

Application Number	21/01437/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	29th March 2021	Officer	Tom Gray
Target Date	25th June 2021		
Ward	Newnham		
Site	18 Adams Road Cambridge		
Proposal	Erection of 2no dwellings following the demolition of No.18 Adams Road		
Applicant	Professor Cathy Speed 3 Manor Court Grange Road Cambridge		

<p>SUMMARY</p>	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The siting, form, height, layout and design of the proposed dwellings is acceptable and responds positively to the character of the Conservation Area, would be appropriate to the surrounding pattern of development and character of the area and sufficient garden space is retained which is important to biodiversity interests. In addition, it would have no adverse impacts upon the character of the Bird Sanctuary (ARBS) as a protected open space. - The proposed development follows the ecology mitigation hierarchy by minimising harm upon the protected species and habitats and providing deliverable compensation and mitigation measures. - Sufficient space for replacement tree planting is retained within the site. Acceptable protection for the remaining trees. It is not considered that the proposed dwellings would significantly increase the likelihood of
----------------	--

	<p>tree removals taking place in the future.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed development would not result in significant adverse impacts upon residential amenity. - The proposed development would provide for a high-quality living environment for future occupiers. - The proposed development would provide appropriate refuse and car/cycle parking facilities and would not result in unacceptable highways impacts.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

0.0 ADDENDUM

0.1 Planning application reference 20/01437/FUL was considered at Cambridge City Council's Planning Committee meeting of 3rd November 2021. The committee resolved to defer the determination of the application to allow for a Committee Site Visit to take place prior to a future Committee Meeting.

0.2 An additional representation was received on behalf of the Chair of Adams Road Bird Sanctuary (Richard Buxton Solicitors). This is summarised as follows:

- Strongly object to proposal and legality of any decision to approve the application.
- Request that the application be withdrawn from consideration and inconsistencies with the Council's previous position reassessed. The current officer report fails to appropriately highlight that a previous application of very similar design (19/0831/FUL) was withdrawn following a recommendation of refusal. Urgent clarification needed for the Council's failure to issue the refusal decision notice. Inexplicable as to why the Council has changed its position so fundamentally.
- Request that a site visit be undertaken by Committee if this application continues to Committee.

- Failure to meet Policy 69 in terms of glass balconies facing the nature reserve at risk of bird strike. No detail at application stage to mitigate the harm.
- Sanctuary's privacy is a key element in the Conservation Area.
- Officer report fails to address fundamental issue that the proposal would result in the subdivision of an existing plot and the construction of two properties. Given that the Conservation Area Appraisal states that such a development is a key issue, we query whether this meets the S72 legislative requirements. It is also contrary to the reasons provided previously for refusal.

Previous withdrawn application 19/0831/FUL

- 0.3 Whilst it is noted that the previous application 19/0831/FUL was initially recommended for refusal on the basis of harm to the tranquillity, recreational and amenity value of the Bird Sanctuary in December 2019, no formal decision was issued. In reference to the tranquillity concerns, the agent raised a concern with regards the policy basis of this judgement as this is not listed within Policy 67 (Protected Open Space). Officers felt that a further site visit was necessary and was carried out in February 2020. Following this visit, it was considered that the impacts upon the ARBS were not one of tranquillity but one of visual amenity and character. It was advised that taller elements should be pushed back from this northern boundary. Whilst re-locating the proposed dwelling to the south west corner of the site could be explored, it was felt that this would likely result in tree impacts and neighbour amenity issues.
- 0.4 Following this site visit and discussion with the agent, it is understood that the applicant wanted to consider their options as to whether to withdraw or accept a refusal with a view to appealing. Instructions were received in October 2020 to withdraw the application with the intention to re-submit a revised scheme.
- 0.5 The current application has been assessed on the basis of the higher elements being re-sited and in light of the changes undertaken, it is not considered that any harm upon the character of the ARBS would result.

Sanctuary's privacy

- 0.6 Whilst the representation has drawn Officers attention to the mention of the Sanctuary's privacy within the Conservation Area Appraisal, notwithstanding that the context of this text is contained within the 'biodiversity' section of this appraisal and refers to principally the wildlife aspects of the Sanctuary, it is important to note that the proposed rear dwelling does not contain any windows/balcony on this northern elevation for a distance of approximately 16 metres and trees with the addition of a proposed green buffer zone would further reducing overlooking impacts. Therefore, taking all this into account, it is not considered that the proposal would detrimentally affect the privacy of the Bird Sanctuary.

Sub-division of garden land

- 0.7 The representation has raised concerns about the Officer report failing to consider the sub-division of the plot as a whole with reference to Policy 52 (Protecting garden land and the subdivision of existing dwelling plots). Whilst the Officer report considers each dwelling independently with reference this policy and character impacts, for clarity, the layout, form/height of buildings and retention of sufficient garden space are now discussed further.
- 0.8 The application site would involve the sub-division of one residential plot. The existing plot is of a substantial size, measuring approximately 70 metres deep. It is not unusual to find several dwellings deep within the Grange Road part of the Conservation Area, an example of which include No.14 and No.15 Adams Road. In addition, No.5 Clarkson Road, No.7, No.6 and No.1 Clarkson Close form a north-south axis of residential development in a very similarly sized area to that of the application site. Five dwellings including that of No.4 Clarkson Close occupy this space. Similarly, the layout of the proposed dwellings would be perpendicular to the highway and would effectively result in a development of three dwellings deep when taking into account the neighbouring dwelling of No.19 Adams Road. Therefore, it is not considered that the proposed layout would adversely impact the Conservation Area in accordance with Policy 52, 55, 57, 61 and 67 of the Local Plan 2018 and the NPPF 2021, and the legislative requirement

of Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

- 0.9 The sub-division of the existing residential plot would result in the reduction of No.18's existing garden land. Whilst this is the case, the existing site comprises approximately 4,750 sq metres, 4200 sq metres of which is garden land. Together, the proposed building footprints would occupy only approximately 25 per cent of the total application site area with approximately 750 sq metres of garden land for the rear plot and 1200 sq metres of garden land for the front plot. Whilst the available residential garden land would be reduced, very generous garden spaces around the proposed buildings would be maintained. Therefore, it is not considered that proposed development would adversely impact the Conservation Area in accordance with Policy 52, 55, 57, 61 and 67 of the Local Plan 2018 and the NPPF 2021, and the legislative requirement of Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
- 0.10 The form and height of the proposed buildings, whilst distinct from each other, would complement the various designs found within the Conservation Area, where both contemporary and traditional forms comprising of two and three storeys in height are found. Therefore, it is not considered that the proposed dwellings would adversely impact the Conservation Area in accordance with Policy 52, 55, 57, 61 and 67 of the Local Plan 2018 and the NPPF 2021, and the legislative requirement of Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
- 0.11 With regards criterion c and d of Policy 52, this is discussed in detail within the relevant residential amenity and parking provision sections of the Officer report. With regards criterion e, given the nature of the proposed development and the application site being situated outside of allocated sites for redevelopment, there is no detrimental effect on the potential comprehensive development of the wider area.

Committee Site Visit

- 0.12 An Officer-led Planning Committee site visit is scheduled to take place prior to the Planning Committee Meeting. Arrangements are still to be confirmed at the time of writing.

Bird strike impacts

- 0.13 As discussed within the Biodiversity section of the Officer report, it is considered that the application has been subject to the mitigation hierarchy and avoidance, minimisation and mitigation measures have been applied. With regards possible bird strike, balcony glazing is fairly low in height and located approximately 16 metres from the ARBS and window glazing at and above first floor levels is largely situated on the side elevations and would be conditioned to comprise specialist glazing to reduce the reflective properties of the glass, making this more visible to birds, and therefore reducing the chances of bird strike. Therefore, there is considered sufficient information to assess the application with regards bird strike and suitable mitigation is proposed to reduce any such impacts.

Other Matters

- 0.14 Correction: Paragraph 8.23 of the Officer report should read 'approximately 65 percent of the total area of the **front plot** for the proposed dwelling'.
- 0.15 Following planning consent 15/1044/FUL and variations to these approved plans under 18/0149/S73 and 20/01953/S73, extant planning consent exists for extensions to the existing dwelling. The proposed front house under the current application is considered to represent an improved design and an enhancement to the Conservation Area compared to the plans approved under these previous applications.
- 0.16 Correction: Paragraph 1.1 of the Officer report should read 'The closest Listed Buildings are of **No.9 Wilberforce Road** and No.60 and No.62 Grange Road'
- 0.17 Correction: Paragraph 8.87 of the Officer report should read 'the rear house would accommodate vehicles within the drive **and within the proposed garage**'

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site is situated within the Newnham Ward in the City of Cambridge. It is located within the West Cambridge Conservation Area.

