

South Cambridgeshire Hall
Cambourne Business Park
Cambourne
Cambridge
CB3 6EA

t: 08450 450 500
f: 01954 713149
dx: DX 729500 Cambridge 15
minicom: 01480 376743
www.scambs.gov.uk



Date

To: Chairman – Councillor Mrs JM Healey
Vice-Chairman – Councillor JH Stewart
All Members of the Development and Conservation Control Committee

Dear Councillor

You are invited to attend the next meeting of **DEVELOPMENT AND CONSERVATION CONTROL COMMITTEE**, which will be held in the **THE COUNCIL CHAMBER** at South Cambridgeshire Hall on **WEDNESDAY, 2 JUNE 2004** at **10.00 a.m.**

Yours faithfully
GJ HARLOCK
Finance and Resources Director

AGENDA

Members should declare any interests immediately prior to the relevant item on the agenda.

Should Members wish to declare an interest in an item discussed after they have left the meeting, and wish also that that declaration be recorded in the Minutes, they should make their declarations clear to the Committee. (Members need only declare an interest in circumstances where there is an item on the agenda that may cause a conflict of interest.)

PAGES

1. Apologies
 2. Minutes of Previous Meeting
To authorise the Chairman to sign, as a correct record, the Minutes of the meeting held on 12th May 2004, copies of which have been made available electronically.
- PLANNING APPLICATIONS**
3. S/0759/04/F - Newton **1 - 6**
Dwelling on land rear of 10-16 Town Street for Upware Marinas Ltd
 4. S/0575/04/F - Castle Camps **7 - 10**
Conversion of barn into dwelling. Barn at Westoe Park, Bartlow for Grandchildren's Settlement Brigadier A M Breitmeyer 1987
 5. S/0606/04/LB & S/0607/04/F - Horseheath **11 - 14**
Alterations and extension – first floor weatherboarded extension above kitchen/diner with staircase to bedroom 2 with gable window and rooflight – the Thatch Cottage for Ms Ryan

6.	S/1210/03/F - Gamlingay Erection of free range egg production building, Woodview Farm, Mill Hill Potton Road, for Mrs L Titmus	15 - 18
7.	S/1209/03/F - Gamlingay Erection of free range egg production building (retrospective application), Woodview Farm, Mill Hill Potton Road, for Mrs L Titmus	19 - 22
8.	S/0784/04/F - Waterbeach Erection of two storey front extension, 53 Winfold Road, Waterbeach for Mr and Mrs M Chester	23 - 26
9.	S/0445/04/F - Landbeach Change of use of paddock to residential garden associated with 43a High Street and the erection of a mower and tractor store (retrospective application) at land to the rear of 43A High Street for B. York	27 - 32
10.	S/0679/04/F - Great Shelford House – land off the Hectare for David Reed Homes Ltd	33 - 38
11.	S/0612/04/F - Great Shelford House – land to the rear of 18 High Street for Mr and Mrs B J Mcauley	39 - 44
12.	S/0162/04/F - Great Shelford Erection of additional dwelling and garage at Westfield House, 11 Westfield Road for Mr and Mrs Longhurst-Goldspink	45 - 52
13.	S/0482/04/F - Willingham Extension to Existing Auction/Viewing Hall, 25 High Street, for Willingham Auctions	53 - 56
14.	S/0144/04/F - Willingham Extensions at 65 Church Street, Willingham for S. Hall	57 - 60
15.	S/0373/04/F - Over Extension, outbuildings and change of use at 8 Elstow Close, Over for J. Lamoon	61 - 64
16.	S/0765/04/F - Comberton Extension at 78 Barton Road, Comberton for Mr and Mrs Layton	65 - 70
17.	S/0797/04/F - Bar Hill Extensions and change of use at 110 Watermead, Bar Hill for S. Godsell	71 - 74
18.	S/0728/LB and S/0729/04/F - Histon	75 - 78

Alterations and extension, including replacement of conservatory / link with enlarged flat roofed garden room, conversion of outbuilding to annexe with two bedrooms, bathroom, shower room and kitchen; relocation of rooflight on south east elevation and installation of rooflight on north west elevation, glazing of existing door opening and the blocking off of existing window, replacement of French doors in sitting room with enlarged glazed opening and blocking up of high level window at 4-6 Church Street for Mrs J Elliott and Mr T Bomber

19.	S/0562/04/F - Teversham Extensions at 11 Fennec Close for Mrs. Abbas	79 - 80
20.	S/0483/04/F - Shepreth Erection of 18 metre high telecommunications tower and associated development at Barrington Park Equestrian Centre, Shepreth for Hutchison 3G Ltd	81 - 88
21.	S/0592/04/F - Toft Erection of B1 Offices, Bennell Farm, West Street, Comberton (In the Parish of Toft) for R W S Arnold	89 - 92
22.	S/0356/04/F - Haslingfield Extension at Chestnut House, 45 New Road, Haslingfield for J Miller	93 - 96
23.	S/0470/04/F- Bourn Removal of agricultural occupancy condition (condition 1 of planning permission S/0017/86/fF, Beck Farm, Toft Road for Mr C White	97 - 100
24.	S/2437/03/F - Orwell Change of use of agricultural buildings to B2 use with associated office facilities, Malton Farm, Malton Road, for R Hoole	101 - 106

INCIDENTAL ITEMS

25.	Appeals against planning decisions and enforcement action	107 - 114
26.	Public Footpath: Proposed diversion of footpath no. 6 in Bartlow	115 - 116
27.	Cambourne Section 106	117 - 120

PLEASE NOTE

Some development control matters in this Agenda where the periods of consultation and representation may not have quite expired are reported to Committee to save time in the decision making process. Decisions on these applications will only be made at the end of the consultation periods after taking into account all material representations made within the full consultation period. The final decisions may be delegated to the Planning Director.

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	2 nd June 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

S/0759/04/F – Newton**Dwelling on land rear of 10-16 Town Street for Upware Marinas Ltd****Recommendation: Approval****Site and Proposal**

1. The application site, which is a grassed area to the rear of Nos. 10-16 Town Street served by a grassed access between Nos. 6 and 10, extends to approximately 0.16 hectares (0.4 acres) excluding the access. It rises gently to the northwest. Surrounding development is a mix of 2-storey and 1½-storey dwellings save that No.16 Town Street is a bungalow. There is a 2 metre high hedge along the field boundary to the northwest, a 1 metre high chain link fence and gappy planting along the boundary to properties in Harston Road (the northeast boundary), a mix of post and rail, post and wire, feather edged boarding and hedging, all 1-1.5 metres high, along the boundary to properties in Town Street (the southeast boundary). The southwest boundary of the site is unmarked. There is a 1.5 metre high fence along the northeast/No.6 Town Street boundary and a post and wire fence along the southwest/No/10 Town Street boundary of the access. There is one first floor window in the rear of No.10 Town Street.
2. This full application, registered on the 8th April 2004 and amended by plan date stamped the 10th May 2004, proposes the erection of a 4-bedroom detached dwelling with an attached double garage/workshop. Two of the bedrooms would be provided in the roofspace. Three catslide roof dormers are proposed in the northwest roof slope. A rooflight is proposed in the southeast and southwest roof slopes. The dwelling would have eaves and ridged heights of 2.5m and 6.3m respectively. The amended plan replaced the originally proposed pitched roof dormers with catslide roof dormers.

Planning History

3. An application for a dwelling on the site was withdrawn earlier this year (**S/0328/04/F**).
4. Planning permission for a 4 bedroom bungalow with attached double garage on the site was refused in November 2002 under planning reference **S/1597/02/F** on the grounds that the use of the driveway would result in disturbance and loss of privacy to occupiers of the adjacent properties; and the development would be out of character with the linear pattern of development on the area and, by virtue of the required hard fencing along adjoining property boundaries, would have an adverse impact on the rural character of the area.

A subsequent appeal was allowed in June 2003 with the Inspector remarking that the development would not be out of keeping with the general form of development in Newton and there would be no unacceptable harm to the occupiers of surrounding dwellings resulting from the use of the bungalow or the access.

5. A full application for a house on the site was withdrawn prior to determination (**S/0821/02/F**).
6. Outline permission for 3 bungalows on the site was refused under reference **S/0439/90/O**. A subsequent appeal was dismissed.
7. An outline application for 3 dwellings on the site was refused under reference **S/2306/89/O**.

Planning Policy

8. The site is within the village framework of Newton, an infill village as defined in the Local Plan 2004.
9. Structure Plan 2003 **Policy P1/3** requires a high standard of design which responds to the local character of the built environment for all new development.
10. Local Plan 2004 **Policy SE5** states that residential developments within the village will be restricted to not more than two dwellings provided the site in its present form does not form an essential part of village character and development is sympathetic to the character and amenities of the locality.
11. Local Plan 2004 **Policy HG10** states that the design and layout of residential development should be informed by the wider character and context of the local townscape and landscape.
12. Local Plan 2004 **Policy HG11** relates to backland development and states that development to the rear of existing properties will only be permitted where the development would not:
 - Result in overbearing, overlooking or overshadowing of existing residential properties;
 - Result in noise and disturbance to existing residential properties through the use of its access;
 - Result in highway dangers through the use of its access; or
 - Be out of character with the pattern of development in the vicinity.

Consultation

13. **Newton Parish Council** recommends refusal and states "The plan still shows a substantial change to the original design with increased roof height together with increased massing of structure. The building has no sympathy for the surrounding area and is too big for the site. No attempt has been made to break down the building with architectural form or detailing. The Council recommends that the plan is rejected in its present form."

Representations

14. Objections have been received from the occupiers of 7, 9, 11 and 15 Harston Road and 2, 6 and 10 Town Street on the following grounds:

- The affect on the local environment and wildlife;
- The increase in height of the dwelling would have a significant impact on neighbours and would make the dwelling more visible and more imposing/intrusive;
- The affect on the character of the village;
- Loss of light to neighbouring properties;
- The plans are in direct contradiction to the conditions laid down by the Planning Inspector which states that there should be no windows in the northeast or southeast facing roof slopes;
- Overlooking and loss of privacy;
- Landscaping and boundary details need to be clarified before occupation of the development;
- The dwelling is too large for the site and out of character with surrounding properties;
- A legal definition is needed as to the liability for maintenance and upkeep of boundaries;
- There is still local opposition to the principle of erecting a dwelling on the site and the previous Inspector's arguments for allowing the appeal are debatable;
- Loss of views; and
- The proposal does not meet local need. Where are the starter homes Mr Prescott's department talks about? Where are the affordable homes land is being released for? Where are our children going to live?
- No guarantee that the Inspector would have granted the appeal if he had been faced with this much more dominating proposal.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

15. The key issues in relation to this application are:
 - The affect on neighbours; and
 - The affect on the character and appearance of the area.
16. The principle of erecting a dwelling on this site with access from Town Street has been established by the successful appeal (S/1597/02/F). The footprint of the dwelling now proposed is very similar to the footprint of the approved dwelling. The main difference between this scheme and the one allowed at appeal are: the ridge height of the dwelling is 1.1 metres higher in order to allow accommodation to be provided in the roof; dormer windows and rooflights are now proposed; and the proposed attached garage/workshop is wider than previously approved, resulting in an increase in height of this element from 4.2 metres to 5.4 metres.

