PLANNING COMMITTEE **2ND OCTOBER 2019**

Application Number	17/0869/FUL	**Agenda Item**	
Date Received	16th May 2017	**Officer**	Charlotte Burton
Target Date	11th July 2017		
Ward	Abbey		
Site	19 - 21 Godesdone Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB5 8HR		
Proposal	Erection of a residential development containing five units (one 2xbed flats, three 1xbed flats and one studio unit) following demolition of the existing buildings on site		
Applicant	N/A c/o Agent		

SUMMARY	The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons: The proposal would provide an acceptable level of amenity for the future occupants The proposal would not have a significant adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties The proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the conservation area.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

1.1 The application site is located on the western side of Godesdone Road and is currently occupied by office/warehouse buildings. The buildings are in two elements, a large pitched roof element and a smaller set back pitched roof element. The buildings occupy the entire footprint of the plot aside from an area at the front of the smaller element where there is space for off street parking.

1.2 The site is located within a residential area characterised by mainly two storey terrace housing with small thresholds at the front. However, there are small pockets of commercial use such as the previous use of the site. No.72 Beche Road which is north of the site and on the corner of Godesdone Road and Beche Road is in commercial use. However, many of the commercial uses have been converted back into residential. Opposite the site is relatively recent housing infill development which replaced an office building.

1.3 The site is located within the Riverside and Stourbridge Common Conservation Area. The properties to the north of the site in Beche Road are identified in the Area Appraisal as 'Buildings Important to the Character'. However, none of the properties in Godesdone Road are identified as such. The site is within the controlled parking zone. There are no other relevant site constraints.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

2.1 The proposal is for the erection of a residential development containing five units (one 2xbed flats, three 1xbed flats and one studio unit) following demolition of the existing buildings on site.

2.2 The proposal follows on from a similar scheme that was refused planning permission. During the course of the current application, the appeal decision on the previous application was issued. The appeal was dismissed and the Inspector's report is a new material consideration. In light of this, the current application was revised to respond to the issued raised in the Inspector's report, and an amended proposal was submitted in May 2018. This included:

- redesign of the side element on the northern elevation from a formerly contemporary design to a more traditional form,
- reduced ridge height,
- redesign of the dormers and
- internal rearrangements.

2.3 A full re-consultation was held with local residents and consultees on the revised proposal, which is described below. Further revisions to the internal arrangements and building height were submitted in September 2018, which were also

subject to public consultation. Finally, amendments to the roof lights were received in October 2018.

2.4 The proposed scheme (as revised) would have the appearance from the street of two semi-detached properties, with features including a symmetrical pair of front doors and bay windows. The northern elevation would have a lowered and recessed gable element with a single storey bin and cycle store within a lean-to. The materials would be brick with tile roof and the front elevation includes lintels and sills, and a date stone on the northern elevation. The building would be set back from the road with space for a landscape buffer in front of the building.

2.5 The ground floor Flat 1 would have a separate entrance while Flat 2 on the ground floor and the upper floor units would use a communal entrance. The units would be arranged with three duplexes on the first and second floors. The ground floor flats would have access to the area at the rear of the site for private amenity space. Cycle parking and bin storage would be provided in the lean-to element with separate stores.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

3.1 As above, the current application follows on from a previous scheme for seven units (16/1002/FUL) which was dismissed at appeal. A copy of the Inspector's report is provided as an appendix. This scheme was refused by the Council on the grounds of the impact on the character of the area, the living conditions of the future occupants with particular regard to external amenity space, and the provision of cycle parking facilities. The Inspector dismissed the appeal on character and lack of amenity space grounds. The relevant sections of the appeal decision are referred to in the assessment below.

3.2 The relevant site history comprises:

Reference	Description	Outcome
16/1002/FUL	Erection of a residential development containing seven units (one 2xbed flat and six 1xbed flats) including bin and cycle storage, following the demolition of the existing buildings on the site	Appeal dismissed

09/1193/FUL	Recovering of existing roof with minor modifications.	APPROVED

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 2018 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan 2018	1, 2, 3, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 41, 50, 51, 55, 56, 57, 59, 61, 80, 81, 82.

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework March 2019 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014 Circular 11/95 (Annex A) Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard – published by Department of Communities and Local Government March 2015 (material consideration)
Supplementary Planning Guidance	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management

	Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012)
Material Considerations	<u>City Wide Guidance</u> Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010) Air Quality in Cambridge – Developers Guide (2008)
	<u>Area Guidelines</u> Riverside and Stourbridge Common Conservation Area Appraisal (2012)

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

6.1 The proposal seeks to justify a zero level of car parking provision within the site. Recent guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework and the IHT guidance on best practice in car parking provision moves away from maximum levels of provision and advises that parking provision for new residential development is based upon levels of access to a private car for existing residential uses in the surrounding area. It is advised that the Planning Authority should assess the impact of the proposal in regard to the guidance provided within the National Planning Policy Framework in tandem with the Local Plan Parking Standards as this may act upon the amenity of residents of the site.

6.2 Following implementation of any Permission issued by the Planning Authority in regard to this proposal the residents of the new dwelling will not qualify for Residents' Permits (other than visitor permits) within the existing Residents' Parking Schemes operating on surrounding streets.

6.3 Recommend conditions for restoration of the kerb and a construction management plan.

Environmental Health

6.4 No objection. Recommend conditions to control construction and delivery hours, piling and dust, and ground contamination.

Urban Design and Conservation Team

Comment on initial scheme 14.06.2016

6.5 Acceptable subject to conditions for windows and doors/joinery, roofing details, dormer details, window details and brick samples.

Comment on revised scheme 28.06.2018

6.6 The fairly traditional form and scale of the main block sit in the streetscape well and, given good materials & detailing, should work with neighbouring buildings. The minor block to the north west also works well in streetscape design terms and brings the scale down adjacent to the 'Sheep Shop'. Whilst the visible gable end is somewhat broad compared to traditional examples, the use of architectural devices [such as the dentil course at eaves] to help visually reduce bulk should work well.