The site is located adjacent to the Adams Road Bird Sanctuary (ARBS), designated as a Protected Open Space (Natural and Semi-natural Green Space) and City and County Wildlife Site within the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

The closest Listed Buildings are of No.60 and No.62 Grange Road and Buildings of Local Interest are identified along Adams Road and statutory protected trees (TPOs) are located within the site in addition to the nearby open space of Trinity Old Field. The site is situated outside of the controlled parking zone.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

2.1 The applicant proposes the erection of two dwellings following the demolition of No.18 Adams Road.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
15/1044/FUL	Demolition of garage. New extensions to west and east side of existing house	Permitted
15/1044/COND4	Condition 4 - Archaeology	Discharged
18/0149/S73	Section 73 application to vary condition 1 (Approved Drawings) of planning permission 15/1044/FUL (Demolition of garage. New extensions to west and east side of existing house) to correct the approved drawings to: 0228/P/110C, 0228/P/115 C, 0222/P/116 C and 0228/P/100.	Permitted
19/0831/FUL	Erection of 2no. dwellings following the demolition of 18 Adams Road	Withdrawn
20/01953/S73	S73 application to vary	Permitted

condition 1 (Approved Drawings) of planning permission 18/0149/S73 (Section 73 application to vary condition 1 (Approved Drawings) of planning permission 15/1044/FUL (Demolition of garage. New extensions to west and east side of existing house) to amend the approved drawings in order to make alterations to the design

21/02098/HFUL Installation of entrance gates to existing driveway Permitted

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 Plan 2018	Local	1 3 8 28 29 31 32 34 35 36 50 51 52 55 56 57 61 62 67 69 70 71 80 81 82

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

<p>Central Government Guidance</p>	<p>National Planning Policy Framework 2021</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance from 3 March 2014 onwards</p> <p>Circular 11/95 (Annex A)</p> <p>Planning Policy Statement – Green Belt protection and intentional unauthorised development August 2015</p> <p>Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard – published by Department of Communities and Local Government March 2015 (material consideration)</p>
<p>Supplementary Planning Documents</p>	<p>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Flood and Water</p> <p>Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007)</p> <p>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012)</p>
<p>Material Considerations</p>	<p><u>City Wide Guidance</u></p> <p>Air Quality in Cambridge – Developers Guide (2008)</p> <p>Arboricultural Strategy (2004)</p> <p>Balanced and Mixed Communities – A Good Practice Guide (2006)</p>

	<p>Biodiversity Checklist for Land Use Planners in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (March 2001).</p> <p>Buildings of Local Interest (2005)</p> <p>Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan (2011)</p> <p>Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (November 2010)</p> <p>Cambridge City Council Draft Air Quality Action Plan 2018-2023</p> <p>Cambridge City Council Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2011)</p> <p>Cambridge City Council Waste and Recycling Guide: For Developers.</p> <p>Cambridge City Nature Conservation Strategy (2006)</p> <p>Cambridge City Wildlife Sites Register (2005)</p> <p>Criteria for the Designation of Wildlife Sites (2005)</p> <p>Cambridge Landscape and Character Assessment (2003)</p> <p>Cambridge Walking and Cycling Strategy (2002)</p> <p>Cambridgeshire County Council Transport Assessment Guidelines (2017)</p> <p>Cambridgeshire Design Guide For Streets and Public Realm (2007)</p> <p>Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy (2011)</p>
--	--

	<p>Contaminated Land in Cambridge - Developers Guide (2009)</p> <p>Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)</p> <p>Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (2020)</p>
	<p><u>Area Guidelines</u></p> <p>West Cambridge Conservation Area Appraisal (2011)</p>

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

Recommends conditions regarding 2x2 metre visibility splays on western side of access; widening of driveway be constructed so that its falls and levels are such that no private water drains onto the adopted highway; driveway be constructed using bound material for a distance of at least 5 metres; no demolition or construction works shall commence on site until a contractors parking plan agreed and recommended informative.

Environmental Health

No objection. Recommends conditions regarding EV charge points; construction/demolition hours and deliveries; piling; dust condition and plant noise insulation informative.

Conservation Officer

Previous application 19/0831/FUL was supported by the Conservation Team.

Response to context:

Development in this area is well established.

The existing building on the site is architecturally appropriate for the location and contributes positively to the character and

appearance of the conservation area. Therefore, for the Conservation Team to support the loss of the existing building, any new structures proposed for the site must preserve, or enhance, the character or appearance of the conservation area. In this part of the Conservation Area, there is no specific building design but generally there are generous properties in large gardens. Although the two buildings would be sited close together, this can be seen in other plots within this part of the Conservation Area. There will be large gardens to the rear of each house which is important to the character of the area.

Layout: Acceptable.

North building moved further away from bird sanctuary than 2019 scheme but would not have any greater impact on the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

Trees and hedging are important to the character of the area. Siting of the two houses are therefore only supported subject to the retention of a large number of trees on the site and hedging along the boundary.

Scale and massing: Supported.

Two and a half storeys of the front house plus basement is similar in scale to other residential buildings in the area.

Additional three storeys for the rear house would result in a minimal increase in eaves (1.37m) and ridge (0.34m) height when compared to the existing building.

Open space and landscaping:

Trees and Landscape Officer may wish to comment on landscaping plan.

Limited views across Trinity Old Fields to rear house and first floor/roof of front house. Proposed views preserve character of conservation area in terms of buildings of this scale being on the site.

Elevations and Materials: Generally supported.

Front house - some concerns over dormer window on second floor which is a dominant feature on the south elevation which does not sit comfortably on the roof. Size of opening should be reduced so that it is smaller than those at first floor level. Use of materials which blend in with the roofing may mean that it recedes into the background. Details of this element plus brick sample panel and roofing materials should be conditioned. Rear house is of a very different character and modernity has been successfully executed in the design. Third floor has been moved away since the 2019 application and subject to materials and details is supported.

Some concern about large areas of glass on both buildings would cause some degree of light pollution. Proposed use of switchable opaque glass on rear house but glazing on front house is not labelled as such on glazed single storey element. Applicant should consider reduction in glazing.

Proposal preserves character or appearance of the conservation area, complies with policies 57 and 61 and para 190 of the NPPF.

Recommends conditions regarding sample panel of facing materials, roof covering materials and dormer details.

Historic England

No comments offered.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Tree Team)

Proposal fails to consider detrimental impact retained trees will have on usability of outside space and impact of shading on the southernmost property.

While the existing house is shaded by the trees towards the south of the site, it benefits from the large garden to the north. The new front house will also be shaded but will gain little benefit from light, space or views to the north resulting from the proposed new northern house. This will result in reasonable pressure to allow additional tree removals to improve light to the property and create usable outside space.

I have concerns about the availability of space outside tree canopies and root protection areas for sustainable drainage, access, storage of materials and construction.

Both the AIA and DAS refer to replacement planting for the proposed 9 trees requiring removal. I have not been able to locate any landscaping proposals but suggest that there is insufficient space to mitigate the loss of trees as this would only further reduce the amount of useable outside space and increase unwanted shading.

For the reasons above the proposal is not supported arboriculturally and it does not respect policy 71 of the Local Plan.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

Informal discussion only.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Officer)

Development is acceptable subject to foul and surface water conditions.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Nature Conservation Officer)

Comments made 27th May 2021

Request review by ecologist of the submitted PEA, as fails to identify that the site is adjacent to the Adams Road Sanctuary County Wildlife Site. This site is known to host protected species including nesting birds, bats, great crested newts and an important invertebrate assemblage.

Comments made on 1st July 2021

Revised PEA still fails to recognise the non-statutory wildlife site designation when considering designated sites, though identified later in evaluation section. Refute that the proposals are 'not of a scale to have a major negative impact'. Mitigation measures for light spill and potential bird window strike have been proposed in the accompanying Ecological Mitigation Plan. however, I do not see evidence as to how the site layout and building form has followed the mitigation hierarchy with respect

the designated site boundary. For instance, by positioning the buildings further from the boundary and reducing glazed elements that face Adams Road Sanctuary. I therefore object to the current proposal that does not meet Policy 69: Protection of sites of biodiversity and geodiversity importance.

In addition, proposal represents a significant loss of existing garden to built form and hardstanding. Suggest that if Defra Biodiversity Net Gain metric were applied the proposed additional woodland meadow and tree planting would still result in a net loss of site biodiversity.

Note presence of single bat roost in garage and this will require a Natural England licence and agreed mitigation as proposed.

If minded to approve, recommend conditions regarding Natural England licence.

Features proposed within Ecological Mitigation Plan such as bird boxes, hedgehog holes and hibernaculum would be appropriate but would not mitigate for the proposed proximity of the built form to the local wildlife site boundary.

If minded to support, principle of proposed specialist glazing and less than 1 lux lighting zone are supported and request condition that requires detailed glazing specification and an ecological lighting design strategy, including modelling of light levels.

Recommend condition with regards pre-commencement Construction Ecological Mitigation Plan to limit impacts on designated site.

Comments made on 27th August 2021

The BNG metric supplied evidences that the landscape scheme will deliver a small onsite BNG for the proposed development, subject to appropriate ongoing management. If minded to approve I would request standard ecology conditions to specify and secure the proposed biodiversity enhancement features.

Natural England

No comments to make.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Archaeology)

Site has been subject to an archaeological evaluation, the result of which indicate that significant archaeological assets will not be affected by the development. No condition necessary.

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:

- Adams Road Bird Sanctuary
- 7A, 10, 11, 13, 16 and 19 Adams Road
- 3, 7, 9, 15 and 30 Wilberforce Road
- 6, 11 and 19 Clarkson Road
- 5 and 31 Madingley Road
- 135 and 145 Victoria Road
- 32A Storeys Way
- 5 Merton Street
- 30 Eachard Road
- 2 Grange Court
- 13 Grange Road
- Church Rate Corner
- 4 Eltisley Avenue
- 2, 4 Hedgerley Close
- 64 Richmond Road
- 22 Riverside Place
- 76 Gilbert Road
- 11 City Road
- 22 Hertford Street
- Orchard House, Conduit Head Road
- 50 Thornton Close, Girton
- 80 High Street Girton

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Comments on original submission

Impact upon Adams Road Bird Sanctuary (Protected Open Space, City and County Wildlife Site)

- Adverse impact upon ecology and tranquility of this natural space, especially over construction period.
- Three storey design inappropriate. Visual impact upon users.
- Critical to respect a 30 metre green buffer building line around the Sanctuary to protect the habitat. Siting is inappropriate. Previous applications for even modest developments have usually been rejected or withdrawn.
- No details provided on visual impact on access lane to the Sanctuary.
- Increased noise and movements, increased artificial light on dark and tranquil nature of Sanctuary.
- Social harm to users of sanctuary.
- Will destroy uniqueness and public contribution of Bird Sanctuary.
- NPPF states that decisions should identify and protect tranquil areas which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value, mitigate and reduce noise from new development and limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation.
- Contribution to public and social amenity and likely impacts on it of light, noise, vehicle movement and other disturbance (Policy 52), importance of Sanctuary and its large surrounding gardens to Conservation Area (Policy 61).
- Dominate entrance track.
- Harm the character of open space of environmental and/or recreational importance, and conflict with Policy 67.
- Open space identified for protection in the 'Natural and Semi Natural Green Space' category. Third highest among the 41 sites identified.
- Visual amenity issue as main bulk still evident from adjacent reserve path and accessway with light spill.
- Noise from gravel drive and construction works.
- Loss of significant portion of garden adjacent to ARBS harms its character (Policy 61)
- Glazing would be 20 to 25 metres from ARBS and would have near-continuous effect of the visible movements within this domestic space.

