional properties, however they would be further broken down with projecting elements and the pitched roof forms. Overall, this approach successfully breaks down the scale and massing of the building into separate elements that respond to the pattern of villas along this part of Hills Road and Queen Edith's Way. The building steps down to one-and-a-half storeys on the eastern side which forms a transition to the bungalow at No.1a Queen Edith's Way. I consider the scale and massing to be appropriate.

- Design and materials

8.36 The 'linked villas' design has taken cues from the character of the traditional villas and reinterpreted this in a contemporary design. Influences have been taken from the surrounding area, in particular, the pitched roof forms, the chimney stacks and the corner bay balcony feature. The use of red/brown brick would be similar to those approved at Nos.3-5 Queen Edith's Way, while the use of hung tiles on the roof scape would be a contemporary use of a traditional material that is prevalent along Hills Road. The balcony balustrades would be metal. I have recommended a condition for materials samples to be submitted for approval.

- Landscaping

8.37 The proposal retains significant tree planting along the frontages, which maintains the verdant character of the site and the junction, and partially screens the proposed building. I am satisfied that the important trees of highest amenity value can be retained for the reasons set out in the section below. The site is currently overgrown and in my opinion, a well-maintained landscaping scheme would enhance the appearance of the site. The Landscape Architect supports the indicative landscaping scheme and details could be secured through the recommended conditions.

- Movement and Access

8.38 The site would have accesses from both Hills Road and Queen Edith's Way, which link to the main entrances to the units on both frontages. The bin store would be located close to the main entrances and in a convenient location near to the public highway for collection. Cycle parking would be provided within the ground floor with convenient access. The vehicular access to the basement parking would be 5m wide and pedestrian access would be via the staircore, which would be convenient and safe.

Disabled access

8.39 The proposal includes a lift within the central atrium which provides access to all units. Flat 1 on the ground floor is identified as 'accessible'. A disabled resident car parking space is provided within the basement, and a further disabled visitor space is provided within the basement and another on the surface level near to the main entrance. The comments from the Disability Panel relate to internal matters that should be addressed by the applicant through building control. The proposal provides good accessibility for disabled users in my opinion, and is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12 in this respect.

Residential Amenity

8.40 The neighbouring properties are No.289 Hills Road and the separate annex to the west and No.1a Queen Edith's Way to the north. The proposal would not impact on other neighbouring properties on the opposite corners of the junction. I have also

considered the impact on the wider area. The impact on residential amenity was not a reason for refusal on the previous scheme and I have highlighted in my assessment where the current proposal has the same impact on neighbouring properties as the previous proposal, and where there are differences I have taken these into account.

- *No. 289 Hills Road*

8.41 This is a substantial detached property set within a large plot, which is currently used as a single dwellinghouse. There are windows on the side elevation facing towards the application site and the property has a private garden to the rear including a conservatory attached to the rear elevation. I have received objections from the owner/occupiers and I visited this property during the previous application.

8.42 The closest part of the proposed building to the shared boundary would be the two storey element on the northern side of the eastern 'villa', which would be within 5-7m of the boundary. The adjacent part of the curtilage of No. 289 is used as a driveway, with hedge and garden beyond. The proposal would be approximately 2-3m closer than the existing dwelling, however the side elevation would be approximately 1.5m lower with a flat roof, rather than a pitched roof. The highest three-storey part of the eastern 'villa' would be approximately 11-12m from the boundary and would be similar in height to the existing pitched roof. In my opinion, this part of the building would not have a significant overbearing or enclosing impact compared to the existing situation, and this would be the same as the previous application.

8.43 The western 'villa' would introduce built form directly to the south of No. 289 where there is currently open space at the front of the existing dwelling. The side elevation of No. 289 is between 4-8m from the boundary. The proposed three storey 'villa' would be between 9-10m from the boundary, so the separation distance between the buildings would be 13-18m. There are substantial deciduous trees planted along the boundary within the application site, which would be retained to provide partial screening. I am satisfied that these trees - combined with the separation distance - would soften the visual impact of the building so that it would not have a significant overbearing impact on No.289. The side elevation and the ridge height would be of domestic proportions,

so in my opinion the relationship would be similar to between other villas along Hills Road, including between Nos.287 and 289 which has a smaller gap between the properties (between approximately 6.6-9.5m). This would be the same as the previous application.