6.7 Additional recommended conditions for stonework details, details of roof lights, and details of external decorative brickwork.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Archaeology)

6.8 No objection or requirements.

6.9 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:

- 36 Beche Road
- 56 Beche Road
- 62 Beche Road

- 64 Beche Road
- 68 Beche Road
- 70 Beche Road
- 3 Godesdone Road
- 7 Godesdone Road
- 9 Godesdone Road
- 12 Godesdone Road
- 17 Godesdone Road
- 20 Godesdone Road
- 22D Godesdone Road
- 43 Priory Road
- 30 Riverside
- 35 Riverside

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

<u>Comments on original submission:</u>

- Use is unsuitable for the area
- Over-development of the site and too many units
- The area is characterised by homes with gardens
- The proposal is larger in scale than neighbouring properties. The roof appears to be significantly higher and disproportionately large.
- The higher roof line would disrupt visual line of the street scene.
- The building will read more like a three storey building.
- The building extends much further back than the other buildings, which makes mass greater and presents expanses of brickwork on the side elevations.
- Loss of gap which provides sense of space and breathability which contribute to the conservation area.
- The different window styles make the building appear muddled and incoherent.
- Large dormer windows are not consistent with the front elevation of the other properties in the street.
- Contrived design of cutback corner which is evidence of over-development.
- Setback from the road is light and out of keeping.
- Buff brick would be overbearing.
- Cladding is out of character
- Slate would be preferred to metal roofing.
- Inadequate car parking.

- Little provision for bicycles.
- Loss of light to neighbouring properties.
- Significant loss of light and outlook, overshadowing and overbearing impact on Nos. 68 and 70 Beche Road, including impact on ground floor kitchen window of No. 70.
- Views from No. 70 Beche Road into the toilet bedroom and seating area would compromise privacy for future occupants.
- Overbearing impact on No. 17 Godesdone Road
- Overlooking bathroom, bedroom, dining room and garden of No. 64 Beche Road and other gardens along Beche Road.
- Size of the units are nearly all significantly below that of the current National Space Standards.
- Lack of outdoor space.
- Ground floor bedrooms will result in shuttered windows which have limited natural surveillance of the street.
- Inadequate bin storage. Management of bin storage needed.
- Bins would get in the way of bike storage.
- Impact of demand for on-street parking on residential amenity.
- Lack of information on location of contractors' compound which could be on the public highway.
- Impact of construction on amenity of neighbouring properties and public realm
- Impact on archaeology needs to be considered.
- Increase in noise and disturbance.
- Unsafe access for road users and pedestrians.
- Extension to 62 Beche Road is not shown on plans. Side window to back bedroom would be overlooked, as would garden.
- Tree in garden of No. 70 Beche Road is shown on plans, which has been removed.
- Errors in submission.
- Inadequate neighbour notification.

<u>Additional comments on first revised proposal:</u>

- Changes to revised proposal are minimal or only a mild improvement. Do not overcome previous concerns about overdevelopment and development being out of character.
- The staggered lean-to on the northern elevation is an amendment welcomed but the proposal would have an overbearing impact on Nos. 68 and 70 Beche Road in terms of outlook and daylight.

- The setback from the front and rear elevations should be increased to more like 2m to reduce the width of this element.

<u>Additional comments on final revised proposal:</u>

- Amendment to increase the height of the proposal is not supported.
- Revisions do not address previous objections and in some cases make the proposal worse.
- rearrangement of internal floors and including of obscure windows do little to address overlooking concerns

7.3 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations can be inspected on the application file.

8.0 ASSESSMENT

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

1. Principle of development
2. Context of site, design and external spaces (and impact on heritage assets)
3. Residential amenity
4. Refuse arrangements
5. Highway safety
6. Car and cycle parking
7. Drainage
8. Sustainability
9. Third party representations

8.2 The Inspector's decision to dismiss the appeal on the previous scheme (16/1002/FUL) is a relevant material consideration, which I have referred to in my assessment below as 'the appeal scheme'. It is important to recognise that the appeal decision was assessed against the development plan policies within the Cambridge Local Plan (2006). This policy context has changed since the adoption of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018. I have assessed the proposal against the adopted development plan however, I have given weight to the Inspector's decision where

the policies of the previous and adopted Local Plan are in alignment.

Principle of Development

8.3 The proposal would result in the loss of a commercial use. I understand the site was last occupied by Outspoken a cycle courier service. However, they have now moved out and the building is currently vacant. Nonetheless, the last lawful use of the existing warehouse building appears to be B8 use. The site is not a protected industrial site. The loss of the existing commercial use was accepted in the Inspector's decision and was found to be in accordance with policy 7/3 of the previous Cambridge Local Plan (2006) relating to the protecting of industrial/storage site.

8.4 The adopted Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 41 'Protection of business space' is a similar policy to 7/3 in protecting employment uses within B1(c), B2 or B8 use class, however the detail of the policy differs. The policy states that development (including change of use) resulting in the complete loss of employment uses will not be permitted unless the site is vacant and has been realistically marketed for a period of 12 months for employment use, including the option for potential modernisation for employment uses and no future occupiers have been found.

8.5 The applicant has stated that the site has been vacant for three units however, has provided no evidence that the unit has been marketed. Thus the proposal cannot demonstrate compliance with adopted development plan policy 41. Nonetheless, there are other material considerations that I must consider.

8.6 The applicant submitted a 'Cambridge Industrial Market Appraisal' report during the course of the application. This finds that, at the time of the report, there was just under 200,000 sq ft of industrial floor space available within 3 miles of Godesdone Road. The site provides only 1.2% of the total available industrial stock. The report concludes therefore its removal from the market would result in a negligible impact on the overall stock levels in the city.

8.7 The report finds that demand is generally being driven by the requirements of the knowledge-intensive market, who require

mid-tech space comprising offices, laboratories and warehouse uses. Over the last five years there has been a decrease in enquiries for city centre industrial units, such as the space available on Godesdone Road. Instead enquiries are focussing on out of centre locations or established industrial parks.

8.8 The applicant has also made the case that the site's location and the existing building are unsuitable for industrial use. They argue that the height of the subject property, power requirements and parking provisions all constrain the type of user who will wish to use the space, as a single storey unit is not favourable for most industrial / warehouse users. Furthermore, they say that occupiers require three phase power and a roller shutter loading door as minimum, which the subject property is unable to provide.

8.9 While I am unable to comment on the suitability of the building for reuse given the wide range of uses that could be considered under the lawful B8 Use Class, I do consider that the site's location is undesirable for potential occupiers. The site has limited on site car parking and is within the controlled parking zone, which restricts staff parking and deliveries. The site's location within is residential area is problematic as industrial occupiers are likely to have noise and operating hour restrictions to prevent statutory noise nuisance.