17. I can understand local residents disquiet now that the previous approval for a bungalow is being followed by an application for a dwelling with accommodation in the roofspace. That said, this application must be considered on its merits.
18. There are a mix of dwelling types and sizes in the locality and, given the principle of erecting a dwelling on the site has already been established, I consider that the increase in height and the inclusion of the proposed dormer windows and rooflights would not cause serious harm in terms of the amenity of neighbours or the character and appearance of the area.
19. The condition attached to the permission for the bungalow relating to the insertion of openings in the northeast and southeast roof slopes referred to by the objectors requires planning permission for any openings in the northeast and southeast roof slopes. The condition enables the Local Planning Authority to retain control over the insertion of any openings in these roof slopes and thereby protect the amenity of neighbours. Whilst I would be concerned about any eye level window serving a habitable room in these roof slopes, the proposed rooflight in the southeast roof slope serves a landing and is high level. It would not therefore result in serious overlooking of neighbouring properties. The rooflight in the southwest roof slope and the proposed dormer windows in the northwest roof slope would also not result in serious overlooking of neighbouring properties. It would be important to apply a condition to any approval requiring a further permission for any further openings in the northeast or southeast roof slopes.

Recommendation

20. Approval as amended by drawing no. 002/1/re Rev.2 date stamped 10.5.04
 1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of five years from the date of this permission – RCA;
 2. No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of external surfaces of the property hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details – RC To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development.
 3. No development shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscaping works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority – RC To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development.
 4. All hard and soft landscaping 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 the programme agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority – RC To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development.
 5. The building shall not be occupied until the area shown for parking and turning of vehicles on the submitted plan no. 002/1/re Rev.2 date stamped 10.5.04 has been drained and surfaced in accordance with details submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and that area shall not thereafter be used for any purpose other than the parking and turning of vehicles – RC In the interests of highway safety.

6. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking or re-enacting that order with or without modifications), no windows, with the exception of the rooflight shown on drawing no. 002/1/re Rev.2 date stamped 10.5.04, shall be constructed in the north-east and south-east facing roof slopes of the development – RC To protect the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Reasons for Approval

1. The approved development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003: P1/3 (Sustainable Design in Built Development).

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004: SE5 (Residential Development In Infill Villages), **HG10** (Housing Design) and **HG11** (Backland Development).

2. The proposal conditionally approved is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations which have been raised during the consultation exercise:
 - Residential amenity, including loss of light and overlooking/loss of privacy;
 - Affect on the character and appearance of the area;
 - Affect on wildlife;
 - Need for clarification of landscaping and boundary treatments; and
 - Housing need.
3. All other material planning considerations have been taken into account. None is of such significance as to outweigh the reason for the decision to approve the planning application.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Planning file Refs: S/0759/04/F, S/0328/04/F, S/1597/02/F, S/0821/02/F, S/0439/90/O and S/2306/89/O

Contact Officer: Andrew Moffat – Area Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713169

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	2 nd June 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

S/0575/04/F – Castle Camps**Conversion of barn into dwelling. Barn at Westoe Park, Bartlow for Grandchildren's Settlement Brigadier A M Breitmeyer 1987****Recommendation: Approval****Departure Application****Site and Proposal**

1. The application relates to an L-shaped barn. Part of the barn is constructed of dark stained timber boarding over a black painted brick plinth with a dark corrugated sheeting roof. The other part is constructed of gault brick, boarding and flint with a corrugated sheeting roof. There is a flint wall with buttresses to the northwest which, together with the buildings, encloses a courtyard. The site also includes a strip of the adjacent wooded area beyond the flint wall to the northwest. Access is via an unmade single width estate track from Camps Road. Woodland extends to the north and west. Agricultural fields extend to the east and south.
2. This full application, received on the 19th March 2004, proposes the conversion of the barn to provide a 4-bedroom dwelling. All the accommodation would be provided on the ground floor. Clay tiles are proposed for the roof. With the exception of three windows, all the proposed doors and windows would be inserted into existing openings. A new wall is proposed on the northeastern side of the courtyard. A Structural Condition Survey and Bat Survey have been submitted. A copy of the agent's letter relating to possible alternative uses of the building is attached as an Appendix.

Planning History

3. None.

Planning Policy

4. The site is within the countryside as defined in the Local Plan 2004.
5. **Policy P1/2** of the Approved Structure Plan 2003 restricts development in the countryside unless the proposals can be demonstrated to be essential in a particular rural location
6. **Policy P1/2** of the Approved Structure Plan 2003 restricts development in the countryside unless the proposals can be demonstrated to be essential in a particular rural location

7. Local Plan 2004 **Policy SE8** states that residential development outside village frameworks will not be permitted.
8. Policies in Local Plan 2004 support, in principle, the conversion of rural buildings to employment uses (**Policy EM10**), holiday accommodation (**Policy RT10**) and tourism-related developments (**Policy RT11**).
9. **Planning Policy Guidance Note 7 The Countryside: Environmental Quality and Economic and Social Development** states that residential conversion of rural buildings to residential may have a part to play in meeting identified needs for new market or affordable housing. It also states that Local Planning Authorities should apply the following five tests to applications for residential re-use of such buildings:
 - They are of permanent and substantial construction;
 - Conversion does not lead to the dispersal of activity on such a scale as to prejudice town or village vitality;
 - Their form, bulk and general design are in keeping with their surroundings;
 - Imposing reasonable conditions on planning permission overcomes any legitimate planning objections (for example on environmental or traffic grounds) which would otherwise outweigh the advantages of re-use; and
 - If the buildings are in the open countryside, they are capable of conversion without major or complete reconstruction.

Consultation

10. **Castle Camps Parish Council** recommends approval.
11. The **Ecology Officer** is satisfied that the proposal can commence without adversely affecting any bats. He recommends that, as the submitted survey indicates that it is likely that nesting birds use the barn, a condition is attached to any approval stating that no works shall take place between 1st March and 31st August unless otherwise agreed with the Local Planning Authority.
12. The **Chief Environmental Health Officer** is concerned that problems could arise from contaminated land and therefore recommends a condition is attached to any approval requiring an investigation of the site to establish the nature and extent of any contamination and the agreement of any necessary remedial works to deal with the contamination before development commences.
13. The **Environment Agency** has no objections provided a foul water drainage condition is attached to any approval. It also makes advisory comments.

Representations

14. None.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

15. The key issue in relation to this application is the principle of converting the building into a dwelling in the light of development plan policies and national planning guidance.

16. The application has been advertised as a departure from the development plan because it proposes residential development in the countryside (Local Plan Policy SE8). However, I am satisfied that, due to its location and access, it would not lend itself to a commercial use and, in view of the information submitted by the applicant, it would not be viable to convert it into holiday accommodation. The proposal would comply with the guidance in PPG7 in relation to the residential re-use of rural buildings in that the building is of permanent and substantial construction; the conversion would not lead to the dispersal of activity on such a scale as to prejudice town or village vitality; the form, bulk and general design of the resulting building would be in keeping with its surroundings; and the building is capable of conversion without major or complete reconstruction. I therefore consider that the conversion of the barn into a dwelling would be acceptable. The proposed residential curtilage would not detract from the character and appearance of the countryside.
17. Access to the site is via a single width track. The track would be acceptable as an access to serve the proposed dwelling albeit it may need to be surfaced to allow year round access. Appropriate surfacing of the track could be carried out as permitted development rights and would be acceptable in terms of the character and appearance of the countryside.
18. I do not consider that approval of the application would significantly prejudice the implementation of the development plan's policies and proposals. I do not therefore consider that it would be necessary to refer it to the Secretary of State.
19. The comments of the Ecology Officer in respect of breeding birds are more appropriately attached as an informative rather than as a condition to any approval.

Recommendations

20. Approval subject to safeguarding conditions including conditions relating to materials, foul water drainage and requiring a site contamination investigation/agreement of necessary remedial works.

Ecology Officer and Environment Agency comments attached as informatives.

Reason for Approval

1. Although the proposal is not in accordance with Policies P1/2 of the Approved Structure Plan 2003 and SE8 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004, it is considered that the re-use and of conversion of the existing traditional building would achieve the objectives of Government Guidance in Planning Policy Guidance 7, "The Countryside :Environmental Quality and Economic and Social Development."
2. All other material planning considerations have been taken into account. None is of such significance as to outweigh the reason for the decision to approve the planning application.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004;

- Planning Policy Guidance Note 7 The Countryside: Environmental Quality and Economic and Social Development;
- Planning file Ref: S/0575/04/F

Contact Officer: Andrew Moffat – Area Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713169

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	2 nd June 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

**S/0606/04/LB & S/0607/04/F – Horseheath
Alterations and extension – first floor weatherboarded extension above kitchen/diner
with staircase to bedroom 2 with gable window and rooflight – the Thatch Cottage for
Ms Ryan**

Recommendation: Refusal

Members of Committee will visit the site on Tuesday 1st June.

Site and Proposal

1. The cottage is a late 18th or early 19th century, two bay, one and a half storey, Grade II listed building. It is timber framed, rendered with a longstraw thatched roof. The cottage, which is orientated with the east gable facing the road, is set back approximately 30 metres from the road within a large garden. Attached to the east gable is a single storey lean-to extension and to the rear, west gable is a partly constructed single storey kitchen/diner extension. The chimneystack is situated on the external wall of the west gable.
2. The cottage is modest in scale; the existing lean-to extension on the east gable is a traditional form and does not detract from the character and appearance of the listed building. The approved single storey extension, partly constructed, is different in form with a roof in line with the main roof but at a lower level. The approved materials are weatherboarding and pantiles, to provide a contrast with the main cottage.
3. The applications, which were received on 23rd March, seek to add a first floor above the kitchen/diner with a staircase to bedroom 2, a gable window and a rooflight. The proposal also includes an access gate and fencing.