Sustainability

- Destruction of perfectly good 1930s house
- Embodied carbon.
- Demolition of house and replacement contravenes the Council's own Climate Change Strategy

Biodiversity impact

- 2018 ARBTECH appraisal is inadequate. No thorough assessment. Dismissive of biodiversity and simplistic to propose a few bat and bird boxes, reptile refugia and hedgehog domes. Policy 69 put onus squarely on the developer to demonstrate that proposals will not have an adverse effect on biodiversity. Approval can only be granted if the benefit of the development outweighs the impacts to the nature conservation site and if the harm can be mitigated. Developer has done neither.
- Mitigation measures are wholly inadequate and demonstrate lack of due diligence and failure to take seriously the value of such a green space for biodiversity and as a public amenity.
- A full ecological impact assessment should be part of the application process.
- The few mitigation measures proposed are inappropriate in scale and will unlikely create a net gain in biodiversity.
- Applicants had two versions of the same ecological assessment document.
- Substantial hazard to bird populations which get confused by large tracts of reflective glass
- Scale of disruption caused by construction period especially between March and August (breeding season). Likely that longest established breeding birds would be lost forever.
- Formidable cost to natural environment and wildlife.
- Important to green infrastructure, linking open fields and the Backs. Conflict with Policies 8, 52, 55, 57 and 61 of the Local Plan in terms of local pattern of development, the height, scale, form and massing of planned buildings, and the character of the relevant conservation area.
- Loss of open ground removes foraging territory for a diversity of creatures and reduces unrestricted flight paths into the reserve.

- Diminish richness of biodiversity observed in and around the Sanctuary.
- Likely to disturb bird populations and priority habitat, and fails to minimise ecological harm (Policy 70).
- Light pollution on species.
- Loss of biodiversity in garden.
- Contrary to Policy 69 and 70 of the Local Plan.
- Adverse impact on CiWS and CWS (Policy 69)

Impact upon Conservation Area/heritage assets

- Underutilized garden acts as a habitat buffer zone and West Cambridge Conservation Area Appraisal highlights huge contribution that unusually large private gardens make to the amenity and conservation value.
- Handsome house positively contributes to character of West Cambridge Conservation Area.
- Design not appropriate and visible.
- Development is out of scale with surrounding houses which are mostly set in large gardens.
- Building would not add further quality to the conservation area and would not be akin to the natural surroundings and format of the bird sanctuary.
- Scale of building would cover almost 60% of the site in buildings and hard surfacing. 1926 map as identified by the Conservation Officer does not set a precedent for a development of this scale.
- Out of character and style of local area, with reference to Policy 51 and 57. Does not have a positive impact on the area.
- Demolition of front building should be the last resort.
- Irreplaceable damage to special nature of Conservation Area.
- At odds with the nature of this site.
- Positioning any house to eliminate the typical long back gardens is damaging and out of keeping with the distinctive local character and pattern.
- 2016 inspector's judgement on a site similarly adjoining the Bird Sanctuary (on the northern side) stated that '[This] part of the Conservation Area is distinguished by long straight roads with properties set in discernible building lines with large detached properties situated towards the front of the individual plots. Behind the frontage there [are] large rear gardens that provide a

leafy backdrop' (Inspector Graham Chamberlain, Appeal Ref: APP/Q0505/D/16/3157264).

- Conservation Area Appraisal stressed importance of large green spaces, hedges and areas of woodland.
- Rear house seems only 2m back from previous application. No other property in this stretch of conservation area stands three deep in from the road. Will degrade vital green buffer and materially narrow important green corridor.
- With regards scale, massing and alignment and loss of garden space, visual effect may affect view of listed Grange Rd buildings.
- Inadequate response to its context (Policy 55).
- Heritage statement submitted is incomplete.
- Street view image confirms that development would be a single structure and wholly out of proportion with anything else in the Conservation Area.
- Concerns about housing density.

Impacts upon trees

- Likelihood of tree management applications succeeding.
- Concerned about the survival of mature trees along No.16's boundary.
- Trees although not having their root protection areas within the area of the proposed building would likely be felled, given that No.19 Adams Road has large trees a considerable distance and was allowed to be felled. Trees along Sanctuary boundary would face similar threat and are still growing.
- Trees and hedgerows at risk. Loss of pear tree is regrettable. Trees along Sanctuary boundary may be earmarked for felling as they grow. Intended fate of valued wester hedgerow is unclear.
- Concern with regard to future felling of trees and fate of hedging (Policy 71)
- Additional conflicts with trees (Policy 55 and 71)

Landscaping

- Proposed landscaping has not been carefully designed. Artificial new hard landscaped areas will relate poorly to ARBS.

- Paving close to T15 and T17 trees would pose a risk to these and would be heavily shaded for the day. Should be accommodated elsewhere within the expansive site.
- Proposed planting along this boundary would take a long time to be established.
- No mention of protection for eastern hedge.
- Need to ensure south end of hedge was not damaged by vehicles turning into the drive
- New planting of trees would be inserted in an area already heavily shaded and dense with root systems, causing harm and nullifying any advantage that might have followed.

Neighbour amenity impacts

- Visual intrusion on privacy of No.16 Adams Rd, from glowing light and large areas of glass.
- Loss of amenity to occupants of No.16.
- Illuminated 3 storey dwelling would compete with height of trees and full light spillage would negatively affect tranquil location of No.16.
- Glazing of front building would also allow an open and illuminated view of occupants' indoor activities. More light pollution than existing dwelling.

Other matters

- Inaccurate visual representations. Misleading site plans.
- Most houses are in fact two storeys with attic accommodation. It is misleading to call them three storeys.
- Other houses around the Sanctuary stand well back from the border. Photographs submitted with the planning statement are deliberately misleading.
- Ancillary structures could be built in small amenity space in NW corner of plot.
- Multiply traffic.
- Public benefit would be minimal.
- Not explained what economic activities will become possible.
- Socially benefits contentious, at worst wholly wrong.
- No indication of length of time of threat of building work.
- Plans do not extend up to the gates on the drive

- Accurate plan needed to establish how long a vehicle could turn into the drive. Risk to cyclists and impact of construction vehicles/times with pedestrians.
- Does not make it clear that this is a County site not only as a City one.
- Divert resources from higher priority projects.
- Concerns regarding contradictory documents and intentions for boundary treatments, landscaping and tree protection. Unclear whether hedgerow on plot's eastern boundary would be preserved and whether reliable protection for trees growing within the Sanctuary if this development went ahead.
- Green corridor and wildlife site network protected from harm under Policies 8, 61, 67, 69 and 70 (NPPF 99, 100, 170, 174, 177, 180 and 9, 12 and 47). Reserve is key part of context, setting and surroundings of 18 Adams Rd and of the character and function of immediate area, and the development would conflict with Policies 52, 55 and 57.
- Insufficient mention of policies within submitted planning statement
- Article 4 Directive restricting permitted development was lodged prior to this application and is currently under consideration
- Second home could be located in the south-west quadrant of the garden.
- Protection needed of Sanctuary fence and its foundations.
- Use of precedent for future applications.
- Groundwater pollution to Sanctuary.

Comments on Updated Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Ecological Mitigation Plan

Ecological appraisal and mitigation information

- Selection of species differs greatly from Sanctuary records
- Omissions in the criteria for designation.
- Mitigation is inadequate and unenforceable.
- Mitigation plan focuses almost entirely on the construction phase and consists largely of generic measures with little or no consideration of longer term impacts of the removal of buffer zone habitats from the nature reserve.

- No data request has yet been made to CPERC no approach to ARBS.
- Neither ecological appraisal is adequate.
- Version of ecological report denied existence of any wildlife designation or larger issues of biodiversity anywhere near the site. Amended appraisal contradicts this. Mitigation measures proposed only minimal measures to protect the distinctiveness and precious resources of the land.
- Listing of a few bird sightings within 2km of the proposed building is extremely slight and unrepresentative.
- Do not have an informed sense of the environment and therefore are not in a position to make a judgement. Only a preliminary survey has been carried out and no evidence to purport their claims. Planning Statement is erroneous.
- Wildflower meadow mitigation measures lacks clarity and does not adequately offset the loss of undeveloped ground
- Lack of information regarding glass to mitigate bird strikes and impact of light pollution on current dark sky oasis
- Inadequacy of survey work in relation to invertebrates

Impact upon Protected Open Spaces

- Neither the planning statement nor appraisal identifies the ARBS as a protected open space (Policy 67). The character of the Sanctuary and indeed its viability as a nature reserve with a high diversity of species depends on the open spaces that surround it in the form of large gardens.
- Policy 67 also has provision for previously unidentified sites, regardless of ownership to qualify as protected open spaces. The gardens surrounding such space fulfil one or more of the three criteria for environmental importance in Appendix I of the Local Plan through their function as a vital buffer zone around an important nature reserve.