8.10 In my opinion, the proposed residential use of the site would be more compatible with the residential context of the site. The residential use is likely to generate less noise and disturbance, and patterns of use of the site would be more similar to the adjacent uses. Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35 lends support to considering the compatibility of adjacent uses, stating that 'People's health and quality of life needs be protected from unacceptable noise impacts by effectively and appropriately managing the relationship between noise sensitive development and noise sources through land use planning'.

8.11 In addition, the proposed residential buildings would lead to improvements to the visual amenity of the site. The existing building is not considered to make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. I have assessed the proposal in the relevant section below, and in my opinion the proposal would be appropriate to the conservation area. The residential character of the proposed buildings and

their response to the traditional terrace form would enhance the site, in my opinion. This would enhance the conservation area in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 61, in my opinion.

8.12 In summary, I have found that there is a conflict with policy 41 as the site has not been marketed, however there are other material considerations that overcome this and I have considered the policies within the development plan as a whole. My conclusions do not undermine policy 41, as all proposals should be considered on their own merits. In this case, I have considered the purposes of policy 41 to protect industrial sites and I consider that the loss of this small site would not have a significant impact on the availability of industrial sites. The constrained nature of the site is likely to make is a less desirable site for future occupiers.

8.13 In terms of the principle of residential development on the site, the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 3 'Spatial strategy for the location of residential development' supports new development in and around the urban area of Cambridge, creating strong, sustainable, cohesive and inclusive mixed-use communities, making the most effective use of previously developed land, and enabling the maximum number of people to access services and facilities locally. The site is previously developed and within an existing residential area, and therefore residential development is acceptable in principle.

8.14 For these reasons, the principle of development is acceptable.

Context of site, design and external spaces (and impact on heritage assets)

8.15 The site is located within a predominantly residential context where the built form is characterised by mainly two storey terrace housing with small front thresholds bound by low brick walls. The surrounding streets are predominantly 19th Century terraced housing of Gault-type brick and Welsh slate with a variety of detailing such as painted stone lintels & sills, fanlights above the main entrances and timber, vertically sliding sash windows. The building form is almost exclusively of two or two-and-a-half storey houses with pitched roofs. Opposite the site is a modern housing development which adds to the variety of housing in this location.

8.16 Aside from the built form, this area is also pocketed with commercial uses mainly located on the corner of streets or at the end of terraces. Nevertheless, as Godesdone Road is predominantly characterised by residential dwellings, the redevelopment of the site from its parcel storage and delivery use to residential would be compatible and potentially improve the street scene. Currently the site consists of a wide pitched roof building with an ancillary pitched roof element which set back and to the side. The building is low in height but of a commercial scale in terms of footprint which covers most of the plot. The demolition of the existing building would be acceptable in principle.

8.17 The proposed units have been designed to reflect the appearance of a pair of traditional dwellings which characterize the area. Contemporary versions of traditional forms have been reproduced within the vicinity, including on the opposite side of Godesdone Road. The front elevation includes bay windows, and the proportion and arrangement of windows, and the brickwork and window detailing respond positively to the character of traditional terraces. The front elevation has been set back from the footpath with space for a landscape buffer which would enhance the appearance of the site compared to the existing situation (details to be secured through a condition). The Conservation Team supports the proposal subject to conditions concerning details, and I have also recommended a condition for brick samples and mortar details.

8.18 The applicant responded to the reasons for refusal on the previous appeal scheme, and amended the scheme further during the course of the application, following receipt of the Inspector's appeal decision. I have provided an assessment of the proposal against the Inspector's appeal decision – which is a material consideration - below.

- *The proposed two and a half storey building which exceeded the height of No. 17 Godesdone Road despite the fall in ground levels and the properties along Beche Road would be excessive in height and would appear overly dominant in the street scene.*

8.19 The current proposal has reduced the ridge and eaves height by approximately 0.5m compared to the appeal scheme. As a result, the eaves are lower than the neighbouring No. 17

Godesdone Road. The window line would also be lower than No. 17. As such, the height relationship between the application scheme and the neighbouring proprieties would follow the fall in ground level and would fit in with the street scene.

8.20 The street elevations show that the ridge would be higher than No. 17. However, this is as a result of the depth of the building. The pitch of the roof slope would be similar the traditional terraces. The ridge line would not be overly prominent in the street scene, in my opinion, other than in the gap between the site and No. 72 Beche Road when the northern gable would be visible. I have explained below how I consider that the proposed lowered gable and lean-to element help to break up the mass of the building in this view.

- *The dormer windows on the front elevation add to the bulk and massing, and exacerbate the impact of the building.*

8.21 The appeal scheme had three dormer windows on the front elevation. These have been reduced to two dormers. These are a similar design to the appeal scheme and are stepped in from the eaves and down from the ridge. In my opinion, these are relatively modest in size and proportionate with the roof slope. Rather than adding bulk and massing, in my opinion the reduced number of dormers help to successfully break up the large roof scape.

- *The modern design of the lean-to element would not reflect the local character of the area and would appear as an incongruous addition to the street scene and the character of the conservation area.*

8.22 The appeal scheme had a contemporary lean-to with a mono-pitched roof over a timber clad element which was attached to the main part of the building by a flat-roof glazed link. Following the Inspector's decision, the lean-to element was comprehensively re-designed. The revised design includes a recessed and lowered pitched roof element and a lower cycle and bin store lean-to element with a cat-slide roof constructed in brick. This more reflects the form of traditional terraces and would be characteristic of subservient extensions. In my opinion, this successfully responds to the Inspector's concerns

and is a more appropriate design for the conservation area and street scene.

- *The excessive overall height of the northern gable elevation would be the main element of harm from this element as a large proportion of the end of the main part of the building would be shielded by the lean-to element.*

8.23 I share the concern of the Inspector that the overall height of the northern elevation could have the potential to harm the street scene. As above, the overall height has been reduced compared to the appeal scheme. However, the ridge would be higher than No. 17 Godesdone Road. In my opinion, the revised design including the lower pitched roof element and the cycle and bin store lean-to element more successfully breaks up the overall scale and mass of the gable elevation compared to the previous scheme. The pitched roof element covers a larger area of the gable elevation and is itself visually broken up by the lean-to element. In my opinion, the reduced overall height and the greater layering on the northern elevation, on balance, overcome the Inspector's concerns on the previous scheme.