Planning History

4. Listed Building Consent reference **S/2465/03/LB**, was approved on 13th January 2004 for the replacement of the existing side extensions on the west gable by a single storey weatherboarded kitchen/diner. Planning Permission was not required.

Planning Policy

5. **Policy EN 20** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 (“The Local Plan”) states that planning permission will be refused where it is required for extensions to Listed Buildings which: (in part)
 - are not necessary to ensure the continuing use of the building;
 - would dominate or detract from the Listed Building in scale, form, massing or appearance.

6. **Policy HG13** the Local Plan states that extensions to dwellings in the countryside will be permitted where:
 1. The proposed development would not create a separate dwelling or be capable of separation from the existing dwelling;
 2. The extension does not exceed the height of the original dwelling;
 3. The extension does not lead to a 50% increase or more in volume or gross internal gross floor area of the original dwelling;
 4. The proposed extension is in scale and character with the existing dwelling and would not materially change the impact of the dwelling on its surrounding; and
 5. The proposed extension has regard to the criteria in Policy HG12 of this Plan.
7. **Policy P7/6** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 (“The County Structure Plan”) requires development to protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the historic built environment.
8. Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 15 “Planning and the Historic Environment” paragraph 3.14 states that “many Grade II buildings are of humble and once common building types and have been listed precisely because they are relatively unaltered examples of a particular type: so they can as readily have their special character ruined by unsuitable alteration or extension as can Grade I or II* structures.

Consultation

9. **Horseheath Parish Council** recommends approval
10. **The Conservation Manager** has no objection to the fence and access gate but objects to the first floor extension in that it is considered to fail to meet the tests in the local plan policy and is inappropriate and detracts from the special character of the cottage. The first floor extension will significantly increase the impact on the listed building and compromise its modest architectural form and historic interest. In addition it will unbalance the east and west elevations and obscure the majority of the chimney which is an important and dominant feature. The result will neither preserve nor enhance its character and appearance.

Representations

11. There were none

Planning Comments

12. **Key Issues**

- The effect of the extension on the character and appearance of the listed building;
- The increase in gross internal floor area of the original dwelling; and

- The impact of the development on the scale and character of the existing dwelling and the countryside.
13. This application was considered at the 13th May 2004 Chairman's Delegation Meeting. Councillor Agnew has requested that the application be considered at Committee.
 14. The cottage is modest in scale and has a two bay plan typical of many humble dwellings of this period. At some time it was extended by the addition of a small lean-to, which was until recently the bathroom. A small extension, approved in 2004, on the west gable was felt to be reasonable in order to provide essential kitchen accommodation and was not considered to have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the listed building.
 15. The principle of an additional floor on the approved single storey extension is considered to be unacceptable as it would dominate and detract from the listed building in scale, form and appearance.
 16. The applicant has not demonstrated why works, which would affect the character of the listed building, are desirable or necessary as required by paragraph **3.4 of PPG 15**. The proposal is not considered necessary to ensure the continuing use or life of the historic building.
 17. The proposed extension and the previous extension would result in a dwelling of 48% increase to the original dwelling. The dwelling is set on a large site in the countryside with open fields to the north, south and west. The proposed extension will not be visible from the road or from other neighbouring properties and there is no adverse impact upon the character and openness of the countryside. Having regard to all criteria in Policies HG12 and HG13 of the Local Plan, this proposal is acceptable and accords with the objectives of those Policies.
 18. The submitted plans did not include details of the access gate and fencing. Construction work of the gate and fencing had been finished during officers' site visits on April 2004. I have asked the agent to submit details of the gate and fencing as part of this application before the meeting. I consider that the gate and fencing are in keeping with the existing dwelling and the countryside.
 19. Compliance with Policies HG12 and HG13 of The Local Plan does not outweigh the harm caused to the character and appearance of the Listed Building.

Recommendations

Refusal

20. The proposed first floor extension would dominate and detract from the special character of this listed building by virtue of its scale, form and appearance. The additional floor space is not considered to meet the test of being necessary for the continued use of the building. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to Policy P7/6 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 and Policy EN20 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

- PPG 15: Planning and the Historic Environment

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- Applications Ref. S/2465/03/LB, S/0606/04/LB and S/0607/04/F.

Contact Officer: Barbara Clarke – Conservation Assistant
Telephone: (01954) 713179

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	2 nd June 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

S/1210/03/F – Gamlingay

**Erection of free range egg production building, Woodview Farm, Mill Hill Potton Road,
for Mrs L Titmus**

Recommendation: Delegated Approval

Site and Proposal

1. This application, submitted on 30th May 2003, proposes the erection of 390m² timber building on a brick plinth for free range egg production on a 0.5ha area of land to the rear of Woodview Farm, Potton Road, Gamlingay.
2. Between the site and Potton Road, is additional land owned by the applicant containing a dwelling and former farm shop, now used as a day nursery. Vehicular access is from the Potton Road.
3. On the other three sides is agricultural land, the land immediately to the south being owned by the applicant
4. The building is 4.1m high to the ridge and would house 4000 birds. The site is currently open to view when approached from the south
5. Additional information on the enterprise is contained under Applicant's Representations below.

Planning History

6. There have been no previous applications on the red edged site.

Planning Policy

7. **Policy P1/2** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 ("The County Structure Plan") states development in the countryside will be restricted unless the proposals can be demonstrated to be essential in a particular rural location; where there is an unacceptable risk to the quality of ground or surface water and; where there could be damage, destruction or loss to areas that should be retained for their biodiversity, historic, archaeological, architectural and recreational value.
8. **Policy CS3** of the Local Plan states that development of sites where drainage to a public sewer is not feasible will not be permitted if proposed alternative facilities are considered inadequate and would pose an unacceptable risk to the quality or quantity of ground or surface water, pollution of local ditches, watercourses or sites of ecological importance.
9. **Policy CS4** of the Local Plan states that development will not be permitted which

poses an unacceptable risk to the quality of the underlying groundwater.

10. **Policy CS5** of the Local Plan states that planning consent will not be granted for development where the site is liable to flooding, or where development is likely to increase the risk of flooding elsewhere by materially impeding the flow or storage of flood water; increase flood risk in area downstream due to additional surface water runoff or; increase the number of people or properties at risk.
11. **Policy EN1** of the Local Plan states that planning permission will not be granted for development which would have an adverse effect on the character and local distinctiveness of Landscape Character Areas.
12. **Policy EN3** of the Local Plan states that in those cases where development is permitted in the countryside the Council will require that the scale, design and layout of the scheme, the materials used and landscaping works are all appropriate to the particular Landscape Character Area.

Consultation

13. **Gamlingay Parish Council** recommends refusal. "Opposed as it is felt by this Council that an Environmental Impact Assessment should first be conducted especially given the proximity of a children's day nursery next door to the site and the flowing of a brook nearby. Notwithstanding the safety implications of transportation vehicles to this site sharing the same access and parking facilities as the day nursery, the Council is also concerned about access to and from the site via the heavily-used Potton Road and its location opposite a busy recycling plant. An ability to view oncoming traffic from the right on exiting this site would be impaired given the uneven level of the road. The Council feels consideration should also be given to the cumulative effect an increasing number of chicken farms in the Gamlingay area would have on the local community and environment."
14. The **Environment Agency** recommends a condition requiring a scheme for the provision and implementation of pollution control to the water environment is attached to any consent to ensure a satisfactory method of surface water drainage. The Agency also offers safeguarding comment.
15. The **Local Highway Authority** requested that the applicant submit additional detailed information relating to existing and anticipated daily traffic flows to the site. These comments are repeated in respect of the additional information received from the applicant.
16. The comments of the **Environmental Health Officer** are attached as Appendix 1.
17. The **Bedfordshire and River Ivel Internal Drainage Board** and **Mid Bedfordshire District Council** have made no comments.

Representations

18. None received.

Applicants Representations

19. The applicant states that the total number of hens on the building would be 4000 once the smaller shed (S/1209/03) is phased out in favour of the larger one. The

current EU legislation for free-range hens is 2500 birds per hectare so there is a capacity for 6000 birds.

20. Any dead birds will be incinerated on the farm and the applicant has agreed in the long-term to purchase an incinerator and understands that to have an on farm incinerator will become law in 2005. It is proposed to sit the incinerator on the northern boundary, half way down the site, just outside the farmhouse garden perimeters. In the short-term, as discussed with Environmental Health Officers any fallen stock would be stored in a sealed container and disposed of at the Duxford pet crematorium or the maggot farm at Longstowe.
21. In respect of pest control the applicant states that bait traps will be used both inside and outside the building. Professional pest control from a registered firm would be sought if vermin get out of hand. Sprays will be used to keep fly's to a minimum.
22. The shed will be cleaned out once a year usually when the hens are around 80 weeks old. Manure will be collected by a neighbouring farmer for spreading on his fields and cultivated immediately into the soil.
23. The volume of transport to the site will be kept to a minimum. There will be a feed lorry once a month. Eggs will be delivered or collected twice a week. Delivery of new hens and collection of spent hens is limited to once a year.
24. The current water systems used are bell drinkers as this is a hard water area. Foul water is confined to a shed deep pit system and water from the building is discharged through guttering into the sub-soil.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

25. The key issues to be considered are environmental impact, impact in the landscape and highway safety.
26. In my view the application is of insufficient scale to warrant an Environmental Impact Assessment. Although a Schedule 2 Development, under the Regs, the area of new floorspace falls below the 500 sq metres threshold in the Regs and the proposal is not located in a designated environmentally sensitive location.
27. The Chief Environmental Health officer is satisfied that with the safeguarding conditions suggested this operation can take place without any adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring users of land or area generally, including the day nursery at the front of the site. The applicant has viewed the suggested conditions and has confirmed that they can be met.
28. The applicant states that in the longer term it is the intention to install an incinerator. Although I have suggested to the applicant that full details be submitted at this stage for consideration with the current application these have not been forthcoming and will need to be the subject of a separate consent. The Chief Environmental Health Officer has confirmed that whilst such provision on-site would be preferable it is not essential.
29. The Environment Agency has no objections provided a condition regarding surface water drainage is imposed.
30. I have previously asked the applicant to amend the application site area to include all areas outside the building to be used by the birds. To date this has not been forthcoming.

31. The applicant owns land to the south of the site and in my view has the opportunity to adequately screen the building, which is 4.1m high to minimise its impact in the landscape.
32. I note the comments of the Local Highways Authority, however this is a small-scale family operation and in my view the amount of additional traffic that will be generated would not justify a refusal on highway grounds. I have, however, asked the applicant to supply the more detailed information on traffic levels requested by the Highway Authority.