- 8.44 In terms of overlooking, the side elevation of No. 289 includes windows that serve habitable rooms and would be sensitive to overlooking. There would be three first floor unobscured windows on the northern side elevation of the western 'villa' serving the main living space and bedroom of Flat 8. These windows would be between 13-18m away from the windows on the side elevation of No.289 and views would be partially screened by the mature trees to be retained on the site. While I appreciate that these trees are deciduous, they are mature with a relatively dense canopy and are protected under the TPO. The proposed windows would be relatively narrow which would reduce the scope of views. For these reasons, in my opinion the proposal would not result in a significant loss of privacy for No. 289. This would be the same as the previous application.
- 8.45 There would be one unobscured second floor window on the northern elevation of the eastern 'villa' serving the bedroom of Flat 13. This would be over 12m from the boundary with No. 289. The window would align with the driveway to the annex to the rear of No. 289. Views towards the rear garden of No. 289 and the conservatory at the rear would be over 20m and would be partially screened by the proposed landscaping shown on the site plan (details of which would be secured through the landscaping condition) and further screened by the hedge and tree planting within the garden of No. 289 itself. The windows on the glazed link and the eastern 'villa' would be obscure glazed, so there would be no views towards the conservatory or the private garden.
- 8.46 The balconies on the northern side of the building have been designed to be inset with solid side walls to prevent direct views towards No. 289. There may be some narrow oblique views from the balconies towards the windows on the side elevation of No. 289, but these would be over a significant distance and would be partially obscured by the trees. This is the same as the previous application and in my opinion this is acceptable. I have recommended a condition to prevent the green roofs from being accessed other than for maintenance.

8.47 Regarding light emission from the glazed link on the northern elevation, this would consist of two strips of obscure glazing and a central panel of hung tiles. This is a recessed link set back from the boundary. The obscure glazing would diffuse the light so that there would be no direct light beams. Moreover, this would be filtered by the mature trees and additional planting. As such, while light would be visible from the windows and the garden of No.289, in my opinion it is unlikely that this would have a significant impact on residential amenity. This is the same as the previous application and the Environmental Health team has raised no concerns about this.

8.48 For these reasons, in my opinion the proposal would not have a significant adverse impact on the residential amenity of the occupants of No. 289.

- *Annex to the rear of No. 289*

8.49 This is a two storey annex converted from an outbuilding which is understood from the occupants to be used as a separate dwelling. The lawful status of the annex as a separate dwelling is unconfirmed because there is no record in the planning history of sub-division of the plot of No. 289 into two units or conversion of the annex into a separate dwelling, both of which would require planning permission. Nonetheless, I have assessed the impact on this annex on the basis of its being used as a separate dwelling. The annex is located on the boundary with No. 291 and is attached to a structure on the application site. There are no windows on the southern elevation facing towards the application site, but there are windows the gable end western elevation. I have seen the annex from my site visit to No. 289.

8.50 The north eastern corner of the eastern 'villa' would be within 5m of the southern elevation of the annex. This would be approximately 2m closer than the existing building. The proposed building would be one-and-a-half storeys on this corner with a sloped roof rising to two storeys. As the building would only be visible in oblique views from the window on the southern elevation, I am satisfied that it would not have a significant overbeating or enclosing impact. Moreover, the site plan shows additional planting which would soften the visual impact of the proposal, the detail of which would be secured through the landscaping condition.

8.51 The first floor windows on the north elevation of the eastern 'villa' facing towards the annex would be obscure glazed to prevent oblique views into the windows. There would be no balconies or roof terraces with views towards the annex. The proposed building is to the south of the annex, however would not result in significant loss of light to the windows on the south elevation compared to the existing situation. As above, light from the glazed link would be visible from the window on the southern elevation, however as the light would be diffused by the obscure glazing and due to the separation distance and filtering by additional landscaping, it is unlikely to have a significant impact on the residential amenity of the occupants.

8.52 For these reasons, in my opinion the proposal would not have a significant adverse impact on the residential amenity of the occupants of the annex.

- *No.1a Queen Edith's Way*

8.53 This is a detached bungalow with a courtyard on the western side and windows serving habitable rooms opening onto the courtyard. I have visited this property.

8.54 The closest part of the building would be between 10-12m to the western elevations of No. 1a, which is similar to the nearest part of the existing dwellinghouse. The side elevation would be approximately double the length of the existing dwellinghouse. However, the elevation would be approximately 1.5m lower and the highest part of the roof would be approximately 2.4m lower. I am satisfied due to the separation distance that this would not have a significant overbearing impact on the courtyard area. The highest three storey part of the building would be over 16m from the boundary and would be lower than the highest part of the existing building, so would be acceptable. The vehicle ramp enclosure would be 2.5m high which would not have a significant impact.

8.55 There would be no first floor windows on the elevation facing towards No. 1a. There would be some roof lights. I have no sections showing the height of these above the internal floor level. However the proposed plans confirm that the base of the roof lights would be at least 1.8m above the finished floor level.

Regardless, due to the separation distance and presence of trees along the boundary within the application site, I am satisfied that there would be no significant loss of privacy, should views from these windows be possible.

8.56 The shadow diagrams show no significant overshadowing compared to the existing situation, and some minor reduction in overshadowing from 5pm on 21 June. There would be some minor increase in the area of the courtyard in shade after 3pm on 21 March. However, this would not fail the BRE guidance as the property would retain at least 2 hours of sunlight across at least 50% of its external amenity space. This is acceptable, in my opinion.