Comments on Biodiversity Net Gain Calculations and Mitigation Hierarchy

- Biodiversity metric does not take into account indirect impacts

- No mention of use in metric within national or local policy.
- User guides for metrics recommend that the tools be applied at the beginning of planning rather than tacked on at the end.
- No mention of how green buffer zone citing heathland and shrub:mixed shrub in moderate condition would be achieved and managed in the future. New lawn areas which are assumed to be seeded with a species rich flowering lawn seed mix but no reliable management planning and monitoring process to enforce this condition.
- Hedges have been excluded from calculations. Eastern hedge partially within property boundary so should have been included in the calculations.
- Inadequate level of analysis of retained trees.
- Answers to questions on strategic significance and ecological connectivity all the answers are firmly negative.
- Inadequacies of analysis
- Does not address impacts of amenity, biodiversity and environmental values of the ARBS. Even if species rich meadow managed as such, properly managed scrub habitat with access holes on eastern border and perhaps widened hedge on eastern boundary would not compensate for light, noise, dust, motor vehicles, visual presence and general disturbance arising so near to the ARBS. The existing buffer of amenity grassland and scattered trees is present in all but one of properties bordering the ARBS.
- If lawn areas are classed as amenity grassland in poor condition, then it cannot be difficult to argue for improvement in biodiversity.
- Only minor amendments have not addressed concerns. Seems that applicants chose the site, then design, then denied special qualities of surrounding land.
- BNG proposition is not practicable.
- Mitigation hierarchy hasn't been followed.
- Avoiding harm trumps minimising it. Impossible to constrain impacts during construction to an acceptable level.
- BNG assessment of gain based on thin desktop evaluation and past its validation date has been conceived on dubious assumptions.
- Dispute accuracy in figures, particularly with regards omission of trees, inclusion of floodplain glazing marsh and dismissal of strategic habitat and connectivity
- Agent states that site is capable of delivering gains and ecology officer states that it would require appropriate ongoing management.

- BNG inputs have major impacts on BNG calculations.
- Wider, indirect effects on biodiversity cannot be ignored
- Natural environment would be left in a worse state than before.
- Would destroy the peace of the Sanctuary and no amount of mitigation measures would address these.

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.

Local Member for Newnham

Cllr Dr Markus Gehring (Newnham) – Call it in to Committee if officers recommend approval. Very large development very close to one of the most sensitive nature areas in Newnham

8.0 ASSESSMENT

8.1 From the consultation responses and representations received the main issues are as follows:

1. Principle of development
2. Context of site, design and external spaces (and impact on heritage assets)
3. Setting of Listed Buildings
4. Carbon reduction and sustainable design
5. Biodiversity impacts
6. Tree Impacts
7. Residential amenity
8. Water management and flood risk
9. Refuse arrangements
10. Highway safety
11. Car and cycle parking
12. Other Matters

Principle of Development

8.2 The proposal is for the demolition of the existing dwelling and erection of two dwellings within the site.

8.3 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that planning decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan unless there are material considerations that indicate otherwise.

- 8.4 Policy 3 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 states that the overall development strategy is to focus the majority of new residential development in and around the urban area of Cambridge, creating strong, sustainable, cohesive and inclusive mixed-use communities. The policy is supportive in principle of new housing development that will contribute towards an identified housing need. The proposal would contribute to housing supply and thus would be compliant with Policy 3 of the Local Plan 2018.
- 8.5 Policy 52 of the Local Plan 2018 states that proposals for development on sites that form part of a garden or group of gardens or that subdivide an existing residential plot will only be permitted where:
- a. the form, height and layout of the proposed development is appropriate to the surrounding pattern of development and the character of the area;
 - b. sufficient garden space and space around existing dwellings is retained, especially where these spaces and any trees are worthy of retention due to their contribution to the character of the area and their importance for biodiversity;
 - c. the amenity and privacy of neighbouring, existing and new properties is protected;
 - d. provision is made for adequate amenity space, vehicular access arrangements and parking spaces for the proposed and existing properties; and
 - e. there is no detrimental effect on the potential comprehensive development of the wider area.
- 8.6 With this in mind, the principle of the proposal is acceptable subject to satisfaction against the above criteria. This will also be assessed against other relevant policies within the Local Plan 2018 in the below section.

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

- 8.7 Policy 55 of the Local Plan 2018 states that development will be supported where it is demonstrated that it responds positively to its context and has drawn inspiration from the key characteristics of its surroundings to help create distinctive and high quality places. Development will:

- a. identify and respond positively to existing features of natural, historic or local importance on and close to the proposed development site;
- b. be well connected to, and integrated with, the immediate locality and wider city; and
- c. use appropriate local characteristics to help inform the use, siting, massing, scale, form, materials and landscape design of new development.

8.8 Paragraph 7.3 within the supporting text states that the context of a development describes the setting of a site or area including land uses, open spaces, the built and natural environment and social and physical characteristics. Proposals for new development should create a scale and form that is appropriate to existing buildings, the public realm and open spaces, which complement the local identity of an area.

8.9 Policy 57 of the Local Plan 2018 states that high quality new buildings will be supported where it can be demonstrated they:

- a. have a positive impact on their setting in terms of location on the site, height, scale and form, materials and detailing, ground floor activity, wider townscape and landscape impacts and available views;
- b. are convenient, safe and accessible for all users;
- c. are constructed in a sustainable manner and are easily adaptable;
- d. successfully integrate functional needs such as refuse and recycling, bicycles and car parking;
- e. design measures to reduce the environmental impact of the buildings, such as renewable energy systems and other rooftop plant and services, in an architecturally integrated way;
- f. successfully integrate features such as meter boxes in an unobtrusive manner;
- g. position building names and numbers clearly and ensure that secure letter boxes are conveniently located and accessible from the street; and
- h. include an appropriate scale of features and facilities to maintain and increase levels of biodiversity in the built environment.

8.10 Paragraph 7.10 within the supporting text states that it is important that a proposed development is considered in terms of site location, height, scale, form and proportions, along with

materials and detailing, with the latter two linking directly to the quality and durability of a proposal.

- 8.11 Policy 61 of the Local Plan 2018 states that proposals should:
- a. preserve or enhance the significance of the heritage assets of the city, their setting and the wider townscape, including views into, within and out of conservation areas;
 - b. retain buildings and spaces, the loss of which would cause harm to the character or appearance of the conservation area;
 - c. be of an appropriate scale, form, height, massing, alignment and detailed design which will contribute to local distinctiveness, complement the built form and scale of heritage assets and respect the character, appearance and setting of the locality;
 - d. demonstrate a clear understanding of the significance of the asset and of the wider context in which the heritage asset sits, alongside assessment of the potential impact of the development on the heritage asset and its context; and
 - e. provide clear justification for any works that would lead to harm or substantial harm to a heritage asset yet be of substantial public benefit, through detailed analysis of the asset and the proposal.
- 8.12 The West Cambridge Conservation Area Appraisal highlights that the area provides an interesting mix of mainly late 19th or early 20th Century houses, in addition to more modern buildings. The largest Character Area is the Grange Road Area, which is defined by its spacious family houses of the late 19th Century, large gardens on generous plots with mature trees and planting and a high ratio of green open space to built area.
- 8.13 The Appraisal continues by adding that the layout is notable for the survival of many of the late 19th Century residential buildings in their original plots, which tend to be quite narrow but deep, providing large back gardens.
- 8.14 Policy 67 states that the development proposals will not be permitted which would harm the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space can be satisfactorily replaced or re-provision located close to the site.
- 8.15 The Conservation Area Appraisal identifies the ARBS as a City Wildlife Site which is important for environmental and

recreational purposes as well as the biodiversity contained within it.

- 8.16 Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires decision-makers to, in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
- 8.17 Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.
- 8.18 Paragraph 185 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2021 states that planning policies and decisions should also ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development. In doing so they should:
- a) mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development – and avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and the quality of life;
 - b) identify and protect tranquil areas which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason; and
 - c) limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation.

Demolition of the existing dwelling

- 8.19 The proposal would comprise the demolition of the existing building within the site. The dwelling was built in 1938 and the contribution it makes to the wider Conservation Area is considered to be positive.
- 8.20 Although this is the case, the building is not identified as either a positive building within the West Cambridge Conservation

Area Appraisal, nor considered to be a Building of Local Interest (BLI). Whilst the building is of a high-quality design and architecture, following a formal consultation with the Council's Conservation Officer, it is considered that subject to the design of any replacement dwelling preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, its demolition could be supported in principle in accordance with Policy 55, 57 and 61 of the Local Plan 2018.

Replacement dwelling ('Front House')

- 8.21 The West Cambridge Conservation Area is characterised by a number of different styles/eras, largely generous buildings with substantial gardens. The proposed replacement dwelling, described as the 'Front House' would be located on the footprint of the existing dwelling. The scale would be 2.5 storeys in height (and basement) and would comprise traditional materials, resulting in a proposal that would be similar in scale and design to other buildings within the locality. Therefore, it is considered that the proposal would sit comfortably within the site and in the context of the Conservation Area. In addition, it is considered that the overall form takes cues from early 20th Century established dwellings within the area whilst providing a glazed single storey element, contemporary in style, which whilst noting the Conservation Officer's concerns, is considered by virtue of its positioning and subservient scale, unobtrusive in the wider context.
- 8.22 Given its location behind the dwelling of No.16 Adams Road and substantial screening to the south and east of the application site, only limited long range views would be possible (from Adams Road and from Grange Road). Following a formal consultation with the Council's Conservation Officer, although some concerns have been raised with regards the southern elevation dormer size, in Officers' view, it is considered that this is proportional to the roofscape of the proposed dwelling and would be in-keeping with other nearby dwellings which consist of variations in dormer styles and sizes, most of which are more prominent within the street scene. Therefore, this is not considered sufficient reason to warrant refusal of the application and therefore subject to dormer details and materials being conditioned on any planning consent granted, the proposed Front House would not have a greater impact upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area than the

existing dwelling and is compliant with Policy 55, 57 and 61 of the Local Plan 2018.

- 8.23 Although the loss of the substantial rear garden space is noted, significant portions of the green space including grass, trees and shrubs would remain with the principal outside amenity spaces positioned to the south and west of the proposed dwelling. Whilst large portions of the site would comprise hardstanding and patio area, outdoor space would represent approximately 65 percent of the total area of application site for the proposed dwelling and therefore it is considered that the proposal would accord with the West Cambridge Area Appraisal in terms of ensuring that the character of large gardens within generous plots with mature trees and planting with a high ratio of green open space to built area is maintained.
- 8.24 In terms of bin and cycle store provision, the proposed dwelling would have both stores located at the plot's frontage. The location and details of which are considered acceptable in accordance with Policy 57 of the Local Plan 2018.
- 8.25 Taking all this into account, it is considered that the proposed development would have an acceptable siting, form, height, layout and design, which responds positively to the character of the Conservation Area, would be appropriate to the surrounding pattern of development and character of the area and sufficient garden space is retained that is important to biodiversity interests. Therefore, the proposal is compliant with Policy 52, 55, 57 and 61 of the Local Plan 2018.