Recommendations

19. That subject to further details from the applicant in respect of an amended plan showing the area outside of the buildings that will be used in connection with the unit and detailed traffic information requested by the Local Highways Authority that delegated powers of approval be granted. Conditions to include the requirements of the Environmental Health Officer, the Environment Agency and landscaping.

Informatives

Reasons for Approval

1. The approved development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:
 - **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003: P1/2**
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004: CS3, CS4, CS5, EN1 and EN3**
2. The proposal conditionally approved is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations which have been raised during the consultation exercise:
 - Amenity of users of land in the vicinity
 - Highway safety
 - Visual impact on the locality
3. All other material planning considerations have been taken into account. None is of such significance as to outweigh the reason for the decision to approve the planning application.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Planning Application File S/1210/03/F

Contact Officer: Paul Sexton- Area Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713255

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	2 nd June 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

S/1209/03/F – Gamlingay**Erection of free range egg production building (retrospective application), Woodview Farm, Mill Hill Potton Road, for Mrs L Titmus****Recommendation: Delegated Approval****Site and Proposal**

1. This application, submitted on 30th May 2003, seeks retention of a 176m² wooden building on a brick plinth for free range egg production on a 0.5ha area of land to the rear of Woodview Farm, Potton Road, Gamlingay.
2. Between the site and Potton Road, is additional land owned by the applicant containing a dwelling and former farm shop, now used as a day nursery. Vehicular access is from the Potton Road.
3. On the other three sides is agricultural land, the land immediately to the south being owned by the applicant.
4. The building is 3.5m high to the ridge and houses 1500 birds. The site is currently open to view when approached from the south. The applicant has indicated that this building will be phased out if the other building is approved.
5. Additional information on the enterprise is contained under Applicant's Representations in the preceding report in respect of application S/1210/03/F

Planning History

6. There have been no previous applications on the red edged site.

Planning Policy

7. **Policy P1/2** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 ("The County Structure Plan") states development in the countryside will be restricted unless the proposals can be demonstrated to be essential in a particular rural location; where there is an unacceptable risk to the quality of ground or surface water and; where there could be damage, destruction or loss to areas that should be retained for their biodiversity, historic, archaeological, architectural and recreational value.

8. **Policy CS3** of the Local Plan states that development of sites where drainage to a public sewer is not feasible will not be permitted if proposed alternative facilities are considered inadequate and would pose an unacceptable risk to the quality or quantity of ground or surface water, pollution of local ditches, watercourses or sites of ecological importance.
9. **Policy CS4** of the Local Plan states that development will not be permitted which poses an unacceptable risk to the quality of the underlying groundwater.
10. **Policy CS5** of the Local Plan states that planning consent will not be granted for development where the site is liable to flooding, or where development is likely to increase the risk of flooding elsewhere by materially impeding the flow or storage of flood water; increase flood risk in area downstream due to additional surface water runoff or; increase the number of people or properties at risk.
11. **Policy EN1** of the Local Plan states that planning permission will not be granted for development which would have an adverse effect on the character and local distinctiveness of Landscape Character Areas.
12. **Policy EN3** of the Local Plan states that in those cases where development is permitted in the countryside the Council will require that the scale, design and layout of the scheme, the materials used and landscaping works are all appropriate to the particular Landscape Character Area.

Consultation

13. **Gamlingay Parish Council** comments are the same as for the previous item.
14. The **Environment Agency** comments are the same as for the previous item.
15. The **Local Highway Authority** comments are the same as for the previous item.
16. The comments of the **Environmental Health Officer** are attached as Appendix 1 in the previous item.
17. The **Bedfordshire and River Ivel Internal Drainage Board** and **Mid Bedfordshire District Council** have made no comments.

Representations

18. None received.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

19. The key issues to be considered are environmental impact, impact in the landscape and highway safety.
20. These issues have been addressed in respect of the larger building in the previous item. The applicant has indicated that this building was erected, without the benefit of consent, as a trial to see if such an operation would be viable on this site. It is not the intention to retain this building once the larger one has been erected, subject to consent being granted.

21. The applicant and Chief Environmental Health Officer have confirmed that this building could not easily be brought up to the standards required by the conditions suggested and in my view any consent should be for a temporary period only with removal being within 12 months or the bringing into use of the new building, if approved, whichever is the sooner.

Recommendations

That consent is granted for a temporary period only. If application S/1210/03/F is not approved the wording of the condition will need revising.

1. The building, hereby permitted, shall be removed and the land restored to its former condition on or before 30th June 2005, or within one month of commencement of use of the building approved by planning permission S/1210/09/F, whichever is the sooner.
(Reason – To minimise the impact of buildings in the countryside.)

Informatives

Reasons for Approval

1. The approved development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:
 - **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003: P1/2**
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004: CS3, CS4, CS5, EN1 and EN3**
2. The proposal conditionally approved for a temporary period is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations which have been raised during the consultation exercise:
 - Amenity of users of land in the vicinity
 - Highway safety
 - Visual impact on the locality
3. All other material planning considerations have been taken into account. None is of such significance as to outweigh the reason for the decision to approve the planning application.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Planning Application File S/1210/03/F

Contact Officer: Paul Sexton- Area Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713255

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	2 nd June 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

S/0784/04/F – Waterbeach**ERECTION OF TWO STOREY FRONT EXTENSION, 53 WINFOLD ROAD WATERBEACH
FOR MR AND MRS M CHESTER****Recommendation: REFUSAL****Site and Proposal**

1. The application property is an end of terrace, two-storey property. The attached property, No 55 Winfold Road is located south of the site while the flank elevation of the dwelling and proposed extension faces the rear garden of No 51 Winfold Road. This property is located to the north.
2. This full planning application received on the 15th April 2004 proposes the erection of a two-storey front extension that projects across the width of the property. The extension measures 3.2 metres in length and is to have a hipped roof, the ridge height of which measures 6.5 metres in height. As part of this application two additional windows are to be inserted in the north facing, flank elevation of the original dwelling. The ground floor window will serve the dining room while the proposed first floor window will serve a bedroom.

Planning History

3. None relevant

Planning Policy

4. **Policy HG12 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings within Frameworks’** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 sets out the requirements that must be met in order for proposals to extend or alter dwellings within village frameworks to be considered for approval.
5. **Policy P1/3 ‘Sustainable Design in Built Development’** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 requires a high standard of design for all new development that responds to the local character of the built environment and details aspects of design to be considered.

Consultation

6. **Waterbeach Parish Council** recommends approval

Representations

7. At the time of writing this report no representations had been received. The neighbour consultation period expires on 20th May. Any comments that are received will be reported verbally to Members.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

8. The key issues to consider in relation to this application are the impact of the extension on the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties and the character and appearance of the street scene.

Neighbouring Residential Amenities

9. Given the application sites physical relationship with the adjoining properties, it is considered that the proposed two storey front extension will mostly affect the attached property, No 55 and the neighbouring dwelling located to the north, No 51 Winfold Road.
10. No 51 is rotated through 90 degrees and consequently the rear elevation and short rear garden, (measuring 10 metres in length) faces the flank elevation of the existing dwelling and proposed extension. The rear boundary of No 51 is lined with a 3 metre high conifer hedge which provides some visual screening. The first floor and roofline of the application property is however still clearly visible.
11. While the ridgeline of the proposed structure is lower than that of the main dwelling, the extension will extend a considerable distance along the rear boundary of No 51, (combined length of house and extension will project 7.8 metres along the common boundary that measures 11.4 metres). Given the length of No 51's rear garden and the height and mass of the existing and proposed structures it is considered that the proposed extension will form an unduly overbearing feature that will create an enclosed and oppressive feel when viewed from within the neighbours rear garden.
12. Having viewed the application site from within the neighbours rear garden the proposed first floor flank window that will serve the existing bedroom will directly overlook the garden area and rear elevation of No 51. At present there are no flank windows in the application property and this new opening will significantly increase the overlooking potential of the property, to the detriment of the neighbours residential amenity.
13. With regard to the attached property, the proposed extension that measures 3.2 metres in length and extends across the full width of the property will appear overly dominant. These terraced properties are relatively small and while the nearest ground floor window serves a kitchen and the two first floor windows both serve the same bedroom, it is considered that, due to its length and proximity to the boundary the proposed extension would again appear unduly overbearing.

Impact on street scene

13. The building line of this terrace is staggered, with Nos. 59-61 set approximately 3 metres closer to the highway. While the roof design of the extension helps reduce the impact of the extension on the neighbouring properties, the introduction of a hipped roof fails to respect the local characteristics of the surrounding built environment. The extension will be clearly prominent and the hipped roof will form an incongruous feature when viewed against the existing terrace. As stated above the building line of the terrace is staggered. An extension of the size proposed is however considered out of scale and if approved, may set an unfortunate precedent.

Recommendation

14. Refusal

- 1) The proposed extension, by reason of its height and length, would form an overbearing and unduly dominant feature when viewed from within the rear garden of No 51 Winfold Road and from the adjacent property No. 55 Winfold Road. The proposed north facing bedroom window to be inserted in the original dwelling will also provide clear views into the rear garden No. 51 Winfold Road. The loss of privacy and overbearing nature of the extension will detrimentally affect the residential amenities of Nos. 51.and 55.
- 2) The proposed extension, by reason of its height, mass and location will form an overly prominent feature within the street scene. While the hipped roof helps reduce the impact of the extension on the neighbouring properties, this design feature is not common to the terrace and will appear out of character when viewed from within the street scene. The proposed extension, by means of its size, also fails to respect the character of the original dwelling and will appear out of scale.

The proposed extension is therefore considered contrary to Policy HG12 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 and Policy P1/3 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- Planning Application File S/0784/04/F

Contact Officer: Paul Belton – Planning Assistant
Telephone: (01954) 713 253

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT	Development and Conservation Control	2 nd June 2004
TO:	Committee	
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

**S/0445/04/F - LANDBEACH
CHANGE OF USE OF PADDOCK TO RESIDENTIAL GARDEN ASSOCIATED WITH
43A HIGH STREET AND THE ERECTION OF MOWER AND TRACTOR STORE
(RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION) AT LAND REAR OF 43A HIGH STREET
FOR B. YORK**

Recommendation: Approval

Conservation Area**Site and Proposal**

1. The 0.83 hectare site was formerly an area of paddock, lying to the rear of nos. 45 - 53 High Street that front the High Street and is on the edge of the village of Landbeach, outside of the village framework and within the Green Belt. It is generally flat with a vehicular access from off Banworth Lane, which is an unadopted road that ends at the site. No. 43A is within the Conservation Area, but the paddock and proposed store is outside.
2. The eastern site boundary adjoins fields beyond the site. A field hedge including a number of trees marks this boundary and provides a pleasant green edge to the village when viewed from the closest public vantage points on Waterbeach Road and the A10. The southern boundary does not benefit from such screening. To the north of the site is a treed area at the end of Banworth Lane, which separates the site from bungalows at Matthew Parker Close. The countryside beyond is characterised by open fields up to the A10. To the south of the site further paddocks are found, with post and rail fences such that an open, rural character is maintained up to the village edge in this area.
3. This full planning application, received on the 4th March 2004 seeks permission for works and change of use of the land that has already been carried out. The paddock area has recently been enclosed by 2000mm high close board fence, turfed and landscaped. A store has been erected close to the access off Banworth Lane to replace buildings that have been removed. This measures 7500mm (length) by 4850mm (width). The building is 3100mm high to the ridge.
4. The application was amended on the 6th April 2004. The application originally included only the store, however following a site visit the measurements of the store were slightly incorrect and the change of use of the paddock was noted. The amendment therefore, included the correct dimensions for the store and the change of use that has taken place.