8.57 I have recommended a condition to ensure that the vehicle ramp is covered in accordance with the approved plans prior to first use of the ramp in order to reduce the noise and disturbance impact from vehicle movements.

- *Wider area*

8.58 The proposal would intensify the use of the site, increasing from a single dwelling to 14 households. However, it is a large plot with space for landscape buffering to mitigate the impact on the immediate neighbours. The site is situated on a busy junction so that the impact of additional comings and goings on the nearby properties is unlikely to be significant. I have discussed the transport impact and parking provision in the sections below and I am satisfied that this would not have a significant impact on residential amenity.

8.59 I have recommended the conditions requested by the Environmental Health team to control the impacts of construction and plant noise in the wider area, and I am satisfied that these are sufficient. In terms of air quality, the site is not within the Air Quality Management Area and as such an air quality assessment is not required. The Environmental Health team has raised no objection to the proposal in terms of the increase in air pollution from traffic generated.

8.60 In my opinion the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and I

consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 3/7.

- Future occupants

8.61 I have assessed the quality of the internal accommodation in the relevant section above in relation to the previous reason for refusal. The Environmental Health team is satisfied that the proposed mechanical ventilation system would provide the occupants with an acceptable internal noise level from traffic and have recommended further mitigation for the external amenity space, which would be secured through a noise insulation condition. In my opinion this is acceptable and the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12 in this regard.

Refuse Arrangements

8.62 A bin store is proposed near to the front of the site which provides capacity for 6no. 1100l bins. The Waste Team has advised that the capacity is acceptable in accordance with the RECAP guidance. The bin store would have a green roof; however no elevations have been submitted. These would be submitted under the landscaping condition I have recommended. The detailed comments from the Waste Team regarding the doors and locks are management issues that I do not consider it to be necessary to secure through conditions. The bin store arrangements are the same as the previous application and this was not a reason for refusal. As such, in my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12 in this regard.

Transport Impact

8.63 The applicant has submitted a Transport Statement which demonstrates that the future occupants would not be dependent on private cars, given the highly sustainable location of the site close to public transport connections at Addenbrooke's and along Hills Road and Long Road. The improvements to the cycle network along Hills Road also promote sustainable transport modes. Thus while car parking spaces would be provided, the proposal is unlikely to generate a significant additional demand on the public highway network. The applicant has stated their intention to issue Travel Packs to the future occupants which is supported, however

these are not necessary to make the development acceptable in my view and therefore securing these through a condition would not be reasonable in my view. In my opinion, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Highway Safety

8.64 The proposal includes the creation of a new vehicle access onto Queen Edith's Way and the removal of the existing vehicle access from Hills Road. The new access would be a minimum of 5m wide and would have visibility splays within the public highway. Concerns have been raised by third parties regarding the highway safety implications of the new access so close to the junction and from refuse lorries/removal vans. The Highways Authority has not raised highway safety concerns, subject to conditions, and I accept this advice. The impact of refuse lorries/removal vans would be a temporary situation and is unlikely to have a significant impact. Moreover, removal and delivery vans would be able to enter the site and use the visitor parking spaces so would not need to park on the highway, which is controlled through double yellow lines. I have recommended those conditions that have been requested by the Highways Authority where they are reasonable. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Car and Cycle Parking

- *Car parking*

8.65 The proposal provides 14 car parking spaces in the underground car park, including one disabled space for the accessible unit (Flat 1). This provides one space per unit, which is in accordance with the Council's adopted standards outside the controlled parking zone. I have assessed the visitor car parking provision in the relevant section above in relation to the previous reason for refusal. In my opinion, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/10.

- *Cycle parking*

8.66 I have assessed the residents' cycle parking in the relevant section above in relation to the previous reason for refusal. 8 no. visitor cycle parking spaces would be provided at ground level as shown

on the proposed site plan. The Cambridgeshire Police Constabulary has raised a concern about the location of the visitor cycle parking, however I consider that this relates well to the main and secondary entrances to the building so would have good natural surveillance. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/6.

Trees

8.67 The proposal includes the loss of some of the trees on the site. However, the 11 trees that are subject to a recent tree preservation order (TPO) from September 2017 would be retained. This was supported by the Tree Officer and Landscape Architect on the previous application subject to suitable replacement planting which would be secured through the landscaping condition. I accept their advice that the proposal retains the trees of highest amenity value and that these can be protected during and after the construction. This was not a reason for refusal on the previous application, and in my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 4/4.

Ecology

8.68 The site is currently overgrown and could be used by protected species, in particular roosting bats. An ecology survey has not been undertaken. However, I have recommended a condition for an ecological construction method statement and ecological mitigation measures based on survey findings to be undertaken to be submitted to the Council for approval. I am satisfied that, should the survey identify the presence of important species on the site, this would provide an appropriate level of protection during construction and mitigation within the proposed development.