Proposed new dwelling ('Rear House')

- 8.26 The proposed dwelling would be situated immediately behind the Front House, with a separation distance of approximately 5 metres between these two storey elements. Whilst it is noted that in plan form, the proposed dwellings would appear as one residential unit, the separation by virtue of a combination of hardstanding and hedging would when viewed within the site's context appear as two stand-alone, distinctive dwellings.
- 8.27 Although the dwelling would be clearly visible from the private access to the ARBS and to some extent, from the ARBS site itself, given its position within the site, public views would be

limited which would be partially hidden by mature vegetation bordering the Old Trinity Field/ARBS access.

- 8.28 Whilst several representations concerning this and the housing density are acknowledged, taking all this into account and given that it is not unusual to find generous detached dwellings being situated in close proximity to each other (as noted by the Council's Conservation Officer) within the Grange Road part of the West Cambridge Conservation Area, examples of which include those along the southern side of Adams Road and the cul-de-sac of Clarkson Close, it is not considered that the limited space between the buildings would harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in this instance.
- 8.29 As discussed previously, the West Cambridge Conservation Area is characterized by a wide range of different architectural styles, including contemporary designs such as No.9 Wilberforce Road. The proposed dwelling would consist of a flat roof form, with largely two storey elements, a single storey 'wing' and a three storey section set back approximately 16 metres from the ARBS to the north of the application site.
- 8.30 Whilst the overall design has steered away from a traditional approach, and the dwelling lacks subservience in scale and massing to the existing dwelling, the proposal is of high quality design, resulting in a unique and individual building which draws on the contemporary buildings found elsewhere in the wider context. The scale is such that there is minimal increase in eaves and ridge height when compared to the existing building. Moreover, when viewing the proposed dwellings from the eastern elevation, the ridge line would not extend beyond the Front House ridge height and in the context of 2.5 storeys and 3 storey properties along Adams Road including the substantial massing and scale of No.6 and No.10 Adams Road, it is not considered that the proposed dwelling would be out of keeping with the prevailing character of the Conservation Area, noting that the proposal would be in a much less prominent position when compared with other examples in the local area.
- 8.31 Whilst the Conservation Officer raises concerns about the large sections of glazing and it is agreed that light spill may result upon the wider area, particularly from first floor and second floor elevations, this could be adequately addressed requiring that specialist glazing be installed mitigating excessive light spill.

- 8.32 The area is characterized as having large rear gardens and the inspector noted in an appeal at 15 Clarkson Close that ‘behind the frontage, development is large rear gardens that provide a leafy backdrop to the street scene’ (APP/Q0505/D/16/3157264). A predominant section of the existing rear garden would be occupied by the proposed dwelling. Whilst this is the case, the building footprint would only equate to approximately 30 percent of the total plot size, with approximately 42 per cent of the site comprising soft landscaping, with the remainder hard landscaping (patio and driveway). Therefore, it is considered that significant portions of the green space including grass, trees and shrubs would remain with the principal outside amenity space positioned to the west of the proposed dwelling. Therefore, it is considered that the proposal would accord with the West Cambridge Area Appraisal in terms of ensuring that the character of large gardens within generous plots with mature trees and planting with a high ratio of green open space to built area is maintained.
- 8.33 Several representations have been raised with regards the impact of the proposal on the character of the ARBS, specifically in terms of noise impacts, light spill and visual impacts, and adverse impacts upon this designated protected open space. As discussed above, the proposed three storey element would be located approximately 16 metres from this northern boundary, with the two storey element situated approximately 8 metres from this boundary. A reasonable green buffer zone is proposed, details of species specification and mix would be conditioned on any approval granted. The mature trees within the boundary of the ARBS would be unaffected by the construction as demonstrated in the provided method statement within the arboricultural report, which will be conditioned as an approved document on any consent granted.
- 8.34 Whilst representations have raised the importance of the residential garden land which acts as a buffer and fulfills one or more of the criteria of land under Policy 67 of the Local Plan, the current application site is designated as residential garden land and is not vacant, therefore, whilst it may contribute to the biodiversity of the area, it cannot be considered as open space under this policy in its own right.
- 8.35 Following withdrawal of the previous application, 19/0831/FUL, the proposed three storey element has been re-sited further

from the ARBS, the two storey element re-sited a further 2 metres and the extent of glazing on the northern elevation substantially reduced. The current proposal is to a large extent solid walls, materials consisting of beige stone and metal. Although some glazing on this northern elevation is proposed, this would either be confined to the single storey wing, located approximately 28 metres from the ARBS boundary or modest amounts within the three storey element. Following a formal consultation with the Council's Nature Conservation Officer, the lux levels of the glazing would be controlled by condition, details of which would be required.

- 8.36 The proposed height of the two storey element would measure approximately 6 metres and whilst the width of this would be extensive, measuring approximately 24 metres, when viewed from the closest Bird Sanctuary path and noting the existing mature vegetation, following the case officer's site visit, it is considered that only glimpse views would be possible.
- 8.37 Taking all this into account, whilst the proposed dwelling would be partially visible, particularly in the winter months, the set back within the plot, the predominantly two storey scale of the dwelling and the limited light spill would not in the view of Officers result in unacceptable dominating impacts upon the character of the ARBS and would not adversely impact its natural recreational and environmental purposes. Given that this is the case, the proposal is not considered by Officers to have a social harm upon the purposes of this wildlife site nor its public contribution and its special characteristics/uniqueness.
- 8.38 Whilst concerns regarding noise impacts are acknowledged, given that the area surrounding the application site is largely residential in nature, comprising gardens and ancillary detached garden rooms, it is not considered that potential noise levels would have such an impact upon the character of the ARBS to warrant refusal of the scheme. It is noted that principal outdoor amenity spaces and the third storey balcony would be a substantial distance from the ARBS boundary in any case. To mitigate noise and dust impacts during the construction phase, a construction ecological mitigation plan and restrictions on construction times will be conditioned on any consent granted.
- 8.39 Moreover, attention has been drawn to previous developments close to the ARBS. Whilst each application is determined on its

own merits, the development at 1 Clarkson Close has a siting closer to the ARBS than this proposal and a similar length of elevation adjacent to the ARBS, whilst being 9 metres in height and was considered to not have an adverse impact on the City Wildlife Site in visual terms.

- 8.40 Other representations have referred to other previously proposed developments close to the Bird Sanctuary being either withdrawn or rejected. Although these comments are acknowledged, Officers are not aware of recent cases. Notwithstanding this, each case is determined on its own merits.
- 8.41 Concerns have been raised with regards the visual impact upon the ARBS access track and its proximity of such. The proposal would be sited approximately 13 metres from this access. Whilst the proposal as demonstrated in the supporting documentation would be clearly visible, given the transient purpose of the access to serve users of the ARBS, it is not considered that the proposal would have a detrimental impact upon the character of the ARBS in this instance.
- 8.42 In terms of bin and cycle store provision, the proposed dwelling would have a refuse area at the entrance to the plot. The bike store would be located to the side of the dwelling in relation to the proposed pool/gym area and is considered to be easily accessible to future occupiers. The location and details of these elements are considered acceptable in accordance with Policy 57 of the Local Plan 2018.
- 8.43 Taking all this into account, it is considered that the proposed development would have an acceptable siting, form, height, layout and design, which responds positively to the character of the Conservation Area, would be appropriate to the surrounding pattern of development and character of the area and sufficient garden space is retained which is important to biodiversity interests. In addition, it would have no adverse impacts upon the character of the ARBS as a protected open space. Therefore, the proposal is compliant with Policy 52, 55, 57, 61 and 67 of the Local Plan 2018 and the NPPF 2021.

Setting of Listed Buildings

8.44 Whilst representations concerning the impact upon the setting of Listed Buildings is acknowledged, no objections from the Conservation Officer are raised regarding this and given the substantial distance from the nearest Listed Buildings and the intervening vegetation and built forms, it is not considered that the proposal would result in harm to the setting of Listed Buildings in accordance with Policy 61 and 62 of the Local Plan 2018.

Sustainable design and construction

8.45 Policy 28 of the Local Plan 2018 seeks opportunities to integrate the principles of sustainable design and construction into the design of proposals.

8.46 A number of representations have highlighted that the demolition of the existing dwelling would have adverse impacts upon the environment in terms of embodied carbon. Whilst the loss of this dwellings fabric is acknowledged, given that the proposed design and construction of the replacement dwelling would be an improvement in sustainability terms over the existing dwelling and both this dwelling and additional dwelling to the rear would comprise ground source heat pumps and energy/water efficiency measures, the proposals are considered to be compliant with Policy 28 and 29 of the Local Plan 2018 and the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2020.

Biodiversity impact

8.47 Policy 69 of the Local Plan 2018 states that in determining any planning application affecting a site of biodiversity or geodiversity importance, development will be permitted if it will not have an adverse impact on, or lead to the loss of, part or all of a site identified on the Policies Map. Regard must be had to the international, national or local status and designation of the site and the nature and quality of the site's intrinsic features, including its rarity.

Where development is permitted, proposals must include measures:

a. to minimise harm;

- b. to secure achievable mitigation and/or compensatory measures; and
- c. where possible enhance the nature conservation value of the site affected through habitat creation, linkage and management.

In exceptional circumstances, where the importance of the development outweighs the need to retain the site, adequate replacement habitat must be provided.

Any replacement habitat must be provided before development commences on any proposed area of habitat to be lost.