Planning History

5. There is no planning history for the land itself, however the house at 43A High Street was built under planning permission **S/0473/96/F**.

Planning Policy

6. **Policy SE9 ‘Village Edges’** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 (“The Local Plan”) requires development on the edge of villages to be sympathetically designed and landscaped to minimise the impact upon the countryside and to ensure that harmony with the prevailing landscape character is achieved.
7. **Policy GB2 ‘General Principles’** of the Local Plan outlines the circumstances under which planning permission may be granted for development within the Green Belt. It clearly establishes the circumstances in which development in the Green Belt can be considered to be appropriate, including agricultural and recreation uses. By definition all development is considered to be ‘inappropriate’ unless specific circumstances set out in policy GB2 are met. The supporting text to this policy states in paragraph 3.12 that ‘the change of use of land to residential curtilage will be resisted where it harms the openness and landscape character of the Green Belt’.
8. **Policy HG12 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings’** of the Local Plan sets out the requirements that must be met in order for proposals to extend or alter dwellings within village frameworks to be considered for approval.
9. Applications for planning permission affecting the setting of a Conservation Area should preserve or enhance the special character and appearance of that area
10. **Policy P1/3 ‘Sustainable Design in Built Development’** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 states that a high standard of design and sustainability should be adopted for all new forms of development.

Consultations

11. **Landbeach Parish Council** recommended the amended proposal be refused. It commented that this area of backland should remain as a paddock as it is concerned that the change of use will set a precedent for the change of use of other paddocks nearby and the loss of a natural break (marked by a dyke to the rear of the gardens). It goes on to note that the Council’s Landscape Officer has worked hard to ensure the sensitive planting and hedging schemes have been adhered to on paddock land adjacent to this site. It has raised no objection to the store itself, as it replaces sheds previously on the site. Concern was raised that the applicant might use the site for business purposes due to the high number of large vehicles visiting the site via Banworth Lane.
12. **Chief Environmental Health Officer** – No significant impacts in terms of noise and pollution from an Environmental Health standpoint.
13. **The Council’s Landscape Officer’s** comments will be reported verbally.

Representations

14. Four letters of objection have been received raising the following concerns:
 - That the store may be used in connection with the applicants commercial business.
 - Increased traffic generation along Banworth Lane and the resultant increased wear and tear to the road surface.

- Increased noise and disturbance caused by tractors and farm vehicles using the lane.
- Concerns regarding pedestrian safety along the narrow lane.
- Precedent that will allow other paddocks in the area to be converted to garden land.

Residents are also concerned about the increased mess from mud deposited by tractors on the road.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

15. The key issues to consider in respects of this application are whether the change of use and erection of the store has resulted in harm to the openness and landscape character of the Green Belt in this area; whether a precedent is set for change of use of adjoining paddocks; and the impact in terms of the use of Banworth Lane, which is a private road.

Openness and landscape character of the Green Belt

16. The change of use of this particular paddock has not had a harmful impact on the openness and character of the Green Belt, as the site is only publicly visible from a distance on Waterbeach Road and the A10 from where a green village edge is seen as a result of the retention of the field boundary. Although views of the site are unchanged as a result of this change of use, the house itself is clearly visible beyond the paddock and further landscaping of the boundaries would be beneficial.
17. The erection of the mower and tractor store is considered to be acceptable, as it replaces a number of older buildings on the land and is small in size so that it is unobtrusive from nearby dwellings. It is not harmful to the openness and landscape of the Green Belt.

Precedent

18. The paddocks to the south are open to the fields beyond, with the boundaries marked only by post and rail fences. This area has a very different landscape character from that of the application site, which is screened by the established field hedge to the east. Planning permission would be required to change the use of these paddocks and due to the different site characteristics would be unlikely to be viewed favourably, as such it is unlikely that a precedent will be set if this application is approved.

Access via Banworth Lane

19. Banworth Lane is an un-made private road and serves houses to the west of the site. Permitting a change of use to garden is unlikely to result in an increase in traffic along the lane. A change of use to residential curtilage will mean that the site will be subject to residential permitted development rights, which restricts the use of residential sites for business purposes. Should concerns about the subsequent use of the land for the applicant's business come to fruition, the Council could pursue appropriate enforcement action at such a time if necessary.
20. Finally I do not consider that the building, given its small scale and replacement for other buildings, would harm the appearance of character of the Conservation Area.

Recommendation

21. It is recommended that the application be approved as amended by plan date stamped 6th April 2004 and subject to the following conditions:
1. Standard Condition A – Time limited permission (Reason A);
 2. Sc21 – Withdrawal of permitted development (Rc21c – ‘harm to the openness and landscape character of the village edge and Green Belt’
 - a. Part 1 (Development within the curtilage of a dwelling house), Class E (Buildings or enclosures in the curtilage of a dwelling house).
 - b. Part 2 (Minor Operations), Class A (Erection of gates, walls or fences)
 3. Sc51 – Landscaping (Rc51) – Re-worded:
‘A scheme of hard and soft landscaping shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority within twenty-eight days from the date of this decision notice. This shall include indications of all existing trees and hedgerows on the land, and details of any to be retained, together with measures for their protection in the course of development and specification of all proposed trees, hedges and shrub planting, which shall include details of density and the size of stock’.
 4. Sc52 – Implementation of landscaping (Rc52) – Reworded:
...shall be carried out in the first planting season and seeding seasons following the approval of a landscaping scheme by the Local Planning Authority...’;
 5. Sc60 – Details of boundary treatment (Rc60) – ‘north, east and south site boundaries’.

Reasons for Approval

1. The approved development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003: P1/3 (Sustainable design in built development)
South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004: Policy SE9 ‘Village Edges’, GB2 ‘General Principles’ and HG12 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings’.
2. The proposal conditionally approved is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations which have been raised during the consultation exercise:

Openness and landscape character of the Green Belt
Highway and pedestrian safety
Residential amenities
3. All other material planning considerations have been taken into account. None is of such significance as to outweigh the reason for the decision to approve the planning application.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003

Planning file Ref: S/0445/04/F

Contact Officer: Melissa Reynolds – Senior Planning Assistant
Telephone: (01954) 713237

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	2 nd June 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

S/0679/04/F – Great Shelford**House – land off the Hectare for David Reed Homes Ltd****Recommendation: Delegated Approval**

Members of Committee will visit the site on Tuesday 1st June 2004.

Site and Proposal

1. The application site is a 0.04 hectare (0.1 acre) plot of land located on the north-west side of The Hectare. Until recently, the site formed part of the garden area to No. 54 Cambridge Road, the site of a bungalow to the south-west that has now been demolished and upon which planning permission has been granted for 4 flats. Directly to the north-east of the plot are 2 storey dwellings.
2. The full application, submitted on 30th March 2004, seeks to erect a detached house on the site. The proposed dwelling would be a 2 storey, 4-bedroom render and pantile property with integral single garage. The dwelling would range in height from 6.8 metres to 7.1 metres. The density of the development equates to 25 dwellings/hectare.

Planning History

3. S/1035/02/F – Planning consent granted for the 4 flats referred to above.

Planning Policy

4. Great Shelford is identified within **Policy SE2** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 as a Rural Growth Settlement where estates, groups of dwelling and infilling are acceptable subject to, amongst other criteria, development being sympathetic to the character and amenities of the locality.
5. **Policy HG11 of the Local Plan** states that development to the rear of existing properties will only be permitted where the development would not:
 - result in overbearing, overlooking or overshadowing of existing residential properties;
 - result in noise and disturbance to existing residential properties through the use of its access;
 - result in highway dangers through the use of its access;
 - be out of character with the pattern of development in the vicinity.

6. **Policy P1/3** of the County Structure Plan 2003 stresses the need for a high standard of design and a sense of place which corresponds to the local character of the built environment.

Consultation

7. **Great Shelford Parish Council** objects to the application, stating:
8. "Recommend refusal. This is overdevelopment of the site. The proposed house would be intrusive to neighbours with bedrooms overlooking rear gardens and the bulk of the house cutting out sunlight to the rear garden of the house to the east of the site."
9. **The Chief Environmental Health Officer** raises no objections in principle subject to a condition being attached to any consent restricting the hours of use of power operated machinery during the period of construction.
10. The comments of the **Trees and Landscape Officer** will be reported verbally at the Committee meeting.

Representations

11. Letters of objection have been received, all from residents within The Hectare (Nos. 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 10, 13, 14, 16, 18, and 20). The main points raised are:
- The proposal would result in a cramped form of development that would be out of keeping with the character, scale, form and layout of development in the vicinity of the site;
 - The dwelling would overlook neighbouring properties and garden areas, notably of No 3 The Hectare;
 - The property would result in a loss of light to neighbouring dwellings, particularly Nos. 1, 3 and 5 The Hectare;
 - The dwelling would be obtrusive in the outlook from adjoining properties;
 - If approved, the development could set a precedent for further development in the area;
 - The development would result in noise and disturbance to neighbouring residents due to the proximity of the site to rear garden areas;
 - The development would result in parking problems and congestion within The Hectare thereby restricting access for emergency vehicles;
 - The development would result in the removal of a number of established trees.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

12. The key issues in relation to this application are:
- The affect on the character and appearance of the area;
 - The affect on neighbours; and

- Parking and highway safety issues

13. ***Affect on character and appearance of the area***

The site adjoins The Hectare, a development of 17 large, detached 2 storey dwellings all set within relatively small plots. The average garden depth of dwellings within The Hectare ranges from 10 to 15 metres with each plot averaging around 0.04 hectares in area. The proposed dwelling sits within a plot measuring 20 metres wide x 22 metres deep (0.04 hectares) and has a 10 metre deep rear garden area. In terms of the plot size, scale of the dwelling and density of the development, therefore, it could not justifiably be argued that the development would be out of keeping with the character of the surrounding area.