- *The chamfered element at first and second floor levels would represent a contrived design, but would not harm the character and appearance of the conservation area owing to its limited visibility.*

8.24 The chamfered edge remains on the current proposal, however I share the view of the Inspector that the limited visibility from within the conservation area means that this would not result in harm.

- *The dormer on the rear elevation would add further bulk and massing and together with its shallow pitch would appear as an alien element.*

8.25 The dormer on the rear elevation has been removed.

8.26 In summary, I am satisfied that the proposal has overcome the Inspector's concerns on the previous scheme. The proposed building would be taller and deeper than the traditional terraces along Godesdone Road, resulting in a more expansive northern gable elevation and a larger roof scape. However, it would be

lower than the appeal scheme and the northern elevation would be broken up visually. The proposal has traditional forms and reflects the character of traditional terraced properties, such that – on balance – it would not harm the character and appearance of the conservation area. The Conservation Team supports the proposal subject to conditions which would secure high quality detailing. I have also recommended a condition for brickwork details and a sample of the roof tiles.

8.27 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 polices 55, 56, 57, 59 and 61.

Residential Amenity

<u>Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers</u>

8.28 The neighbouring properties are Nos. 68 and 70 Beche Road to the north of the site (the impact on the commercial property No. 72 Beche Road is not considered to be harmful), No. 17 Godesdone Road to the south, and the rear garden of No. 66 Beche Road, and residents within the wider area. I have assessed the impact on these properties below. I am not concerned about the impact on the properties opposite the side.

8.29 It is relevant that the Inspector concluded on the appeal scheme that, 'Whilst the proposed building would be larger than the existing buildings, given the juxtaposition between the existing dwellings and the proposed development, I consider that the impact on the surrounding dwellings, in particular 68 and 70 Beche Road, would not be significant as to warrant the withholding of planning permission' (paragraph 19). This is a material consideration that I have referred to in my assessment below.

- Impact on Nos. 68 and 70 Beche Road

8.30 These are attached two storey traditional dwelling with small rear gardens compared to the other dwellings to the west. The rear garden of No. 68 backs onto the site whereas to the rear of No. 70 there is a 1m wide rear passage between the boundary and site. The rear gardens are between 4.6m (No. 70) and 5.6m (No. 68) deep.

8.31 In terms of overbearing impact, currently the majority of the outlook ground floor windows in the rear elevations of these dwellings - which serve kitchens - is overlapped by the existing commercial building. For No. 70, the existing building covers the entire rear boundary. For No. 68, the existing building cuts across half the width of the rear garden. The depth of the proposed building would be similar to the appeal scheme. The bin and cycle store lean-to on the northern elevation would be approximately 2.2m high to the eaves compared to the existing building (3.3m) and the previous scheme (4m). The lower gable elevation would be approximately 4.5m high. This would be higher than the existing building and the lean-to element on the appeal scheme, but would be approximately 8.5m from the rear elevation of the neighbouring properties. The lower gable elevation would be seen against the mass of the main part of the building and would be visually broken up by the bin and cycle store lean-to. I am satisfied that the proposal would not have a significant overbearing impact compared to the existing situation or the appeal scheme, and would be acceptable. The proposed single storey rear projection would not have an overbearing impact on these properties.

8.32 In terms of overshadowing, the Inspector concluded that the appeal scheme would not have a significant adverse impact in terms of loss of light. The current proposal has a lower ridge height than the appeal scheme and the scale of the northern elements has been reduced. I am satisfied that the current proposal would not have a significant impact compared to the appeal scheme which was considered to be acceptable.

8.33 In terms of overlooking, there are no windows in the gable end of the main building.

- No. 66 Beche Road

8.34 This property has a long rear garden which adjoins the site's rear / western boundary, albeit separated by a passageway.

8.35 The proposed two storey rear elevation would be approximately 3m away from the site rear / western boundary and would be lower than the appeal scheme which was not considered by the appeal inspector to have an unacceptable overbearing impact. There would be a single storey rear element which has been introduced since the previous scheme. The single storey

element would have a pitched roof and a gabled western / rear elevation adjacent to the site boundary. This would be 4.3m high to the ridge and 2.3m high to the eaves. This would be separated from the garden boundary by the footpath. Due to the separation and the scale of the single storey element, I am satisfied that this would not have an unacceptable enclosing or overbearing impact on the garden of No. 66.

8.36 In terms of overshadowing, the proposal would be to the south east of the garden. The appeal Inspector did not conclude that the previous scheme would have a significant adverse impact. The current proposal is lower than the appeal scheme and I do not consider that the additional single storey element on the current proposal would have a significant overshadowing impact compared to the appeal scheme.

8.37 In terms of overlooking, due to the proximity and orientation of the rear elevation in relation to the garden of No. 66, there is potential for views into middle and rearmost parts of the garden. During the course of the application, the plans were amended so that two of the first floor windows on the rear elevation could be obscured to prevent views into the middle part of the garden without harming the amenity of the future occupants of those units. The two obscured windows would serve a bedroom and a staircase. I have recommended a condition to secure obscure glazing and fixed prior to first occupation. The remaining unobscured first floor window would serve the circulation space of Flat 3. I am not concerned about overlooking from this window as views would be towards the rearmost part of the garden of No. 66 which is less sensitive, there would be three first floor windows on the rear elevation facing towards the garden of No. 66 and other properties to the west along Beche Road. One of these would serve the main stair case and another would serve an entrance hallway for Flat 3. The appeal scheme included an unobscured bedroom window in a similar position, which was not considered by the Inspector to have a significant adverse impact on the nieghbouring garden.

8.38 The proposal includes four roof lights on the rear roof slope, including one on the roof slope of the lower gabled element. These would serve habitable rooms. The applicant has revised the plans during the course of the application to demonstrate that the base of the rooflights would be over 1.7m from the

internal finished floor levels. I am satisfied that there would be no significant overlooking from these rooflights and it is not necessary to condition these. I have recommended a condition for no windows to be inserted on the first floor rear elevation. The units would not have permitted development rights to insert further rooflights or dormers as the units are flats and not dwellinghouses.

- No. 17 Godesdone Road

8.39 This is a two storey property which has been extended in the roof with a flat roof dormer connecting to a three storey rear outrigger. There is a conservatory on the ground floor and long narrow rear garden. The existing building on the application site abuts the boundary with the conservatory and the rear garden.