- 8.48 The Adams Road Bird Sanctuary (ARBS) is one of a number of designated City Wildlife Sites and County Wildlife Sites based on substantive nature conservation interest against published criteria.
- 8.49 Paragraph 7.65 supporting text states that development would only be supported where it can be adequately demonstrated that proposals will not have an adverse effect on biodiversity; and that, where required, suitable mitigation measures are acceptable and deliverable. In addition, the potential for the enhancement of the site and adjacent habitats should also be explored. Proposals on or adjacent to a site of local conservation importance should not be granted without proper consideration of the potential to enhance the designated site's biodiversity through enhanced management, habitat creation or the formation of new linkages with adjacent habitat areas.
- 8.50 Paragraph 7.66 states that where development is proposed within, adjoining or which will otherwise affect a locally-designated nature conservation site, comprehensive surveys of the historic and existing biodiversity importance, a professional ecological assessment of the impact of the proposed development and details of measures to protect and enhance the habitat or species identified will be required.
- 8.51 Policy 70 of the Local Plan 2018 states that development will be permitted which protects priority species and habitats and enhances habitats and populations of priority species... If significant harm to the population or conservation status of a protected species, priority species or priority habitat resulting from a development cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated,

or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission will be refused.

- 8.52 The existing application site comprises amenity grassland, trees, shrubs and hedgerows. According to the updated Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA), the adjacent City Wildlife Site is designated on the basis of its broadleaved woodland, swamp, marginal vegetation and standing and running water.
- 8.53 Whilst several representations regarding the validity and reliability of this PEA have been received and the fieldwork survey was carried out in 2018, the updated report was dated September 2019 and therefore valid at the time this application was received. No objections from the Nature Conservation Officer with regards this are noted.
- 8.54 Following a formal consultation with the Council's Nature Conservation Officer, it is understood that the ARBS is known to host protected species such as nesting birds, bats, great crested newts and invertebrates. Following the revised PEA, concerns were raised from the Officer with regards the associated negative impact upon this adjacent site, and the lack of consideration of the mitigation hierarchy with respect the designated site boundary, for instance, by positioning the buildings further from the boundary and reducing glazed elements that face Adams Road Sanctuary. The Nature Conservation Officer therefore objects on the basis of Policy 69 of the Local Plan 2018.
- 8.55 Whilst these comments are acknowledged, following withdrawal of the previous application, the glazing elements at both single and two storey level closest to the ARBS have been removed from the proposal and the three storey element sited substantially further from the boundary than previously proposed and sufficiently outside the root protection areas of these adjacent trees. Whilst it is noted that the proposal would still remain fairly close to the ARBS, these changes are considered to avoid the indirect impacts such as bird strike implications associated with the glazing.
- 8.56 Given that the proposed dwelling would be sited on largely amenity grassland, the habitat value is considered to be fairly small. A reasonable green buffer, measuring approximately 6

metres in depth would separate the proposed hardstanding and built form of the proposed Rear House which would help to compensate for any loss of vegetation. In addition, replacement trees would be planted within the site which will be discussed in a later section. Therefore, it is considered that large parts of the grassland would be retained and enhanced through the proposed green buffer, the proposal is compliant with Policy 52 of the Local Plan 2018.

- 8.57 Following these comments, a biodiversity net gain metric has been provided. Whilst several representations have questioned the calculations and the inadequacy of the analysis, a formal consultation with the Council's Nature Conservation Officer confirms that the landscape scheme would deliver a small onsite net gain. In discussion with the Landscape Officer, a suitable soft landscaping scheme could be achieved within the site and therefore it is considered reasonable and necessary that this is conditioned in addition to securing its ongoing management.
- 8.58 In addition, measures to minimize harm could be secured via a construction management ecological condition to limit noise, dust and removal of vegetation outside of active seasons. In addition, specialist glazing and less than 1 lux lighting zone would be conditioned as part of the ecological lighting design strategy and therefore any impacts on the adjacent designated site could be minimized in accordance with Policy 69(a) of the Local Plan 2018.
- 8.59 As discussed above, whilst the proposed Rear House would be situated within 8 metres of the ARBS and the Nature Conservation Officer objects to the proposal, the ecological mitigation plan demonstrates that appropriate compensation measures could be achieved such as bird boxes and hedgehog holes in accordance with Policy 69(b) of the local Plan 2018.
- 8.60 Moreover, as demonstrated through the Biodiversity Net Gain calculations, the creation of the green buffer zone is considered to provide habitat creation and linkages to adjacent sites in accordance with Policy 69(c) of the Local Plan 2018.
- 8.61 With regards any direct harm upon protected species, a single bat roost in the garage has been identified and following a formal consultation with the Council's Nature Conservation

Officer, a condition requiring mitigation will be attached on any approval granted in accordance with Policy 70 of the Local Plan 2018.

- 8.62 Whilst several representations have been received with regards the adverse effects on biodiversity and the lack of mitigation, it is considered that on balance the supporting information has demonstrated that the proposal meets the criteria within Policy 69 and Policy 70 subject to the recommended conditions in addition to the green roof condition in accordance with Policy 31.

Tree Impacts

- 8.63 Policy 71 of the Local Plan 2018 states that development will not be permitted which involves felling, significant surgery (either now or in the foreseeable future) and potential root damage to trees of amenity or other value, unless there are demonstrable public benefits accruing from the proposal which clearly outweigh the current and future amenity value of the trees.

Development proposals should:

- a. preserve, protect and enhance existing trees and hedges that have amenity value as perceived from the public realm;
- b. provide appropriate replacement planting, where felling is proved necessary; and
- c. provide sufficient space for trees and other vegetation to mature.

- 8.64 A total of nine trees would be removed to enable the construction of the two dwellings. The two statutory protected trees (TPOs) within the site would not be impacted. Following a formal consultation with the Council's Trees Officer, whilst there is no objection to the loss of these nine trees, concerns have been raised regarding the lack of space within the site to mitigate the loss of trees via replacements and further reduction on the amount of useable outdoor space and resultant shading.

- 8.65 The existing dwelling is shaded by trees situated to the south of the site. Whilst this benefits from a large garden and private outdoor amenity space to the rear, by virtue of its position within the plot, closer to existing trees than the proposed dwelling

(front house), it is considered that habitable room windows are currently subject to substantial shading.

- 8.66 The proposed front house would be situated slightly further north within the plot and extensive glazing is proposed at ground floor level with additional rooflights so that it maximizes sunlight internally.
- 8.67 The Trees Officer and third party representations have raised concerns regarding the reasonable future pressure for tree removal resulting from the lack of usability of outside space and impact on shading. It is acknowledged, as demonstrated by the 'proposed site plan with tree survey' that the front house plot would be shaded for some parts of the day. However, small parts of the garden would be subject to no shading and at other times of the day, parts of the patio area would not be subjected to shading. Whilst the usability of the garden space would largely be dictated by the sun's movement, it is considered that given the extensive garden space and multiple patio areas proposed, on balance, it is not considered that the proposal would result in additional future pressure for tree removal in accordance with Policy 71 of the Local Plan 2018.
- 8.68 Whilst this is the case with the front house, the proposed rear house would be sited a reasonable distance away from trees along or close to the western boundary and therefore would not result in pressure for future tree removal as a result of existing trees on site.
- 8.69 Replacement tree planting is proposed as illustrated by the 'proposed site plan'. Whilst the Council's Trees Officer and third party concerns regarding insufficient space for these replacement trees and the potential for future reduction of usable outside space is acknowledged, the proposed replacement trees would be situated along the northern boundary and would contribute to the green buffer bordering the ARBS.
- 8.70 The illustrative replacement tree planting, whilst positioned fairly close to the proposed rear house, would in principle be acceptable due to the extensive 62 metres length by 6 metres depth of assigned buffer zone. Moreover, due to the area's northern orientation and the lack of fenestrations in the proposed rear house at ground and first storey level, it is

considered that a replacement tree planting scheme could be deliverable on the site without impacting the usability of the proposed dwelling's internal and external spaces, nor impacting the root protection areas of trees within or adjacent to the site. Therefore, subject to a soft landscaping scheme detailing species choice and specification, the proposal is in accordance with Policy 71 of the Local Plan 2018.

8.71 An arboricultural survey and impact assessment has been provided which demonstrates that the other trees within the site could be protected from harm. Whilst the Council's Trees Officer has concerns regarding the availability of space for drainage, access, storage of materials and construction, there is considered to be substantial space in the north west and north east parts of the site which in principle could avoid the canopies and root protection areas of the trees. In addition, service trenches and species techniques would be employed to avoid incursions into the root protection areas of trees as described in the Arboricultural report and method statement. Therefore, it is considered that the proposal is in accordance with Policy 71 of the Local Plan 2018.

8.72 Other concerns have been raised with regards the trees within the ARBS boundary, and the western hedgerow bordering the access track. It is considered that there is sufficient space to avoid impacts upon this hedgerow.

Residential Amenity Impact

Neighbour impacts

8.73 The proposed dwellings would be situated a substantial distance from the closest neighbouring dwellings, with respective distances to No.16 and No.19 Adams Road being approximately 40 metres from any first and second floor windows. Therefore, it is not considered that the proposed dwellings would result in significant overbearing, loss of light or overlooking impacts upon nearby neighbouring dwellings.

8.74 Whilst the separation distances between the two proposed dwellings are close, given that any windows serving habitable rooms on first and second floors of the proposed front house dwelling would be secondary or serve non-habitable room

windows, these could be conditioned to be obscured on any consent granted.

- 8.75 An extensive balcony/terrace is proposed on the second floor of the proposed rear house. Given that any views to the south would be blocked by the bulk and massing of the front house, limited overlooking of the front house's garden space would be possible and therefore not significant in this instance.
- 8.76 Concerns have been raised regarding the visual intrusion on No.16 Adams Road. Whilst extensive areas of glazing are proposed on the rear house's western elevation, given the substantial distance and intervening mature vegetation, it is not considered that the proposal would result in significant disturbance on account of excessive lighting/illumination. Moreover, as discussed previously, it is considered that the light spill could be further mitigated by conditioning specialist glazing on any approval granted.
- 8.77 Following a formal consultation with the Council's Environmental Health Officer, it is considered that in the interests of safeguarding neighbouring residential amenities, conditions could reasonably be attached with regards construction, noisy works and deliveries, piling, and dust on any consent granted in accordance with Policy 35 of the Local Plan 2018.
- 8.78 Following consultation with the Environmental Health Officer, due to the proposed close proximity of ground source heat pumps to each dwelling, it is considered that sufficient noise insulation should be provided to mitigate associated noise impacts. This will be conditioned on any approval granted in accordance with Policy 35 of the Local Plan 2018.
- 8.79 Therefore, taking all this into account, subject to conditions, it is considered that the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 35, 52, 55 and 56.