14. ***Residential amenity***

Concern has been expressed about the impact of the dwelling upon the outlook from neighbouring properties, particularly those at Nos. 1 and 2 The Hectare. The side elevation of the dwelling would be sited 14 metres away from the rear/south-west elevation of No.1 The Hectare within which there are windows serving the lounge and kitchen/dining areas. This back-flank distance is normally considered sufficient to avoid any undue loss of light or outlook. There are 2 trees directly adjacent to the north-eastern boundary of the site that presently soften the outlook from No.1 The Hectare and would largely screen the development. In order to protect the amenities of the immediate neighbour, it would be preferable to retain these trees and I have sought the advice of the Trees and Landscape Officer about the feasibility of doing so. There is 1 first floor ensuite window in the north-east side elevation of the proposed dwelling. Should Members be minded to grant consent for the scheme, conditions should be applied requiring this window to remain obscure glazed and preventing the insertion of further windows in this elevation at a later date. Similarly, I would recommend that such conditions be applied to the other side elevation of the dwelling in order to prevent any overlooking of the private garden areas of the (yet to be built) flats.

15. The dwelling lies approximately 20 metres away from the rear elevation of the 4 flats approved under planning ref: S/1035/02/F. In addition, the private amenity space for the flats is separated from the site by a communal parking court and I am therefore satisfied that the development would not unduly affect the amenities of future occupiers of the flats.

16. I do have strong reservations, however, about the impact of the development upon the amenities of No.3 The Hectare. There would be just 17 metres between 2 dormer windows in the rear elevation of the proposed dwelling and windows serving habitable rooms within the rear elevation of No.3, thereby resulting in an unacceptable level of overlooking. I have therefore requested that these windows be substituted with rooflights. The window in the rear gable serving bedroom 2 is, at a distance of approximately 22 metres, sufficiently far from the rear of No.3 to avoid any undue loss of privacy. Again, I would recommend that conditions be applied to any planning consent preventing the insertion of further windows in the rear elevation of the dwelling at a later date.

17. In addition to the above, should Members be minded to grant consent for the scheme, permitted development rights for extensions to the dwelling and roof alterations/additions should be removed in order to help prevent future overlooking of neighbouring properties.

18. With regards to the issue of noise, the Environmental Health Officer has only raised concerns about disturbance to local residents during the construction period. This matter can be controlled by planning condition.
19. **Highway Safety/Parking**
The proposed dwelling has 2 parking spaces, 1 in the integral garage and 1 in front of the property. This Authority's standards require a maximum of 1.5 spaces per dwelling. I am therefore satisfied that there is sufficient on-site parking to prevent vehicles parking within The Hectare to the detriment of highway safety.

Recommendations

20. Subject to the receipt of amended plans substituting the 2 rear dormer windows with rooflights, delegated powers are sought to approve the application subject to the following conditions:
1. Standard Condition A – Time limited permission (Reason A);
 2. Sc5a – Details and samples of materials for external walls and roofs (Rc5a);
 3. Sc51 – Landscaping (Rc51);
 4. Sc52 – Implementation of landscaping (Rc52);
 5. Sc60 – Details of boundary treatment (Rc60);
 6. Sc21 – Withdrawal of permitted development rights – Part 1, Classes A, B and C (Rc21c.....overdevelop the site or cause harm to adjoining residents by reason of overlooking);
 7. Sc22 – No windows at first floor level in the north-east (side), south-west (side) and north-west (rear) elevations of the development (Rc22);
 8. Sc23 – First floor window in the north-east and south-west elevations to be fitted and permanently maintained with obscure glass (Rc23);
 9. During the period of construction no power operated machinery shall be operated on the premises before 08.00 hours on weekdays and 08.00 hours on Saturdays nor after 18.00 hours on weekdays and 13.00 hours on Saturdays (nor at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays) unless otherwise previously agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority in accordance with any agreed noise restrictions (Rc26);

Informatives

Reasons for Approval

1. The approved development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:
 - **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003: P1/3** (Sustainable design in built development);

- **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:** SE2 (Development in Rural Growth Settlements) and HG11 (Backland Development).
2. The proposal conditionally approved is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations which have been raised during the consultation exercise:
 - Residential amenity including loss of outlook and overlooking issues
 - Visual impact on the locality
 - Highway safety/parking
 - Relationship to the character of the area
 3. All other material planning considerations have been taken into account. None is of such significance as to outweigh the reason for the decision to approve the planning application.

General

1. Should driven pile foundations be proposed, before works commence a statement of the method for construction of these foundations shall be submitted and agreed by the District Environmental Health Officer so that noise and vibration can be controlled.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report: Local Plan, Structure Plan, File Refs: S/0679/04/F, S/1035/02/F.

Contact Officer: Mr Andrew Moffat – Area Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713169

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation
Control Committee

2nd June 2004

AUTHOR/S: Director of Development Services

S/0612/04/F – Great Shelford

House – land r/o 18 High Street for Mr and Mrs B J Mcauley

Recommendation: Approval

Conservation Area

Site and Proposal

1. The application site is a 0.12 hectare (0.3 acre) plot of land sited to the rear of Nos. 18, 20 and 22 High Street. The site forms part of the garden area to No.18 High Street, a 2 storey brick and slate dwelling previously used as a funeral directors, and comprises a single storey outbuilding that was used as a chapel of rest.
2. The full application, submitted on 24th March 2004, seeks consent for the erection of a house on the plot. The proposed dwelling would be a 2 storey, 3-bedroom brick and slate house standing a total of 7.6 metres high. It would be sited approximately 80 metres back from the High Street and would be accessed via an existing driveway on the south side of No.18 High Street. The density of the development equates to approximately 8 dwellings per hectare.

Planning History

3. **S/1135/03/F** – Planning permission was granted for the erection of a bungalow and double garage on the site. This was subject to a number of conditions including removal of permitted development rights relating to extensions and roof alterations in order to prevent overlooking of neighbouring properties.
4. **S/0114/04/F** – An application to erect a 2 storey dwelling on the site was withdrawn. Officers had intended to refuse the scheme on the basis of the design of the dwelling and its harmful impact upon the character of the Conservation Area.
5. **S/1744/02/F** – An application for an extension to No.18 and the erection of 2 new dwellings within the garden area (ie – the current site area) was refused due to the impact upon the character of the area, adverse neighbour impact and inadequate access width.

Planning Policy

6. Great Shelford is identified within **Policy SE2** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 as a Rural Growth Settlement where estates, groups of dwelling and infilling are acceptable subject to development being sympathetic to the character and amenities of the locality.

7. **Policy HG11** of the Local Plan states that development to the rear of existing properties will only be permitted where the development would not:
 - result in overbearing, overlooking or overshadowing of existing residential properties;
 - result in noise and disturbance to existing residential properties through the use of its access;
 - result in highway dangers through the use of its access;
 - be out of character with the pattern of development in the vicinity.
8. **Policy P1/3** of the County Structure Plan 2003 stresses the need for a high standard of design and a sense of place which corresponds to the local character of the built environment.
9. The site lies within the Village Conservation Area. **Policy P7/6** of the County Structure Plan 2003 requires development to protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the historic built environment, whilst **Policy EN30** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 requires new development in a Conservation Area to either preserve or enhance the character of the area.

Consultation

10. **Great Shelford Parish Council** objects to the application stating:
11. “We remain convinced that in the interests of adjoining residents a bungalow as approved is the most appropriate development for the site. We do not feel the submitted design is appropriate to the site and if more accommodation is required, a better design taking into account the impact on surrounding properties is necessary.”
12. **The Conservation Manager** raises no objections to the application, stating that the revised design will have a significantly reduced impact compared with the original scheme (see paragraph 4 above). It is recommended that conditions be applied to any planning consent requiring sample materials and details of the stone sub-cills.
13. **The Chief Environmental Health Officer** raises no objections in principle subject to a condition being attached to any consent restricting the hours of use of power operated machinery.
14. The comments of the **Trees and Landscape Officer** will be reported verbally at the Committee meeting.

Representations

15. Letters of objections have been received from 4 neighbouring properties, Nos. 20, 22, 24 and 28 High Street. The main points raised are:
 - The dwelling would overlook neighbouring houses and gardens;
 - A 2 storey building would have an adverse impact upon the character of the area;

- The proposal would result in the loss of trees;
- The width of the access is inadequate;
- The existing chapel of rest is not shown on the plans. Is this to be demolished?
- The development should be surrounded by a brick wall rather than fence in order to protect adjoining residents from noise disturbance;
- The siting of 3 parking spaces half way down the garden would result in noise disturbance to neighbouring properties;
- The chimney should be sited away from neighbouring properties.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

16. Planning consent was granted under planning ref: S/1135/03/F for the erection of a bungalow on the site following the demolition of all existing outbuildings. The principle of backland development on the site together with the demolition of the existing buildings has therefore been established and the key issues in relation to the present application relate to the affect of the proposal on:

- The character of the Conservation Area
- The amenities of adjoining residents

Character of the Conservation Area

17. The site is situated within the Conservation Area although is set some 80 metres back from the High Street to the rear of existing 2 storey dwellings. An application to erect a 2 storey house on the site was withdrawn earlier this year, partly due to concerns about the scale and design of the dwelling and its subsequent adverse impact upon the character of the Conservation Area. The property was 8 metres high to ridge (5 metres to eaves). Under the current application, the overall height of the building has been reduced to 7.6 metres. In addition, the front of the dwelling incorporates a single storey wing and lean-to, thereby dropping the eaves height across part of the front elevation to 2.5 metres. This has significantly reduced the bulk of the building when viewed from the High Street and from neighbouring properties and the Conservation Manager is now satisfied that the proposal would not result in undue harm to the character of the area, subject to the use of appropriate external materials.

Amenities of adjoining residents

18. A number of residents have expressed concern about the application on overlooking grounds. In order to avoid any undue overlooking, the dwelling incorporates just 1 first floor window in its front/south-east elevation. This serves an ensuite bathroom and is shown on the plan as being obscure glazed. There are also 2 rooflights in this elevation both of which serve a landing/stairwell area. Should Members be minded to grant consent for the scheme, conditions should be applied requiring the window to remain obscure glazed and preventing the insertion of further windows in this elevation at a later date. In addition, removing permitted development rights for extensions and roof alterations/additions would also be necessary.