8.40 The proposed development would not project beyond the rear of the existing conservatory. The south east elevation would be on the boundary. The first floor and attic storey elements would be chamfered away from the boundary. The ground floor element would include a lean-to element than links into the chamfered edge. The lean-to element would have a lower roof profile than the existing outbuilding. The side elevation would be approximately 2.7m high to the eaves so would not have an overbearing impact on the conservatory. The garden of Flat 1 would have a 1.6m high closer boarded fence forming the boundary with the garden of No. 17, which would be an improvement compared to the existing situation. Notwithstanding this, I have recommended a condition that this fence should be increase in height to a minimum of 1.7m in order to prevent overlooking. The development would be to the north of No. 17 so would not overshadow the conservatory or garden.

8.41 There are two bedroom windows at the first and second floor on the main part of the house. The back bedroom is served by one window out of which there are clear views of the existing building. As the footprint of the building would extend beyond the first and second floor windows, side elevation has been chamfered at 47 degrees. Whilst the chamfered edge would still conflict with the 45 degree ‘rule of thumb’ from the centre point of the first floor window, the impact over and above the existing is not considered to be significant in terms of enclosure and loss

of light. Furthermore, this is the same as the previous scheme which was found by the Council and the Inspector to have an acceptable impact on these windows. I have no reason to take a different view here.

8.42 There would be oblique views from the first floor unobscured window serving the circulation space of Flat 3, however I am not concerned that this would result in a significant loss of privacy given the separation distance, orientation and dense urban context.

- Wider area

8.43 The Environmental Health team has recommended conditions to mitigate the impact of construction on nearby residential properties. The Highways Authority has recommended a construction traffic management plan. I have assessed the car parking provision in the section below. I accept the advice of consultees that the impact on the wider residential area is acceptable subject to the mitigation measures to be secured through the recommended condition.

8.44 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 2018 policies 57 and 35.

<u>Amenity for future occupiers of the site</u>

8.45 The floor space of the proposed units is provided in the table below in comparison to the internal space standards set out in policy 50 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018. The initial plans fell short of the space standards. The revised plans were rearranged internally during the course of the application so that all units meet the space standards.

Unit	Number of bedrooms	Number of bed spaces (persons)	Number of storeys	Policy Size requirement (ml)	Proposed size of unit	Difference in size
1	1	2	1	50	53	+3
2	2	3	1	61	65	+4
3	1	2	2	58	77	+19
4	1	1	2	58	59	+1
5	1	1	1	37	37	0

8.46 Policy 50 also requires all new residential units to have private amenity space. The ground floor units (Flats 1 and 2) would have access to private amenity space to the rear. Flat 2 is a 2-bed unit which could be occupied by a family which generally has a greater need for private amenity space. The proposed terrace would be approximately 15.6 sqm which would provide useable space and an acceptable level of residential amenity.

8.47 The upper floor flats would not have private amenity space and therefore fail to meet policy 50. The Inspector found on the previous appeal scheme that the lack of amenity space for the upper floor units would give rise to unsuitable living conditions for the future occupants (paragraph 17). This was to some extent as a result of the limited size of the upper floor units. The Inspector stated that 'given the limited size of some of these flats (particularly flats 4, 6 and 7) the lack of external amenity space would give rise to an overall poor standard of living conditions' (paragraph 15).

8.48 Compared to the appeal scheme, the number of units has been reduced from 7 to 5 and the units have been increased in size to meet the internal space standards. The previous scheme included units as small as 32.2sqm (Flat 4), 34.8 sqm (Flat 6) and 37.2sqm (Flat 7). By comparison, the smallest unit proposed is the studio unit (Flat 5) which is 37sqm, and the other upper floor units exceed the space standards. As such, on balance, my opinion is that the lack of amenity space would not result in a poor standards of living conditions because the internal space available would be larger.

8.49 The size of the units means that the future occupants are likely to be individuals or couples who would have less need for private amenity space. The future occupants would be in close proximity of green spaces on Midsummer Common and along the Riverside. It would be difficult to provide balconies for the upper floor units given the conservation area status and the potential overlooking at the rear. In my opinion, these are material considerations which outweigh the lack of amenity space. I have also given weight to the desirability of redeveloping the industrial site to residential use which would be more compatible with the residential area.

8.50 I am satisfied that the units would be provide an acceptable level of residential amenity for the future occupants in other

regards. While two of the windows on the rear elevation would be obscure glazed (which limits the outlook), these windows serve a bedroom and communal stair well, and as such would be acceptable. The use of roof lights and dormers ensures acceptable light into the upper floor units. The landscaping at the front would provide a buffer in front of the ground floor bedroom windows to protect the privacy of the occupants. The cycle and bin stores would be convenient, as discussed in the relevant sections below.

8.51 In my opinion the proposal provides an acceptable living environment for the future occupiers, and I consider that in this respect it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 50 and 57.

Accessible Homes

8.52 The proposal does not include lifts to the upper floors and therefore fails to comply with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 51. The Council has received a viability appraisal from the applicant that seeks to demonstrate that the introduction of a lift would result in a loss of a unit which would make the proposal unviable. This is currently being reviewed by an independent consultant. An update will be provided on the amendment sheet.

Refuse Arrangements

8.53 The proposal includes a separate bin store within the lean-to element. The proposal shows the bin store with capacity for 2 x 660 litre bins and 1 x 240 litre bins. This provides a total capacity of 1560 litres which is below the requirement within the RECAP guidance for the number of units proposed which would be 1700 litres. However, having measured the store, I am satisfied that the 240 litre bin could be replaced by a larger 660 litre bin which would provide 1980 litre capacity. The store would be in a convenient location for the residents. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 57 in this regard.

Highway Safety

8.54 The proposal does not include vehicle access to the public highway and would remove an existing access. The Highways

Authority has not raised concerns that the access or impact of trips generated from the proposal would harm highway safety. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 81.

Car and Cycle Parking

- *Car parking*

8.55 The proposal is for car-free development. This is compliant with the Council's adopted maximum car parking standards which promote reduced car travel and sustainable transport modes. The site is within the controlled parking zone and the Highways Authority has advised that the future occupants would not be eligible for residents' parking permits. The proposal would not therefore put pressure on on-street parking within the vicinity.