Surface Water Drainage

8.69 The Sustainable Drainage Engineer and the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) support the proposal and are satisfied that a detailed surface water drainage scheme can be secured through conditions. While I recognise the concerns of third parties with regard to the impact of the basement excavation on the water table, I accept the advice of consultees and in my opinion the proposal is acceptable in this regard, subject to the recommended condition.

Renewable energy and sustainability

- 8.70 In line with the requirements of policy 8/16 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006), major developments are required to meet at least 10% of their energy needs from the use of on-site renewable energy, with the requirement measured in terms of carbon reduction. Photovoltaic panels are proposed to meet this requirement, and while the roof plan shows the location of these panels, carbon calculations, although referred to in the Sustainability Statement, do not appear to have been submitted. As the general choice of technology is supported, it is considered that the submission of carbon calculations can be dealt with by way of condition, as recommended by the Council's Sustainability Officer.
- 8.71 The proposal also includes the use of Mechanical Ventilation with Heat Recovery (MVHR) which is supported from an energy efficiency and internal air quality perspective. The proposal also includes the provision of biodiverse green roofs, low-flow sanitary ware and appliances to reduce water consumption, which are supported. Subject to conditions to secure the implementation of these sustainability measures, the applicants have suitably addressed the issue of sustainability and renewable energy and the proposal is in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/16 and the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2007.

Public Art

- 8.72 The Public Art Officer has advised that the proposal should require a public art proposal in line with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 10/1 and the Public Art Strategy SPD. The applicant has not included a public art proposal. In my opinion, the site's verdant and enclosed character - which would be maintained through the proposal - does not lend itself to a public art proposal contribution to the street scene. This was not sought under the previous application and lack of public art provision was not a reason for refusal. While I appreciate the comments from the Public Art Officer, in this instance, I do not consider that a public art proposal is necessary or reasonable to request.

Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

8.73 The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010 have introduced the requirement for all local authorities to make an assessment of any planning obligation in relation to three tests. Each planning obligation needs to pass three statutory tests to make sure that it is

(a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;

(b) directly related to the development; and

(c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

8.74 In line with the CIL Regulations, councils can pool no more than five S106 contributions towards the same project. The new 'pooling' restrictions were introduced from 6 April 2015 and relate to new S106 agreements. This means that all contributions now agreed by the city council must be for specific projects at particular locations, as opposed to generic infrastructure types within the city of Cambridge. In bringing forward my recommendations in relation to the Planning Obligation for this development I have considered these requirements.

8.75 The Developer Contribution Monitoring Unit (DCMU) has recommended that contributions be made to the following projects:

Infrastructure	Identified project	Contribution
Community Facilities	The proposed development is within 1 mile of the Clay Farm Community Centre site. Towards the provision of and / or improvement of equipment at the Clay Farm Community Centre	£15,702.00 (plus indexation)
Indoor Sports	The proposed development is within one mile of Netherhall School. The improvement of sports facilities at Netherhall School is highlighted in the Council's Interim approach to S106 funding agreed by the	£5,649.00 (plus indexation)

	<p>City Council's Executive Councillor for Communities in June 2016.</p> <p>Towards the provision and/or improvement of new indoor gym and studio (including equipment) at Netherhall School.</p>	
Outdoor Sports	<p>This proposed development is within 500m of Nightingale Recreation Ground. The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Playing Pitches Strategy (2016) highlights scope for improving the capacity of this facility there in order to mitigate the impact of local development.</p> <p>For the provision of and / or improvements to access to the grass playing pitches at Nightingale Recreation Ground.</p>	£4,998.00 (plus indexation)
Informal Open Space	<p>This proposed development is within 500m of Nightingale Recreation Ground, which is on the council's 2016/17 target list of informal open spaces for which specific S106 contributions may be sought. The Informal Open Spaces Audit (2016) highlights that the scope for improving the open space facilities in order to mitigate the impact of local development.</p> <p>For the provision of and/or improvement of and/or access to the Informal Open Space at</p>	£5,082.00 (plus indexation)

	Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground.	
Play provision for children and teenagers	This proposed development is within 550 metres of Nightingale Avenue play area, which is on the Council's 2016/17 target list of play areas for which specific S106 contributions may be sought. Towards the provision and/or improvement of the children's play area at Nightingale Avenue play area.	£3,792 (plus indexation)

8.86 I agree with the DCMU that the planning obligation is necessary, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably in scale and kind to the development and therefore passes the tests set by the CIL Regulations. Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure this infrastructure provision, I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/8, 5/14 and 10/1 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010.

9.0 THIRD PARTY COMMENTS

9.1 I have assessed the issues raised in third party representations as follows:

Representation	Assessment
<u>Principle</u>	
No justification for demolition. The building appears to be in good condition. The developer has not explored any options to retain, convert and/or extend the building.	See 'Principle of development' section above. There are no planning grounds to resist the demolition of the unprotected building.
Loss of family housing. Proposed flats would not meet housing demand.	See 'Affordable housing / Housing mix' section.