19. Two first floor bedroom windows are proposed in the south-west side elevation of the dwelling. These overlook at a distance of some 8 metres, the rear sections of the garden areas of Nos. 24 & 26 High Street which are some 60 metres away from the rear elevations and main private areas of the respective dwellings. The harm would therefore not be significant enough to warrant a refusal on this basis, particularly as the windows are narrow (approximately 0.6m width) and secondary to the principal window on the rear (north west) elevation.
20. With regards to the issue of noise, the Environmental Health Officer has only raised concerns about disturbance to local residents during the construction period. The neighbours preference for a wall rather than fence along the boundaries of the site can be forwarded on to the applicants but cannot justifiably be stipulated as a condition of any planning consent. No concerns have been raised by the Environmental Health Officer in respect of the position of the chimney.

Recommendations

21. Approval

1. Standard Condition A – Time limited permission (Reason A);
2. Sc5a – Details and samples of materials for external walls and roofs (Rc5aii);
3. Sc5 – Details of the stone sub-cills (Reason – To ensure satisfactory detailing of the development);
4. Sc51 – Landscaping (Rc51);
5. Sc52 – Implementation of landscaping (Rc52);
6. Sc60 – Details of boundary treatment to north east, north west and south west boundaries (Rc60);
7. Sc21 – Withdrawal of permitted development rights – Part 1, Classes A, B and C (Rc21c overdevelop the site or cause harm to adjoining residents by reason of overlooking);
8. Sc22 – No windows at first floor level in the front/south east elevation of the development (Rc22);
9. Sc23 – First floor window in the front/south east elevation to be fitted and permanently maintained with obscure glass (Rc23);
10. During the period of construction no power operated machinery shall be operated on the premises before 08.00 hours on weekdays and 08.00 hours on Saturdays nor after 18.00 hours on weekdays and 13.00 hours on Saturdays (nor at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays) unless otherwise previously agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority in accordance with any agreed noise restrictions (Rc26);

Informatives

Reasons for Approval

1. The approved development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:
 - **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003:** P1/3 (Sustainable design in built development) and P7/6 (Historic Built Environment);
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:** SE2 (Development in Rural Growth Settlements); EN30 (Development in/adjacent to Conservation Areas) and HG11 (Backland Development)
2. The proposal conditionally approved is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations which have been raised during the consultation exercise:
 - Residential amenity including noise disturbance and overlooking issues
 - Visual impact on the locality
 - Impact upon setting of adjacent Conservation Area
3. All other material planning considerations have been taken into account. None is of such significance as to outweigh the reason for the decision to approve the planning application.

General

1. Should driven pile foundations be proposed, before works commence a statement of the method for construction of these foundations shall be submitted and agreed by the District Environmental Health Officer so that noise and vibration can be controlled.
2. During construction there shall be no bonfires or burning of waste on site except with the prior permission of the Environmental Health Officer in accordance with best practice and existing waste management legislation.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report: Local Plan, Structure Plan, File Refs: S/0612/04/F, S/0114/04/F, S/1135/03/F and S/1744/02/F.

Contact Officer: Mr Andrew Moffat – Area Planning Officer
Telephone: (01223) 443169

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	2 nd June 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

S/0162/04/F – Great Shelford**Erection of additional dwelling and garage at Westfield House, 11 Westfield Road for Mr and Mrs Longhurst-Goldspink****Recommendation: Approval**

Members will visit the site on Tuesday 1st June 2004.

1. This application was deferred at the 12th May meeting to enable a site visit to take place.
2. A copy of the report to the May meeting is attached as an Appendix.

Consultation Update

3. The **Trees & Landscape Officer** has visited No.3 Walnut Drive and has no objections to the proposal in terms of its affect on the walnut tree in the rear garden of No.3 Walnut Drive.

Representations Update

4. The occupier of 135 Cambridge Road objects to the proposal on the grounds that: the building is far too large and tall to maintain the character of the location; the roof is high enough to allow transformation into a two storey dwelling which would overlook her garden; and the building is too close to its boundaries to allow for soakaways on the property itself/no indication is given as to how to deal with run-off problems.

Planning Comments Update

5. The comments made by the occupier of 135 are not reason to change my recommendation of approval. The footprint of the building is similar to the footprint of the existing greenhouse and outbuildings on the site. Having discussed the scheme with my colleagues in Building Control, I have no reason to believe that an adequate surface water drainage scheme could not be designed to serve the development.

Recommendations

6. Approval subject to the conditions, reasons for approval and informatives set out in the report to the May meeting.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- Planning file Ref: S/0162/04/F

Contact Officer: Andrew Moffat – Area Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713169

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation Control
Committee

12th May 2004

AUTHOR/S: Director of Development Services

**S/0162/04/F – GREAT SHELFORD
ERECTION OF ADDITIONAL DWELLING AND GARAGE AT WESTFIELD HOUSE, 11
WESTFIELD ROAD FOR MR & MRS LONGHURST-GOLDSPIK**

Recommendation: Approval

Site and Proposal

1. The site extends to approximately 0.16 hectares (0.41 acres) and includes No.11 Westfield Road, a two-storey render over red brick plinth dwelling with a hipped plain tile roof and a brick garage/store to the side, and its curtilage. There is a large greenhouse plus outbuildings in the rear garden. The site and surrounding land rises gently from northeast to southwest. There are a mix of hedges, fencing and the rear wall of the outbuildings along the existing side and rear site boundaries. Whilst there is a mix of single storey and two-storey dwellings in the locality, surrounding dwellings in Westfield Road and Walnut Drive are all single storey.
2. This full application, received on the 29th January 2004 and amended by plans date stamped the 25th March 2004, proposes the erection of a 4-bedroom detached bungalow faced with bricks under a hipped concrete tile roof and an attached single garage within the rear garden of the existing dwelling. The new dwelling would measure 2.5m to eaves and 6m to ridge. Access for the new dwelling would be achieved by creating a new access between Nos. 11 and 13 Westfield Road. The existing dwelling would continue to be served from the existing access. As No.11's existing garage/store would be demolished to form the new access, a new single garage for No.11 also forms part of the application. The density equates to 12.5 dwellings to the hectare. The amended plans show revisions to the design and height of the dwelling, including a 0.6m reduction in the ridge height.

Planning History

3. A planning application for the erection of an additional dwelling and garages on the site was withdrawn in April 2003 prior to determination (**S/0372/03/F**).
4. An outline application for 3 bungalows on land to the rear of 9, 11, 13 and 15 Westfield Road was refused in June 1996 for the following reasons: overdevelopment of the site; poor amenity for occupiers of the proposed dwellings; the proposed access was of insufficient width to allow two vehicles to pass; the requisite visibility splays could not be provided; lack of adequate on-site turning; and noise disturbance to occupiers of adjacent properties (**S/0705/96/O**).
5. A subsequent full application for two bungalows on land to the rear of 9, 11, 13 and 15 Westfield Road was refused in January 1997 for the following reasons: overdevelopment of the site; poor amenity for occupiers of the proposed dwellings; and noise disturbance to occupiers of No.11 Westfield Road (**S/1934/96/F**).

Planning Policy

6. Structure Plan 2003 **Policy P1/3** requires a high standard of design for all new development which responds to the local character of the built environment.
7. The site is within the village framework of Great Shelford, which is defined as a Rural Growth Settlement in Local Plan 2004.
8. Local Plan 2004 **Policy SE2** states that residential development will be permitted on unallocated land within village frameworks of Rural Growth Settlements provided that (a) the retention of the site in its present form is not essential to the character of the village; (b) the development would be sensitive to the character of the village, local features of landscape or ecological importance, and the amenities of neighbours; (c) the village has the necessary infrastructure capacity; and (d) residential development would not conflict with another policy of the plan. It also states that development should provide an appropriate mix of dwellings in terms of size, type and affordability and should achieve a minimum density of 30 dph unless there are strong design grounds for not doing so.
9. Local Plan 2004 **Policy HG10** states that: the design of housing schemes should be informed by the wider character and context of the local townscape and landscape; and schemes should achieve high quality design and distinctiveness.
10. Local Plan 2004 **Policy HG11** relates to backland development and states that development to the rear of existing properties will only be permitted where the development would not:
 - Result in overbearing, overlooking or overshadowing of existing residential properties;
 - Result in noise and disturbance to existing residential properties through the use of its access;
 - Result in highway dangers through the use of its access; or
 - Be out of character with the pattern of development in the vicinity.
11. Local Plan 2004 **Policy EN5** states that the District Council will require trees and hedges to be retained wherever possible in proposals for new development.

Consultations

12. **Great Shelford Parish Council** recommends refusal stating “This dwelling has the proportions of a house rather than a bungalow and as such would dominate adjacent properties. We feel the site is inappropriate for this type of development.”
13. The **Chief Environmental Health Officer** raises no objections but recommends that conditions should be attached to any approval relating to the times during the construction period when power operated machinery shall not be used, driven pile foundations and stating that no bonfires or burning of waste shall take place on site during demolition/construction except with his prior permission.
14. The **Trees & Landscape Officer** has viewed the proposal from the site and initially asked whether it would be possible to move the dwelling an additional 2-3 metres from the walnut tree in the garden of No.3 Walnut Drive. At the time of compiling this

report, he was to arrange to view the proposal from No.3. His further comments will be reported verbally.

Representations

15. Objections have been received from the occupiers of 2, 3 and 4 Walnut Drive and 13 Westfield Road on the following grounds:
- Loss of privacy to neighbours;
 - Concern that the dwelling could be converted into a house at a later stage as the roof section appears to be large enough to accommodate several additional bedrooms and the hallway appears to be large enough to allow for stairs to be added;
 - Loss of afternoon summer sunlight to neighbours;
 - Restricted sunlight to proposed dwelling and concern this might lead to pressures to remove the preservation order on the walnut tree in the garden of No.3 Walnut Drive;
 - The building would be too close to the walnut tree in the garden of No.3 Walnut Drive and would damage its root system. The roots of the tree might also damage the foundations. There is also a walnut tree in the garden of No.4 in very close proximity to the proposed dwelling;
 - Once demolition of the garage begins, there is a strong possibility of partial collapse of the wall causing damage to No.13 Westfield Road. Special care should be taken when demolishing the garage, any damage to the wall should be made good and compensation should be paid for any damage caused to No.13 Westfield Road during construction;
 - The proposed dwelling is too large and too high and would result in an out of character overdevelopment;
 - The existing leylandii screen along the boundary with No.4 Walnut Drive gives no sunlight to No.4's main rooms and, if removed, no privacy;
 - Noise, disturbance and affect of lighting to neighbours;
 - The wildlife/birdlife in this area would be permanently disturbed by building works;
 - The proposed access is unsuitable, being too close to Westfield House and the boundary with No.13 Westfield Road; and
 - Additional parking in Westfield Road.
16. The occupiers of No.9 Westfield Road objected to the original scheme but state that they have no objections to the scheme as amended.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

17. The key issues in relation to the application are the affect of the proposal on:
- The character of the area;
 - The amenity of neighbours;
 - The protected walnut trees; and
 - Highway safety and parking in Westfield Road.