8.56 The Highways Authority has not raised concerns on highway safety grounds and I have assessed the impact on residential amenity. The site is in a highly sustainable location close to the city centre, with public transport links on Newmarket Road and pedestrian/cycle links including along Riverside. The future occupants of the 1-bed units are likely to be individuals or couples, albeit the one 2-bed unit could be occupied by families. However, given the location, the future occupants would not be dependent on car travel.

8.57 I acknowledge the concerns of local residents, however it is a material consideration that the Inspector concluded on the previous appeal scheme that, 'Whilst I have no doubt that parking demand in the area is high, I am not convinced that the development would lead to parking issues which would amount to a significant highway safety or amenity issue' (paragraph 25). I have no reason to come to a different conclusion on the current scheme. For these reasons, in my opinion the proposed car-free development is acceptable in compliance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 82.

- *Cycle parking*

8.58 The proposal includes a cycle store within the lean-to element with space for 8 bicycles. This exceeds the Council's cycle parking standards. The spaces would be provided using Sheffield hoops. I am satisfied that the spacing of the stands

meets the Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010). However, the door from the street and the door between the bin store and the cycle store would be approximately 0.8m wide which is too narrow. The guidance requires these to be at least 1m wide. I have recommended a condition for this to be amended on the plans. Subject to this, in my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 57 and 82.

Drainage

8.59 The site is not within an identified area of surface water flood risk. The existing site is covered by buildings or hard surfacing. The proposal would include gardens and soft landscaping at the front of the site, which would increase the permeable area. I am satisfied that an acceptable surface water drainage scheme could be secured through conditions which could better the drainage on the site. Subject to this, in my opinion, the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 32.

Sustainability

8.60 I have recommended conditions to secure carbon reduction and water conservation measures in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 28 and 31. In my opinion, this condition is reasonable as the measures are likely to be achievable.

Third Party Representations

8.61 I have addressed the third party representations as follows:

Representation	**Response**
Comments on original submission:	
Use is unsuitable for the area	The site is within an existing residential area and I consider the proposed use to be more compatible with the surroundings that the existing industrial use. The principle of development is acceptable.
Over-development of the site and too many units	I have assessed the proposal in terms of its response to the

	site context, impact on neighbouring properties and quality of the living accommodation for future occupants. I have found these to be acceptable and therefore there would be no grounds on which to argue over-development.
The area is characterised by homes with gardens	While internally the building would be sub-divided into flats, externally the building is similar to a pair of traditional semi-detached properties and would have gardens at the rear. The gardens would be shorter than most that characterise the area however, would be more similar to the short gardens of Nos. 68-70 Beche Road.
The proposal is larger in scale than neighbouring properties. The roof appears to be significantly higher and disproportionately large.	I have addressed this in my report.
The higher roof line would disrupt visual line of the street scene.	The street scene along the western side has a staggered roof line due to the slope of the road. While the ridgeline would be higher than the neighbouring property, it would be a detached building. The ridge would be further back into the site due to the depth of the proposed building. The eaves line would be lower than the neighbouring property, which is more important from a street scene perspective, in my opinion. In my opinion, the proposal would continue to the variety in ridge heights

	within the area.
The building will read more like a three storey building.	I do not agree with this assertion. The eaves line would be similar to the neighbouring two storey properties. It is not uncommon for two storey buildings to have attic conversions including dormer windows. In my opinion, the building would read as a two storey building with an attic storey.
The building extends much further back than the other buildings, which makes mass greater and presents expanses of brickwork on the side elevations.	I agree that the building has a much deeper footprint than the traditional terraces which – combined with the higher ridgeline – has the potential to create an expansive gable end elevation. This comment was made on the original scheme with the contemporary lean-to element. I am satisfied that the revised proposal has overcome this concern. As I have set out in my report, I consider that the revised proposal with the layered lower gable and lean-to helps to visually break up the mass of the elevation.
Loss of gap which provides sense of space and breathability which contribute to the conservation area.	A gap would be maintained between the proposed building and the Beche Road terrace.
The different window styles makes the building appear muddled and incoherent.	This was a comment made on the original submission. The revised proposal includes timber two-pane windows on the front and rear elevations. This would respect the character of traditional terraces, and would include

	features such as reconstituted stone lintels and cills and a bay window. I consider this to be an appropriate design approach and high quality details would be secured through the conditions recommended by the conservation team.
Large dormer windows are not consistent with the front elevation of the other properties in the street.	I accept that there are no dormers on the existing traditional terraces. However, the proposed building with bay window reflects larger buildings within the area. As the number of dormers has been reduced compared to the appeal scheme, and the dormers have been set up from the eaves, I consider this would not harm the character and appearance of the conservation area. The proposal is a new build interpretation of the traditional forms rather than a replica.
Contrived design of cutback corner which is evidence of over-development.	I have addressed this in my report.
Setback from the road is out of keeping.	The proposed building would be closer to the pavement than the traditional terraces along Godesdone Road. However, it would retain space for landscaping which would be in keeping with the character of the street. I do not consider that this would harm the conservation area, and would be an improvement compared to the existing situation.
Buff brick would be overbearing.	The buff bricks would be in keeping with the character of

	the area. I do not consider that this would be overbearing. I have recommended a condition for a brickwork sample panel.
Cladding is out of character	The cladding was removed in the revised proposal.
Slate would be preferred to metal roofing.	The metal roofing was removed in the revised proposal.
Inadequate car parking.	I have addressed this in my report.
Little provision for bicycles.	I have addressed this in my report.
Loss of light to neighbouring properties.	I have addressed this in my report.
Significant loss of light and outlook, overshadowing and overbearing impact on Nos. 68 and 70 Beche Road, including impact on ground floor kitchen window of No. 70.	I have addressed this in my report.
Views from No. 70 Beche Road into the toilet bedroom and seating area would compromise privacy for future occupants.	There would be no direct views into windows or roof lights as shown on the revised plans. If needed, the future occupants could take measures to protect their own privacy, such as obscure glazed film.
Overbearing impact on No. 17 Godesdone Road	I have addressed this in my report.
Overlooking bathroom, bedroom, dining room and garden of No. 64 Beche Road.	I have assessed the impact on No. 66 which is the adjacent garden and a closer property. I have found the impact to be acceptable. I do not consider that there would be a greater impact on No. 64 which is located further from the application site. The first floor windows on the rear elevation would be obscured.