<p>The proposal avoids affordable housing contributions by reducing the number of units.</p>	<p>I have addressed this in the relevant section of my report above in relation to the previous reason for refusal.</p>
<p>Concerns about use as house in multiple occupation.</p>	<p>The units could be occupied as houses in multiple occupation for up to 6 occupants under permitted development rights. However, in my opinion, it is unlikely that even the 2-bed units would be occupied in this way.</p>
<p><u>Character</u></p>	
<p>The existing dwelling has architectural, historical and social importance as well as group value.</p>	<p>The existing dwelling is not a listed building and is not within a conservation area. As such, it is not protected from demolition. The principle of demolition cannot be resisted in planning terms for the reasons previously given.</p>
<p>The proposal would be out of character with the area, in terms of scale and massing, architectural style and materials, and would be a characterless and bland proposal that would not have a positive impact on such a prominent location on major route into the city.</p>	<p>I have addressed this in the relevant section of my report above.</p>
<p><u>Transport impact</u></p>	
<p>Impact on highway safety and congestion, pollution and accidents.</p>	<p>The Highways Authority has not advised me of any concerns about highway safety issues. This was not a reason for refusal on the previous proposal. The current proposal is for one fewer units and thus – as the previous decision is a material consideration that I must give weight to – there would be no reasonable</p>

	grounds on which to recommend that this impact would be unacceptable.
Impact of demand for parking on roads, cycle lane and pavement.	The current proposal provides residents car parking at levels that meet the Council's adopted maximum car parking standards. Visitor car parking spaces have been provided. The site is in a sustainable location and in my opinion, there would not be reasonable grounds on which to require parking exceeding the maximum standards or to recommend refusal based on the impact of additional demand for offsite parking.
Traffic at the junction needs modelling.	The Highways Authority has assessed the proposal on the basis of the additional impact of traffic generated from the new units on the overall operation of the public highway network, and has not advised that a traffic model is required due to the scale of the proposal.
Impact of construction traffic on highway safety and contractors parking on verge	The Highways Authority has recommended a condition for a Traffic Management Plan which would include details of the movement and control of deliveries and arrangements for contractor's parking which should be within the curtilage of the site and not on street wherever possible. The Highways Authority would review the information submitted by the applicant and advise of any highway safety concerns.

<p>The site is in an unsustainable location.</p>	<p>I disagree as the site is located on major routes within the city within close proximity to bus stops along Hills Road and the bus interchange at Addenbrooke's Hospital, as well as to hospital and biomedical campus which is a major employment site.</p>
<p>Plans do not show the entrance to the Devonshire House Dental Practice opposite the proposed entrance.</p>	<p>There is no requirement for the plans to show this detail and I am mindful that the Local Highways Authority has assessed the proposal and is satisfied that it will not adversely affect highway safety.</p>
<p><u>Environment</u></p>	
<p>Loss of trees and greenery on the character of the area and amenity value.</p>	<p>The trees of highest amenity value on the site have been identified and protected by the Council's Tree Officer. These trees would be retained and would be enhanced by additional landscaping.</p>
<p>Impact on the long term health and future of the trees retained or planted.</p>	<p>Please see the 'trees' section of my assessment</p>
<p>Damage to trees during construction, in particular excavation of the basement.</p>	<p>Please see the 'trees' section of my assessment and the recommended tree protection conditions.</p>
<p>Impact on biodiversity.</p>	<p>Please see the 'ecology' section of my assessment and the recommended ecology condition.</p>
<p>Impact on climate change resilience.</p>	<p>The Council has no adopted policies on climate change resilience, albeit it is a principle of sustainable development. Please see comments below.</p>

<p>The proposal includes few sustainable features to reduce carbon emissions and save water.</p>	<p>The proposal includes photovoltaic panels, green roofs, a Mechanical Ventilation with Heat Recovery (MVHR) and low flow sanitary ware and appliances. The proposal is supported by the Council's Sustainability Officer in accordance with adopted policies.</p>
<p>Demolition of existing dwelling is unsustainable.</p>	<p>The principle of demolition cannot be resisted in planning terms for the reasons previously given.</p>
<p><u>Impact on neighbours</u></p>	
<p>Adverse impact on the amenity of the immediate neighbours through loss of privacy, perception of overlooking, overbearing sense of enclosure, light pollution from the atrium, in particular No. 289 and the dwelling to the rear of No. 289</p>	<p>I acknowledge the concerns of the immediate neighbours and I have assessed these in detail in the relevant section of my report above.</p>
<p>Deciduous trees offer only partial screening and do not extend along the entire boundary with the neighbouring properties.</p>	<p>The existing trees are deciduous thereby providing less screening in the winter months, however these are mature trees so have a relatively dense canopy. The indicative landscaping plan shows additional planting along the boundary to extend the tree screen. Appropriate species and the maturity of the specimens can be secured through the recommended landscaping condition.</p>
<p>Even narrow windows would result in loss of privacy to neighbouring properties.</p>	<p>I accept that there would be some views from the windows towards the windows on the neighbouring property, as per my assessment below.</p>