Future occupiers

- 8.80 The proposed dwellings would meet the requirements of a 6 bedroom, 8 person internal space standards in accordance with Policy 50 of the Local Plan 2018.
- 8.81 Whilst as discussed previously, the front house's outdoor amenity space would be subject to some shading, taking into account the amount of patio space available, it is considered that at times during the day, this amenity space would enjoy some direct sunlight. It is therefore considered that there is sufficient quality and amount of outdoor amenity space to provide residents with acceptable practicable space for play, rest and clothes drying in accordance with Policy 50 of the Local Plan 2018.
- 8.82 In terms of accessibility of the proposed dwellings, the proposal exceeds the requirements of Policy 51 (part M4(2) of Building Regulations compliance) by providing a ground floor WCs, level access, and lift access. Therefore, the proposal is in accordance with Policy 51 of the Local Plan 2018.

Integrated water management and flood risk

- 8.83 The application site is situated within Flood Zone 1 with no high surface water issues identified within the footprints of the proposed dwellings. Whilst third party representations concerning ground water pollution are acknowledged, no objection has been raised by the Council's Drainage Officer subject to foul and surface water conditions which would have regard for appropriate disposal of surface water. This is considered reasonable and necessary in accordance with Policy 31 and 32 of the Local Plan 2018.
- 8.84 Policy 31 requires all flat roofs to be green or brown providing it is acceptable in the historic environment. In this instance, extensive flat roofs are proposed to both dwellings and green or brown roofs would not detract from the character of the Conservation Area. Therefore, it is considered that this will be conditioned on any approval granted in accordance with this policy requirement.

Refuse Arrangements

- 8.85 Bin stores are considered to be appropriately located with easy direct access to the roadside. Taking into account the dragging distance involved of the existing dwelling, it is not considered that the additional distance required for the additional dwelling to the north would be unacceptable in this instance. Therefore, the proposal is considered to be compliant with Policy 57 of the Local Plan 2018.

Highways Safety

- 8.86 Whilst third party representations regarding the potential increase in traffic and risks to pedestrian/cyclists are acknowledged, following a formal consultation with the Local Highways Authority, it is considered that subject to a contractors parking plan, 2x2 metre pedestrian visibility splays and driveway construction conditions, the proposal is compliant with Policy 81 of the Local Plan 2018.

Car parking and cycle provision

- 8.87 The application site is located outside of the controlled parking zone. The proposed front house would accommodate car parking within the basement and the rear house would accommodate vehicles within the drive. Therefore, it is considered that there would be sufficient space within the plots of the proposed dwellings for at least two car parking spaces with turning capacity in accordance with Policy 52 and 82 of the Local Plan 2018.
- 8.88 Covered cycle parking would be provided in convenient locations as demonstrated and details of which would be conditioned on any consent granted in accordance with Policy 52 and 82 of the Local Plan 2018.

Other matters

- 8.89 Third party representations have been received with regards misleading information, planning policies and visual representations within the supporting documentation. This planning assessment has been subject to a site visit to the application site and ARBS and a thorough assessment of the

materials provided with input from specialist officers regarding technical matters.

- 8.90 Whilst minimal social and economic benefits of the scheme have been raised, as discussed, it is considered that the proposal accords with the policies within the Local Plan 2018.
- 8.91 Whilst comments regarding an Article 4 Directive removing permitted development rights are acknowledged, as this matter is ongoing and has not been determined, it cannot be given weight in the planning assessment process.
- 8.92 Third party representations regarding the length of time of building work and impact upon the ARBS fence and foundations are acknowledged. Whilst it wouldn't be reasonable to control the length of time for construction works to take place, conditions would be attached to mitigate impacts such as hours of work and control of noise and dust as discussed. Any potential impacts upon adjacent fences and structures is a civil matter outside of this planning assessment.
- 8.93 Following a formal consultation with the County Archaeological Officer, it is noted that the site has already been subject to investigation and no objections nor conditions are required in this instance in accordance with Policy 61 of the Local Plan 2018 and the NPPF 2021.
- 8.94 The applicant has agreed to the recommended pre-commencement conditions to be attached to any planning consent granted.

Planning balance and conclusion

- 9.1 In conclusion, the proposed development would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, the retention of sufficient garden land and considerable numbers of trees within the site. The scheme provides for a high-quality living environment for future occupiers whilst protecting neighbour amenities.

Whilst objections from the Council's Trees Officer and Nature Conservation Officer are acknowledged, it is considered that on balance, the scheme has demonstrated that the biodiversity

interests of the site and adjacent designated site would be both minimized, mitigated and compensatory measures provided in accordance with local plan policies. It is considered that there is sufficient space within the site for a deliverable tree planting scheme whilst not resulting in future pressure for tree removal.

For the reasons set out in this report, officers consider the planning application to be acceptable in accordance with relevant national and local planning policies, and having taken all relevant material considerations into account, it is considered that planning permission should be granted in this instance.

10.0 Recommendation

10.1 Officers recommend that the Planning Committee approve the application, subject to the following conditions:

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

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by 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 development shall commence until a scheme to minimise the spread of airborne dust from the site including subsequent dust monitoring during the period of demolition and construction, 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 36).

4. No development hereby permitted shall be commenced until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and in accordance with Cambridge City Council local plan policies, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is occupied.

The scheme shall include:

- a) Details of the existing surface water drainage arrangements including runoff rates for the QBAR, 3.3% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) (1 in 30) and 1% AEP (1 in 100) storm events;
 - b) Full results of the proposed drainage system modelling in the above-referenced storm events (as well as 1% AEP plus climate change) , inclusive of all collection, conveyance storage, flow control and disposal elements and including an allowance for urban creep, together with a schematic of how the system has been represented within the hydraulic model;
 - c) Detailed drawings of the entire proposed surface water drainage system, including levels, gradients, dimensions and pipe reference numbers, details of all SuDS features;
 - d) A plan of the drained site area and which part of the proposed drainage system these will drain to;
 - e) Full details of the proposed attenuation and flow control measures;
 - f) Site Investigation and test results to confirm infiltration rates;
 - g) Full details of the maintenance/adoption of the surface water drainage system;
 - h) Measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface water
- The drainage scheme must adhere to the hierarchy of drainage options as outlined in the NPPF PPG

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development can be adequately drained and to ensure that there is no increased flood risk on or off site resulting from the proposed development in accordance with Policy 31 and 32 of the Local Plan 2018.

5. No demolition or construction works shall commence on site until a contractors parking plan has been agreed in writing with the Planning Authority. The aim of the plan should be to demonstrate how the developer will control and regulate on street motor vehicle parking for the contractors and sub-contractors under taking the works.

Reason: in the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy 81 and 82 of the Local Plan 2018.

6. No development shall commence (including demolition, ground works, vegetation clearance) until a Construction Ecological Management Plan (CEcMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CEcMP shall include the following:
 - a) Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities.
 - b) Identification of biodiversity protection zones.
 - c) Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction (may be provided as a set of method statements).
 - d) The location and timings of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features.
 - e) The times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works.
 - f) Responsible persons and lines of communication.
 - g) The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) or similarly competent person.
 - h) Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs if applicable.

The approved CEcMP shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period strictly in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that before any development commences appropriate construction ecological management plan has been agreed to fully conserve and enhance ecological interests in accordance with Policies 57, 69 and 70 of the Local Plan 2018.

7. No development above ground level, other than demolition, shall commence until details of a hard and soft landscaping scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include: a) 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; The scheme must be developed and delivered in line with the Landscape Institute's current guidance on plant

biosecurity (Biosecurity Toolkit); b) a landscape maintenance and management plan, including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas. c) If within a period of five years from the date of the planting, or replacement planting, any tree or plant is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree or plant of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place as soon as is reasonably practicable, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation. d) boundary treatments indicating the type, positions, design, and materials of boundary treatments to be erected including provision for gaps in fencing for hedgehogs.

All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The maintenance shall be carried out in accordance with the approved schedule. Any trees or plants (existing retained or proposed) that, within a period of five years after planting (or replanting if previously failed), 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: To ensure the development is satisfactorily assimilated into the area and enhances biodiversity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 57, 59 and 69).

8. No operational plant, machinery or equipment shall be installed until a noise assessment and any noise insulation/mitigation as required has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Any required noise insulation/mitigation shall be carried out as approved and retained as such.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 36).

9. 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 unless otherwise previously agreed in writing

with the Local Planning Authority.

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

10. No construction or demolition work shall be carried out and no plant or power operated machinery 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, unless otherwise previously agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

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

11. In the event of piling, no development shall commence until a method statement detailing the type of piling, mitigation measures and monitoring to protect local residents from 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 assessed 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 statement.

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

12. The development, hereby permitted, shall not be used or occupied until, carbon reduction measures have been 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.

Where grid capacity issues subsequently arise, written evidence from the District Network Operator confirming the detail of grid capacity and a revised Carbon Reduction Statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The revised Carbon Reduction Statement shall be implemented and thereafter maintained in accordance with the approved details.

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).

13. No dwelling(s) shall be occupied until a water efficiency specification for each dwelling type, based on the Water Efficiency Calculator Methodology or the Fitting Approach set out in Part G of the Building Regulations 2010 (2015 edition) 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 and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To ensure that the development makes efficient use of water and promotes the principles of sustainable construction (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 28 and the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2020).

14. The development hereby approved, shall be carried out in strict accordance with the recommendations contained within the Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement prepared by A.T Coombes Associates Ltd, dated 20th March 2021 and the associated drawings (Appendix 4 - Tree Protection Plan).