	There are no windows on the side elevation. There would be no significant views from the rooflights.
Size of the units are nearly all significantly below that of the current National Space Standards.	The units now meet the Council's internal space standards which align with the national Technical Housing Standards (March 2015).
Lack of outdoor space.	I accept that there is a lack of private amenity space which is contrary to policy 50. However, in my opinion there are other relevant material considerations. I have assessed this in my report
Ground floor bedrooms will result in shuttered windows which have limited natural surveillance of the street.	The ground floor bedrooms would provide natural surveillance. It is not uncommon for bedrooms or living rooms to be shuttered or curtained in order to protect the privacy of the occupants. I do not consider that the proposal would be highly unusual in this respect.
Inadequate bin storage. Management of bin storage needed	I have addressed this in my report. The moving of bins to and from the public highway for collection would be a management issue.
Bins would get in the way of bike storage.	The arrangements to access the cycle store via the bin store are not ideal, however I am satisfied that the bin store is large enough that adequate access to the cycle store could be maintained. Given the constraints of the site, I consider this to be an acceptable arrangement.
Impact of demand for on-street parking on residential amenity.	I have addressed this in my report.
Lack of information on location	Placement of a contractors'

of contractors' compound which could be on the public highway.	compound on the public highway would require the approval of the Highways Authority and would be separate to the planning permission.
Impact of construction on amenity of neighbouring properties.	The Environmental Health team has recommended a condition to restrict construction and delivery hours, piling and dust. I accept this advice that these conditions are necessary and sufficient to mitigate the impact of construction on neighbouring properties.
Impact on archaeology needs to be considered.	The County Historic Environment Team has advised that there are no requirements for archaeological evaluation works. This is consistent with the advice on the previous application and I accept this advice.
Increase in noise and disturbance.	I consider that the proposed residential use would have a lesser impact from noise and disturbance than the lawful industrial use.
Unsafe access for road users and pedestrians.	The red line of the application site does not include the public highway. The proposal would remove a vehicle access into the site which would enhance safety. The Highways Authority has raised no concerns on highway safety grounds.
Extension to 62 Beche Road is not shown on plans. Side window to back bedroom would be overlooked, as would garden.	I am not concerned about the impact on this property, which is too far from the site to be impacts in terms of overbearing and

	overshadowing, and there would be no overlooking.
Tree in garden of No. 70 Beche Road is shown on plans, which has been removed.	This was removed from the plans during the course of the application. I have assessed the proposal based on my site visit. I am s
Errors in submission.	I am satisfied with the quality of the submission.
Inadequate neighbour notification.	I am satisfied that the correct notification has been undertaken.
<u>Additional comments on first revised proposal:</u>	
Changes to revised proposal are minimal or only a mild improvement. Do not overcome previous concerns about overdevelopment and development being out of character.	Noted. I have assessed the revised proposal in the relevant sections of my report.
The staggered lean-to on the northern elevation is an amendment welcomed but the proposal would have an overbearing impact on Nos. 68 and 70 Beche Road in terms of outlook and daylight.	I have assessed this in my report.
The setback from the front and rear elevations should be increased to more like 2m to reduce the width of this element.	Officers recommended that the setback of the recessed lower gabled element on the northern elevation was increased in order to further breakdown the visual bulk and massing of the northern elevation, however this was not taken up by the applicant. I have assessed the proposal as submitted, and I am satisfied that – on balance – the northern gable elevation is acceptable.

8.62 I note the third party comments on the amendments submitted during the course of the application. The issues raised have been addressed in my assessment.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 The scheme has sought to address the reasons for refusal on the previous appeal scheme. The reduced height and the redesign of the lean-to element has addressed the Inspector's main concerns, as well as the reduced number of dormers.

9.2 The application must be assessed in the current policy context which – since the adoption of the new Local Plan 2018 – has raised new concerns, in particular compliance with the internal and external space standards, and the loss of the industrial use.

9.3 The scheme complies with the internal space standards, however the lack of external amenity space fails to comply. Nonetheless, in my opinion, the constraints of the site and the proximity to Riverside and Midsummer Common are also material considerations.

9.4 The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the site has been marketed for 12 months, however the constraints of the site and the computability of the industrial use with the residential area are material considerations that I have given weight to.

9.5 The impact on residential amenity of neighbouring properties was not raised as a concern by the appeal Inspector and I have provided assessment to show that the current scheme would not have a significant adverse impact.

9.6 For these reasons, my recommendation is for approval subject to conditions.

10.0 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. Submission of Preliminary Contamination Assessment:

   Prior to the commencement of the development (or phase of) or investigations required to assess the contamination of the site, the following information shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

   (a) Desk study to include:
   -Detailed history of the site uses and surrounding area (including any use of radioactive materials)
   -General environmental setting.
   -Site investigation strategy based on the information identified in the desk study.
   (b) A report setting set out what works/clearance of the site (if any) is required in order to effectively carry out site investigations.

   Reason: To adequately categorise the site prior to the design of an appropriate investigation strategy in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

4. Submission of site investigation report and remediation strategy:

   Prior to the commencement of the development (or phase of) with the exception of works agreed under condition 3 and in accordance with the approved investigation strategy agreed under clause (b) of condition 3, the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

(a) A site investigation report detailing all works that have been undertaken to determine the nature and extent of any contamination, including the results of the soil, gas and/or water analysis and subsequent risk assessment to any receptors
(b) A proposed remediation strategy detailing the works required in order to render harmless the identified contamination given the proposed end use of the site and surrounding environment including any controlled waters. The strategy shall include a schedule of the proposed remedial works setting out a timetable for all remedial measures that will be implemented.

Reason: To ensure that any contamination of the site is identified and appropriate remediation measures agreed in the interest of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

5. Implementation of remediation.

Prior to the first occupation of the development (or each phase of the development where phased) the remediation strategy approved under clause (b) to condition 4 shall be fully implemented on site following the agreed schedule of works.

Reason: To ensure full mitigation through the agreed remediation measures in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

6. Completion report:

Prior to the first occupation of the development (or phase of) hereby approved the following shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.
(a) A completion report demonstrating that the approved remediation scheme as required by condition 4 and implemented under condition 5 has been undertaken and that the land has been remediated to a standard appropriate for the end use.