	<p>However, I consider that the narrowness of these windows combined with the screening offered by the retained mature trees and the separation distance would not result in an unacceptable loss of privacy. Some degree of mutual overlooking between neighbouring properties is acceptable, and I consider that the degree proposed would not be significantly harmful.</p>
<p>The dwelling to the rear of No. 289 is a separate dwelling and pays Council Tax as such.</p>	<p>Paying Council Tax as a separate dwelling does not make the dwelling lawful in planning terms. As above, there is no record of the subdivision or conversion of the curtilage of No. 289 to create a separate dwelling. Therefore, the lawfulness of this use in planning terms is unconfirmed. Nonetheless, I have assessed the impact on the annex to the rear as a separate dwelling in terms of the residential amenity that the occupants should expect.</p>
<p><u>Amenity of future occupiers</u></p>	
<p>Inadequate noise assessment.</p>	<p>The Environmental Health team has assessed the applicant's submission and advised me that the impact of noise from traffic on the amenity of the future occupants could be mitigated using mechanical ventilation, and such details would be secured through the recommended condition. I accept the advice of my colleagues on this matter.</p>

Inaccessible cycle parking. No provision for non-standard bicycles, such as cargo cycles.	Please see the 'cycle parking' section of my assessment above. There is no policy requirement to provide for non-standard bicycles, however as there is an over-provision of Sheffield hoops according to the adopted standards and there is space within the store, I consider that cargo bicycles could be accommodated within the proposed store.
<u>Other</u>	
Concerns about pre-determine outcomes and transparency.	The outcome of the application has not been pre-determined. Advice given to the applicant prior to determination is given on a 'without prejudice' basis.
Developer profit. No benefits to the local community.	Developer profit is not a material planning matter. The proposal would make planning obligations towards community facilities, open space and recreational facilities as listed above, which would be secured through a legal agreement.

9.2 I have responded to the petitioners' grounds as follows:

Grounds	Response
There is no case for demolishing "Raylands" (policy 5/4 of CLP 2006)	There are no planning grounds to resist the demolition of this unprotected building.
The plans do not safeguard environmental character (policy 3/3 of CLP 2006)	See 'Context' section of my assessment.
The application does not respond to the local context (policy 3/4 of CLP 2006)	See 'Context' section of my assessment.
Cramped living accommodation (policy 3/7 of CLP 2006)	See paragraphs 8.11-8.15

The development would have a significant adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties, provide inadequate amenity space, detract from the prevailing character and appearance of the area, and adversely affect trees (policy 3/10 of CLP 2006)	See the 'Residential amenity', 'Context' and 'Trees' sections of my assessment.
A negative impact on the local setting (policy 3/12 of CLP 2006)	See 'Context' section of my assessment.
Damage to trees (policy 4/4 of CLP 2006)	See 'Trees' section of my assessment.
Adverse effects on health and the environment (policy 4/13 of CLP 2006)	See assessment of residential amenity and environment in my assessment above.
No provision for affordable housing (policy 5/5 of CLP 2006)	See paragraphs 8.3-8.10.
Unacceptable transport impact (policy 8/2 of CLP 2006)	See 'Transport impact' and 'Highway safety' sections of my assessment.

9.3 The queries raised by Cllr McGerty (Ward Councillor) at the DCF were put to the applicant for a response. At the time of writing, a response has not been received from the applicant, however any response received prior to committee will be reported on the amendment sheet or as a verbal update. I have provided my assessment of the matters raised as follows:

Query	Considerations
Is the applicant able to provide a Tree Protection Method statement as part of the planning application?	The Tree Officer was satisfied on the previous application that these details could be secured through a condition worded so that these details would be agreed prior to the commencement of works. The Tree Officer would review these details. This is a standard approach that the Council takes on similar applications and I

	<p>cannot see reasonable grounds for taking a different approach on this application. The lack of information was not a reason for refusal on the previous application and this is a material consideration. In my opinion, there would not be reasonable planning grounds to require the applicant to submit this information prior to determination and such detail can be appropriately secured through the recommended condition.</p>
<p>Is the applicant able to provide a detailed plan of new planting and make this a firm undertaking during the planning process?</p>	<p>The Council does not usually require a detailed landscape scheme to be submitted prior to determination as these details can be agreed through the recommended condition. The Landscape Officer has recommended this approach. While I accept that the landscaping scheme is important to the character of the street and to the screening between the proposal and neighbouring properties, I am satisfied that there is sufficient space for an appropriate landscaping scheme to be put in place. Again, the lack of landscaping details was not a reason for refusal on the previous application, and I do not consider that there would be reasonable grounds to recommend refusal.</p>
<p>Could the grass verges on Queen Edith's Way be protected with Heras fences during construction?</p>	<p>Details of contractor parking and the control of this would be agreed through the condition for the Traffic Management Plan.</p>