Reason: To ensure that any works undertaken comply with

arboricultural best practice and minimise the impact on the tree's health and amenity in accordance with Policy 71 of the Local Plan 2018.

15. The 'Rear House', hereby permitted, shall not be occupied until the proposed first floor windows in the northern elevation of the 'Front House', have, apart from any top hung vent, been fitted with obscured glazing (meeting as a minimum Pilkington Standard level 3 or equivalent in obscurity) and shall be fixed shut or have restrictors to ensure that the windows cannot be opened more than 45 degrees beyond the plane of the adjacent wall. The glazing shall thereafter be retained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To prevent overlooking of the adjoining properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 57/58).

16. The development, hereby permitted, shall not be occupied or the use commenced, until details of facilities for the covered, secure parking of cycles for use in connection with the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include the means of enclosure, materials, type and layout. The facilities shall be provided in accordance with the approved details and shall be retained as such.

Reason: To ensure appropriate provision for the secure storage of bicycles (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 82).

17. The development, hereby permitted, shall not be occupied or the use commenced, until details of facilities for the bin stores provided in connection with the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include the means of enclosure, materials, type and layout. The facilities shall be provided in accordance with the approved details and shall be retained as such.

Reason: To ensure appropriate provision for the refuse for future occupiers (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 56, 57).

18. Notwithstanding the Ecological Mitigation Plan and Biodiversity Net Gain calculations provided, no development above ground level, other than demolition, shall commence until a biodiversity

enhancement scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Authority detailing the proposed specification, number and locations of internal and / or external bird and / or bat boxes on the new buildings and any other measures to demonstrate that there will be a net biodiversity gain on the site of at least 10%. The installation of the boxes and biodiversity enhancements as agreed shall be carried out prior to the occupation of the development and subsequently maintained in accordance with the approved scheme for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To provide ecological enhancements for protected species on the site in accordance with Policy 69 of the Local Plan 2018.

19. Notwithstanding the approved plans, the building, hereby permitted, shall be constructed to meet the requirements of Part M4(2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings' of the Building Regulations 2010 (as amended 2016).

Reason: To secure the provision of accessible housing (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 51).

20. The flat roofs hereby approved shall be a Green Roof or Brown Roof unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. A Green Roof shall be designed to be partially or completely covered with plants in accordance with the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 glossary definition, a Brown Roof shall be constructed with a substrate which would be allowed to self-vegetate. The roofs shall not be used as an amenity or sitting out space of any kind whatsoever and shall only be used in the case of essential maintenance/repair or escape in case of emergency.

Reason: To ensure that the development integrates the principles of sustainable design and construction and contributes to water management and adaptation to climate change (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 28 and 31)

21. Details for the long term maintenance arrangements for the surface water drainage system (including all SuDS features) to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of any of the buildings hereby permitted. The submitted details should identify runoff

sub-catchments, SuDS components, control structures, flow routes and outfalls. In addition, the plan must clarify the access that is required to each surface water management component for maintenance purposes. The maintenance plan shall be carried out in full thereafter.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory maintenance of drainage systems that are not publicly adopted, in accordance with Policy 31 and 32 of the Local Plan 2018 and the NPPF 2021.

22. No building hereby permitted shall be occupied until foul water drainage works have been detailed and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development can be adequately drained and to ensure that there is no increased flood risk on or off site resulting from the proposed development in accordance with Policy 31 and 32 of the Local Plan 2018.

23. Before starting any brick, stone or cladding work, a sample panel of the facing materials to be used shall be erected on site to establish the detail of bonding, coursing and colour, type of jointing shall be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The quality of finish and materials incorporated in any approved sample panel(s), which shall not be demolished prior to completion of development, shall be maintained throughout the development.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the Conservation Area and to ensure that the quality and colour of the detailing of the brickwork/stonework and jointing is acceptable and maintained throughout the development. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 57 and 61).

24. No roofs shall be constructed until full details of the type and source of roof covering materials and the ridge, eaves and hip details, if appropriate, have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority as samples and approved in writing. Roofs shall thereafter be constructed only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policy 61).

25. No dormers shall be constructed until full details, at a scale of 1:10, showing the construction, materials, rainwater disposal and joinery of the dormers, including their cheeks, gables, glazing bars and mouldings, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Dormers shall thereafter be constructed only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policy 61).

26. Prior to first occupation of the dwellings, the pedestrian visibility splay of 2m x 2m to the western side of the access (as shown on dwg 10 of the Transport Statement) shall be maintained free from obstruction exceeding 0.6m above the level of the adopted public highway for the life time of the development.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy 81 of the Local Plan 2018.

27. The widening of the drive way shall be constructed so that its falls and levels are such that no private water from the site drains across or onto the adopted public highway. Please note that the use of permeable paving does not give the Highway Authority sufficient comfort that in future years water will not drain onto or across the adopted public highway and physical measures to prevent the same must be provided.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy 81 of the Local Plan 2018.

28. The drive shall be constructed using a bound material for a distance of not less than 5m from the boundary of the adopted public highway (in this case the back of the footway) to prevent debris spreading onto the adopted public highway.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy 81 of the Local Plan 2018.

29. No permanent connection to the electricity distribution network shall be undertaken until a dedicated electric vehicle charge point scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall demonstrate that at least one active electric vehicle charge point will be

designed and installed with a minimum power rating output of 7kW for each residential unit.

The approved scheme shall be fully installed before the development is occupied and retained as such.

Reason: In the interests of encouraging more sustainable modes and forms of transport and to reduce the impact of development on local air quality (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 36 and 82 and the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2020).

30. The demolition of the garage building shall not in any circumstances commence unless the local planning authority has been provided with either:
- a) a licence issued by Natural England pursuant to Regulation 53 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 authorising the specified activity/development to go ahead; or
 - b) a statement in writing from the relevant licensing body to the effect that it does not consider that the specified activity/development will require a licence.

Reason: To safeguard protected species in accordance with Policy 57, 69 and 70 of the Local Plan 2018 and the NPPF 2021.

31. Prior to development above slab level, a detailed glazing specification shall be provided and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, detailing the specialist glazing and less than 1 lux lighting zones hereby approved in principle. All development shall be carried out in accordance with these details.

Reason: To conserve ecological interests. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 57, 69 and 70).

32. Prior to occupation a "lighting design strategy for biodiversity" features or areas to be lit shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The strategy shall:
- a) Identify those areas/features on site that are particularly sensitive for bats and that are likely to cause disturbance in or around their breeding sites and resting places or along important routes used to access key areas of their territory, for

example, for foraging; and

b) show how and where external lighting will be installed (through the provision of appropriate lighting contour plans and technical specification) so that it can be clearly demonstrated that areas to be lit will not disturb or prevent the above species using their territory or having access to their breeding sites and resting places.

All external lighting shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and locations set out in the strategy, and these shall be maintained thereafter in accordance with the strategy. Under no circumstances should any other external lighting be installed without prior consent from the local planning authority.

Reason: To conserve and enhance ecological interests. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 57, 69 and 70).

33. No works to any trees shall be carried out until the Local Planning Authority has received and approved in writing the full details of replacement tree planting. Details are to include number of replacements, species, size, location and approximate date of planting. The replacement planting shall be carried out as approved.

Reason: To require replacement trees to be approved, planted and subsequently protected, to ensure continuity of tree cover in the interest of visual amenity in accordance with Policy 71 of the Local Plan 2018.

INFORMATIVES

1. The granting of a planning permission does not constitute a permission or license to a developer to carry out any works within, or disturbance of, or interference with, the Public Highway, and that a separate permission must be sought from the Highway Authority for such works.
2. To satisfy the plant noise insulation condition, the rating level (in accordance with BS4142:2014+A1:2019) from all plant, equipment and vents etc (collectively) associated with this application should be less than or equal to the existing background sound level (LA90) at the boundary of the premises subject to this application and having regard to noise sensitive premises.

If noise sensitive premises are located within the site boundary, then the glazing of the premises and/or amenity areas will also be a location for the rating level of all plant not to exceed the existing background sound level (LA90).

Tonal/impulsive sounds and other sound characteristics should be eliminated or at least considered in any assessment and should carry an additional correction (rating penalty) in accordance with BS4142:2014+A1:2019. This is to prevent unreasonable disturbance to other premises. This requirement applies both during the day (0700 to 2300 hrs over any one hour period) and night time (2300 to 0700 hrs over any one 15 minute period).

It is recommended that the agent/applicant submits an acoustic prediction survey/report in accordance with the principles of BS4142:2014+A1:2019 "Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound" or similar, concerning the effects on amenity rather than likelihood for complaints. Noise levels shall be predicted at the application boundary having regard to neighbouring premises.

Whilst our requirements are for the rating level not to exceed the background sound level at the application site boundary, if the plant is roof mounted and nearby noise sensitive receivers are in closer proximity than the site boundary and / or the site boundary is afforded shielding from the application building parapet, the nearest noise sensitive receiver would be the required assessment location.

It is important to note that a full BS4142:2014+A1:2019 assessment is not required, only certain aspects to be incorporated into an acoustic assessment as described within this informative.

Such a survey / report should include: a large scale plan of the site in relation to neighbouring premises; sound sources and measurement / prediction points marked on plan; a list of noise sources; details of proposed noise sources / type of plant such as: number, location, sound power levels, frequency spectrums, directionality of plant, noise levels from duct intake or discharge points; details of noise mitigation measures (attenuation details of any intended enclosures, silencers or barriers); description of full acoustic calculation procedures; noise levels at a representative sample of noise sensitive locations and hours of

operation.

Any report shall include raw measurement data so that conclusions may be thoroughly evaluated and calculations checked.

3. To satisfy the dust minimisation condition, it is required that a dust management plan should reference and have regard to various national and industry best practical technical guidance such as:

Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction, version 1.1 (IAQM, 2016)

Guidance on Monitoring in the Vicinity of Demolition and Construction Sites, version 1.1 (IAQM, 2018)