(b) Details of any post-remedial sampling and analysis (as defined in the approved material management plan) shall be included in the completion report along with all information concerning materials brought onto, used, and removed from the development. The information provided must demonstrate that the site has met the required clean-up criteria.

Thereafter, no works shall take place within the site such as to prejudice the effectiveness of the approved scheme of remediation.

Reason: To demonstrate that the site is suitable for approved use in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

7. Material Management Plan:

Prior to importation or reuse of material for the development (or phase of) a Materials Management Plan (MMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The MMP shall:
a) Include details of the volumes and types of material proposed to be imported or reused on site
b) Include details of the proposed source(s) of the imported or reused material
c) Include details of the chemical testing for ALL material to be undertaken before placement onto the site.
d) Include the results of the chemical testing which must show the material is suitable for use on the development
e) Include confirmation of the chain of evidence to be kept during the materials movement, including material importation, reuse placement and removal from and to the development.

All works will be undertaken in accordance with the approved document.

Reason: To ensure that no unsuitable material is brought onto the site in the interest of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

8. Unexpected Contamination:

If unexpected contamination is encountered whilst undertaking the development which has not previously been identified, works shall immediately cease on site until the Local Planning Authority has been notified and the additional contamination has been fully assessed and remediation approved following steps (a) and (b) of condition 4 above. The approved remediation shall then be fully implemented under condition 5.

Reason: To ensure that any unexpected contamination is rendered harmless in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

9. No demolition or construction works shall commence on site until a traffic management plan has been agreed with the 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.

Thereafter, development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

10. No construction work or demolition work shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours and1300 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 2018 policy 35).

11. Except with the prior agreement of the local planning authority in writing, there should be no collection or deliveries to the site during the demolition and construction stages outside the hours of 0700 hrs and 1900 hrs on Monday Saturday and there should be no collections or deliveries on Sundays or Bank and public holidays.

    Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35).

12. In the event of the foundations for the proposed development requiring piling, no such piling shall take place until a report / method statement detailing the type of piling and mitigation measures to be taken to protect local residents noise and or vibration has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. 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 2018 policy 35).

13. 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 2018 policy 35).

14. Prior to commencement of external brickwork, the following details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:

a) a brickwork sample panel showing the brick type, mortar details and coursing; and
b) large scale drawings showing all external decorative brickwork, including (as appropriate), quoining, drip moulds, blind windows, plinths, niches, eaves & band courses, etc.
Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details thereafter.

Reason: To protect or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 56, 57 and 61).

15. Prior to the erection of cills and lintels, details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This shall include the source, colour, texture, coursing, mortar mix design, joint type and thickness and pointing technique. This information shall be in the form of large-scale drawings and/or samples. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details thereafter.

    Reason: To protect or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 56, 57 and 61).

16. Prior to the insertion of roof lights hereby permitted, full details including dimensions, materials, fixings & flashings, finishes and the like shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and retained as such thereafter.

    Reason: To ensure the roof lights are appropriate to the character and appearance of the conservation area (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 56, 57 and 61).

17. Prior to the commencement of roof tiling, samples of the slates shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and retained as such thereafter.

    Reason: To protect or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 56, 57 and 61).

18. Prior to first occupation, the windows identified as having obscured glass on the approved drawings shall be obscured to a height of at least 1.7m above the internal finished floor level to a minimum level of obscurity to conform to Pilkington Glass level 3 or equivalent 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 2018 policies 55, 56 and 57).

19. No windows shall be inserted in the first floor south west and north west elevations, other than in accordance with those shown on the approved plans.

    Reason: In the interests of residential amenity of neighbouring properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 56 and 57).

20. Notwithstanding the approved plan, the boundary fences shown on the approved plans shall be erected to a minimum height of 1.7m above the finished ground level of the site and shall be erected prior to first occupation of the units hereby approved. The fences shall be maintained to the minimum height thereafter.

    Reason: In order to prevent overlooking towards neighbouring properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 56 and 57).

21. Prior to commencement of development (other than demolition), a surface water drainage scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Before these details are submitted, an assessment shall be carried out of the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system in accordance with the principles set out in The National Planning Policy Framework and associated Guidance, and the results of the assessment provided to the local planning authority. The system should be designed such that there is no surcharging for a 1 in 30 year event and no internal property flooding for a 1 in 100 year event + 40% an allowance for climate change. The submitted details shall:

a. 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
b. 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.
Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details thereafter.

Reason: To minimise flood risk (Paragraph 163 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2018) and Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 31).

22. Prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted (or in accordance with an alternative timescale agreed in writing by the local planning authority), a hard and soft landscaping scheme for the in front of the building 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; boundary treatments; hard surfacing materials;
b) planting plans; written specifications; 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 and management responsibilities; and
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 2018 policy 59).

23. Prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted, carbon reduction measures shall be implemented in accordance with a Carbon Reduction Statement which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to implementation. This shall demonstrate that all new residential units shall achieve reductions in CO2 emissions of 19% below the Target Emission Rate of the 2013 edition of Part L of the Building Regulations, and shall include the following details:

A) Levels of carbon reduction achieved at each stage of the energy hierarchy;
B) A summary table showing the percentage improvement in Dwelling Emission Rate over the Target Emission Rate for each proposed unit;
Where on-site renewable or low carbon technologies are proposed, the statement shall also include:
C) A schedule of proposed on-site renewable energy technologies, their location, design, and a maintenance programme; and
D) Details of any mitigation measures required to maintain amenity and prevent nuisance.

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/low carbon technologies 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 and to ensure that development does not give rise to unacceptable pollution (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, Policies 28, 35 and 36).

24. Prior to the occupation of the first dwelling, a water efficiency measures shall be installed in accordance with 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) that has been submitted to and approved in writing by 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.

Reason: To ensure that the development makes efficient use of water and promotes the principles of sustainable construction (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 28).

INFORMATIVE: This development involves work to the public highway that will require the approval of the County Council as Highway Authority. It is an OFFENCE to carry out any works within the public highway, which includes a public right of way, without the permission of the Highway Authority. Please note that it is the applicant's responsibility to ensure that, in addition to planning permission, any necessary consents or approvals under the Highways Act 1980 and the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 are also obtained from the County Council.
No part of any structure may overhang or encroach under or upon the public highway unless licensed by the Highway Authority and no gate / door / ground floor window shall open outwards over the public highway.

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

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