	In my opinion, this would not be reasonable grounds to recommend refusal as the impact would be temporary.
--	--

10.0 CONCLUSION

10.1 While I acknowledge that there is strong local opposition to the current proposal, I must give strong weight to the decision on the previous planning application which is a material consideration. In my opinion, for the reasons I have given, the current proposal has overcome the previous reasons for refusal, namely affordable housing, cramped living accommodation, inadequate residents' cycle parking, and inadequate visitor car parking. I have assessed the proposal in full and no new material issues have been raised, in terms of residential amenity, response to the local context, environmental quality, transport impact and highway safety, and other matters. For these reasons, my recommendation is for approval subject to conditions and the completion of a S106 Agreement to secure planning obligations.

11.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to completion of the s106 Agreement and the following conditions:

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. There should be no collections from or deliveries to the site during the demolition and construction stages outside the hours of 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours to 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

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

5. No development shall commence until a programme of measures to minimise the spread of airborne dust from the site during the demolition / construction period has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme.

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

6. No demolition or construction works shall commence on site until a Traffic Management Plan has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The principle areas of concern that should be addressed are:
 - i. Movements and control of muck away lorries (wherever possible all loading and unloading should be undertaken off the adopted public highway)
 - ii. Contractor parking, for both phases (wherever possible all such parking should be within the curtilage of the site and not on street).
 - iii. Movements and control of all deliveries (wherever possible all loading and unloading should be undertaken off the adopted public highway)
 - iv. Control of dust, mud and debris, please note it is an offence under the Highways Act 1980 to deposit mud or debris onto the adopted public highway.

Development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details thereafter, unless any variation has been agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

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

7. 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)

8. If during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted a remediation strategy to the local planning authority detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with and obtained written approval from the local planning authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: In the interests of the protection of water resources.

9. Prior to the commencement of development (including demolition), and in accordance with BS5837 2012, a phased Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and Tree Protection Plan (TPP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought onto the site for the purpose of development. In a logical sequence the AMS and TPP will consider all phases of construction in relation to the potential impact on trees and detail the specification and position of protection barriers and ground protection and all measures to be taken for the protection of any trees from damage during the course of any activity related to the development, including demolition, foundation design, storage of materials, ground works, installation of services, erection of scaffolding and landscaping.

Reason: In the interests of tree protection (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/4).

10. Prior to the commencement of site clearance, a pre-commencement site meeting shall be held and attended by the site manager, the arboricultural consultant and local planning authority's Tree Officer to discuss details of the approved AMS.

Reason: In the interests of tree protection (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/4).

11. Prior to the commencement of development (including demolition), a written scheme of archaeological investigation (WSI) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This shall include:
 - i. the statement of significance and research objectives;
 - ii. the programme and methodology of site investigation and recording and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works; and
 - iii. the programme for post-excavation assessment and subsequent analysis, publication and dissemination, and deposition of resulting material.For land that is included within the WSI, no demolition/development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed WSI until an evaluation report in accordance with the programme set out in the agreed WSI has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of archaeology.

12. The approved AMS and TPP will be implemented throughout the development and the agreed means of protection shall be retained on site until all equipment, and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area protected in accordance with this condition, and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered nor shall any excavation be made without the prior written approval of the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of tree protection (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/4).

13. Prior to commencement of development (including demolition and site clearance), an ecological survey report shall be undertaken and submitted to the local planning authority for approval in writing. This shall include, as appropriate to the findings of the survey:
 - i. a construction environmental management plan (CEMP) including a risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities, practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction, and details of responsible persons and lines of communication; and
 - ii. ecological mitigation measures to be provided on site.Any approved CEMP shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period strictly in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Any approved ecological mitigation measures shall be implemented prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted (or in accordance with an alternative timescale that has been agreed in writing by the local planning authority) and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In order to protect important species and habitats.

14. Prior to commencement of development (other than demolition), a surface water drainage works scheme in accordance with the submitted Drainage Statement by JPP Consulting, Revision B dated February 2018, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The submitted details shall:

- i. include results of infiltration testing in accordance with BRE Digest 365 should be submitted to the local planning authority to identify whether infiltration of the surface water runoff would be feasible;
- ii. be designed such that there is no surcharging for a 1 in 30 year event and no internal property flooding or flooding off site for a 1 in 100 year event + 40% an allowance for climate change;
- iii. include detailed drawings of the entire proposed surface water drainage system, including levels, gradients, dimensions and pipe reference numbers;
- iv. 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
- v. 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.

The surface water drainage scheme shall be completed in accordance with the agreed details prior to first occupation of the development, and shall be managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the agreed details and the management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: In the interests of surface water drainage.

15. Prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted, a hard and soft landscaping scheme shall be implemented in accordance with details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include:
 - a) proposed finished levels or contours; means of enclosure; car parking layouts, other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials; minor artefacts and structures (e.g. furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting); proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines indicating lines, manholes, supports); retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant;

b) planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate and an implementation programme;

c) a landscape maintenance and management plan, including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas;

d) boundary treatments indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatments to be erected.

Development shall be carried out and maintained in accordance with the agreed details. Any trees or plants that, within a period of five years after planting, are removed, die or become in the opinion of the local planning authority, seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced as soon as is reasonably practicable with others of species, size and number as originally approved, unless the local planning authority gives its written consent to any variation.

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

16. Notwithstanding the approved plans, details of the cycle parking shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The cycle parking shall be provided in accordance with the agreed details prior to first occupation of the development, and shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/6).

17. Prior to the commencement of construction of external surfaces, samples of the brick and hung tiles, and details of the brick mortar shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details thereafter.

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

18. Prior to the installation of balustrades, details of the materials and design 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 balustrades are an appropriate design (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/12).

19. Prior to the installation of windows, details of the window, glazing type and reveals 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 windows are an appropriate design (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/12).

20. The windows identified as having obscured glass on the approved plans shall be obscure glazed to a minimum level of obscurity to conform to Pilkington Glass level 3 or equivalent prior to first occupation of those units and shall have restrictors to ensure that the window cannot be opened more than 45 degrees beyond the plane of the adjacent wall, and shall be retained as such thereafter.

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

21. There shall be no access to the areas shown on the approved plans as 'green roof' other than for maintenance purposes. At no time shall these areas be used for amenity space.

Reason: To protect the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

22. Prior to first vehicular use of the vehicle access ramp hereby permitted, the roof covering the ramp shall be completed in accordance with the agreed details, and shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To protect the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

23. Prior to the commencement of development (other than demolition and site clearance), a noise insulation scheme detailing the acoustic noise insulation performance/specification of the external building envelope to reduce the level of noise experienced in the residential units (having regard to the building fabric, glazing, ventilation, internal plant related noise and external balconies/terraces) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme as approved shall be fully implemented and a completion report submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to first occupation of the units. The approved scheme shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To protect the amenity of future occupants of this property from the high ambient noise levels in the area (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13).

24. Prior to commencement of use of the vehicular access hereby permitted, the access where it crosses the public highway shall be laid out and constructed in accordance with the Cambridgeshire County Council construction specification, or in accordance with alternative details that have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The access shall be constructed with adequate drainage measures to prevent surface water run-off onto the adjacent public highway. The access shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to ensure satisfactory access into the site, and to prevent surface water discharging to the highway (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2).

25. Prior to commencement of use of the vehicle access hereby permitted, the visibility splays, access and manoeuvring areas shall be provided as shown on the approved drawings. The areas within the visibility splays shall be kept clear of all planting, fencing, walls and the like exceeding 600mm high thereafter. The access and manoeuvring areas shall be maintained thereafter free of any obstruction that would prevent a domestic vehicle from being able to manoeuvre with ease so it may enter and leave the property in a forward gear.

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

26. Notwithstanding the provision of Class A of Schedule 2, Part 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) (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).

27. No unbound material shall be used in the surface finish of the driveway within 6 metres of the highway boundary of the site.

Reason: To avoid displacement of loose material onto the highway in the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/2).

28. The on-site renewable and low carbon energy technologies as shown on the approved plans and as detailed in the '10% reduction in Carbon by LZC Onsite Energy or 10% Improvement in Energy Demand' letter from Green Heat Ltd dated 6 July 2017 shall be fully installed and operational prior to first occupation of the development (or in accordance with an alternative timescale agreed in writing by the local planning authority) and shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with a maintenance programme, which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the occupation of the development. The technologies shall remain fully operational in accordance with the approved maintenance programme, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

No review of this requirement on the basis of grid capacity issues can take place unless written evidence from the District Network Operator confirming the detail of grid capacity and its implications has been submitted to, and accepted in writing by, the local planning authority. Any subsequent amendment to the level of renewable technology provided on the site shall be in accordance with a revised scheme submitted to and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 8/16).

29. Prior to first occupation of the development, a water efficiency specification for each dwelling type, based on the Water Efficiency Calculator Methodology or the Fitting Approach sets out in Part G of the Building Regulations 2010 (2015 edition) shall be submitted to the local planning authority. This shall demonstrate that all dwellings are able to achieve a design standard of water use of no more than 110 litres/person/day. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the development makes efficient use of water and promotes the principles of sustainable construction (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/1 and Supplementary Planning Document 'Sustainable Design & Construction' 2007).

INFORMATIVE: Dust condition informative

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

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

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

-Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction

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

- 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

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.

INFORMATIVE: 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.

INFORMATIVE: 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.

In the event that the application is refused, and an Appeal is lodged against the decision to refuse this application, delegated authority is sought to allow officers to negotiate and complete the Planning Obligation required in connection with this development