Character of the area

18. There are examples of backland development further along Westfield Road and in-depth development along Cambridge Road (Walnut Drive). I therefore consider that the principle of erecting a dwelling on this site is acceptable in terms of the character of the area. Although 6 metres high to the ridge, the dwelling is single storey, which I

consider to be appropriate. The size/footprint of the dwelling is large but would also be acceptable in terms of the character of the area and the private amenity space provided for the occupiers of the proposed dwelling. Whilst some way below the 30 dwellings to the hectare normally required on sites within the village, as a result of the proximity of neighbours and the width of the access, I consider that the proposed density of development on the site (12.5 dwellings to the hectare) would be acceptable in this instance.

Amenity of neighbours

19. The proposal would have an impact on the amenity of neighbours in terms of noise and disturbance, including the use of the access by vehicles, and some overshadowing. However, subject to the imposition of a condition requiring the agreement of boundary treatments and requiring a further planning permission for any windows or openings in the roof, I do not consider that the proposal would seriously affect the amenity of neighbours in terms of loss of light or outlook, overlooking, noise/disturbance or by being unduly overbearing.

Protected Walnut Trees

20. At the time of compiling this report, the Trees & Landscape Officer had viewed the proposal from the site but not from No.3 Walnut Drive's rear garden. He initially asked whether it would be possible to move the dwelling a further 2-3m away from the walnut tree within the rear garden of No.3 and was to arrange to view the proposal from No.3. His further comments will be reported verbally.

Highway and parking issues

21. The access arrangements and parking provision (a garage plus additional parking and turning areas for the new dwelling and a garage and parking in front for No.11) for the proposed dwelling and No.11 Westfield Road would be acceptable.

Other issues

22. Possible damage to No.13 Westfield Road during the demolition of the existing garage and/or the construction period is a matter between the two parties, but an informative relating to the need to pay particular care during these times could be attached as an informative to any approval.

Recommendation

23. Subject to no objections being raised to the proposal by the Trees & Landscape Officer following his visit to No.3 Walnut Drive:
24. Approval (as amended by plans No. 964.101B, 1G, 2G and 3G date stamped the 25th March 2004) subject to the following conditions:
 1. Standard Condition A – Time limited permission (RCA).
 2. Standard Condition 5 a, e & f – Details of materials for external walls, roofs and hard surfaced areas plus finished floor levels (RC To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development and to protect the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties).

3. Standard Condition 51 – Landscaping (RC51).
4. Standard Condition 52 – Implementation of landscaping (RC52).
5. Standard Condition 60 – Details of boundary treatments (RC60 and to protect the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties).
6. During the construction period ... Standard Condition 26 (0800, 0800, 1800, 1300)– Times when power operated machinery shall only be operated (RC26).
7. Standard Highway Condition D5b (2m x 2m) – Pedestrian visibility splays (RC In the interests of highway and pedestrian safety).
8. No windows or openings of any kind shall be inserted in the roof of the dwelling hereby permitted unless expressly authorised by planning permission granted by the Local Planning Authority in that behalf (RC To protect the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties).

Informatives:

Reasons for Approval

1. The approved development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003: P1/3 (Sustainable Design in Built Development);
South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004: SE2 (Development in Rural Growth Settlements); **HG10** (Housing Design); **HG11** (Backland Development); and **EN5** (Landscaping)
2. The proposal conditionally approved is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations which have been raised during the consultation exercise:
 - Residential amenity including noise, disturbance, light, overlooking and loss of light;
 - Affect on the character and appearance of the area;
 - Affect on the adjacent walnut trees and the affect of the trees' roots on the foundations of the proposed dwelling;
 - Damage to No.13 Westfield Road;
 - Affect on wildlife/birdlife; and
 - Parking in Westfield Road
3. All other material planning considerations have been taken into account. None is of such significance as to outweigh the reason for the decision to approve the planning application.

25. During the demolition and construction period, no bonfires or burning of waste shall take place on site except with the prior permission of the Council's Environmental Health Officer in accordance with best practice and existing waste management legislation.
26. Particular care should be taken when demolishing the existing garage and during the construction period to ensure that no damage is caused to No.13 Westfield Road.
27. Should driven pile foundations be proposed, before development commences, a method statement for the construction of the foundations shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Council's Environmental Health Officer; development shall be carried out in accordance with any approved statement.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- Planning file Ref. S/0162/04/F

Contact Officer: Andrew Moffat – Area Planning Officer
Telephone: (01223) 443169

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	2 nd June 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

S/0482/04/F – Willingham**Extension to Existing Auction/Viewing Hall, 25 High Street, for Willingham Auctions****Recommendation - Approval****Site and Proposal**

1. Willingham Auction is a business based on an assemblage of former traditional farmbuildings accessed of the eastern side of High Street. These are large areas of hardstanding within the site which are used for outside storage of goods to be auctioned and for car parking.
2. The full application, received on the 8th March 2004 proposes an extension to the large barn used as the auction hall for further auction hall floorspace and a reception. The extension has a slate pitched roof to match the profile and height of the existing building with a lower, single storey reception link. It has a similar width as the existing building and is a similar length (15.5m) excluding the 4.3 reception link. The wall are clad in timber with brick plinth and quoins to match the existing. Gross external floor area proposed is 136 sq metres.

Planning History

3. In September 2002 planning permission was granted by members (item 20) for an extension to the auction hall which had a similar footprint but a lower ridge link and no reception area.

Planning Policy

4. The following policies are relevant:
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
5. **Policy P1/3** – Sustainable Design in Built Development
6. **Policy P2/6** – Rural Economy
South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
7. **Policy EM7** – Expansion of existing firms at villages
8. **Appendix 7/1** - Gives standards for car parking provision

Consultations

9. Willingham Parish Council objects “The extension is taking away valuable parking spaces from this site. Auction days cause a great deal of parking problems for the village, and with the future narrowing of the High Street with the Bovis site we feel the parking on the application site is imperative.”
10. The Chief Environmental Health Officer has no objections subject to a condition limiting the hours of use of power operated machinery during the construction period.

Representations

11. No representations have been received.

Planning Comments

12. Key Issues
 - The impact of the extension of the amenities of neighbouring properties.
 - The appropriateness of the design of the extension to a traditional barn.
 - The displacement of existing car parking.
13. There is an extant planning permission for a very similar extension to the existing auction hall, both in terms of footprint, scale and location on the site. The only significant differences are the introduction of a single storey “link” to form a reception area and a higher ridge line. The design replicates the features of the existing barn and is acceptable.
14. The extension will be over 50m from the nearest dwelling and there is no detrimental impact on neighbour amenity.
15. The Parish Council has again raised concerns about the displacement of on-site parking and the likely impact on parking in the High Street during auction days. Auctions are currently held on a 3 weekly basis and the advantage of an extension is that it will not necessitate more frequent auctions. An additional overspill area of parking is proposed to off set that lost to the extension, but inevitably some customers will continue to park in the High Street. The Local Highway Authority has not commented on the application and these are no grounds to refuse the proposal on highway safety grounds. This proposal would supersede the 2002 permission (111sq metres gross external area) given that it occupies the same site.
16. The Auction is a thriving business and is an appropriate use of the traditional barns on the site.

Recommendations

17. Approval
 1. Standard Condition A Time Limited Permission - (Reason A);

2. During the period of construction no power operated machinery shall be operated on the premises before 08.00 hours on weekdays and 08.00 hours on Saturdays nor after 18.00 hours on weekdays and 13.00 hours on Saturdays (nor at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays), unless otherwise previously agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority in accordance with any agreed noise restrictions.
(Reason - To ensure neighbour disturbance is minimised.)

Informatives

Reasons for Approval

1. The approved development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:
 - **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003: P1/3** (Sustainable design in built development) and P2/6 (Rural Economy);
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004: EM7 – Expansion of existing firms),**
2. The proposal conditionally approved is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations which have been raised during the consultation exercise: **The impact of potential additional parking on the High Street.**
3. All other material planning considerations have been taken into account. None is of such significance as to outweigh the reason for the decision to approve the planning application.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

- County Structure Plan 2003
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Planning Application File S/0482/04/F

Contact Officer: Mr Robert Morgan - Area Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713165

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	2 nd June 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

S/0144/04/F – Willingham**Extensions at 65 Church Street, Willingham for S. Hall****Recommendation: Approval****Conservation Area****Site and Proposal**

1. No. 65 is a brick and slate Grade 2 listed building and former Methodist Chapel situated on the northern side of Church Street, opposite Willingham Green, within the Willingham Conservation Area. Single storey rear additions have been added to the building.
2. Adjoining the site are rear gardens of dwellings facing Rockmill End to the north, a single storey building used as a library and rear garden of 1 Rockmill End to the east, Willingham Green to the south and a two-storey dwelling to the west.
3. This full planning application was received on 27 January 2004 and amended by plans date stamped 25 February 2004, proposes the partial demolition of a previous single storey rear addition and the erection of a two storey rear extension. This extension will provide additional bedrooms and water closets/bathrooms and will have a lower ridge height than the existing ridge height of the building.

Planning History

4. Listed Building Consent was given on 22 April 2004 for Internal and External Alterations to the building (including the proposed two-storey extension to the dwelling (included in the above planning application), subject to various conditions of consent (**Ref: S/0428/04/LB**).
5. Planning permission was given in June 2003 for a change of use of the former Methodist Chapel to a Dwelling (**Ref: S/1107/03/F**). In March 2004, listed building consent was also given for internal and external alterations to the building (**Ref: S/2447/03/LB**).
6. Planning permission was also given for an extension to the building in 1977 (**Ref: S/1317/77/F**).

Planning Policy

7. **Policy HG12 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings within Frameworks'** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 ("The Local Plan") establishes that proposals to extend dwellings should have regard to the issues of scale, design, materials and the degree of impact upon surrounding properties and street scene.

8. **Policy EN20 ‘Unsympathetic Extensions’** of the Local Plan states that the District Council will refuse planning permission for extensions to Listed Buildings which are not necessary to ensure the continuing use of the building, would dominate or detract from the Listed Building in scale, form, massing and appearance or would imply the loss of building fabric of architectural or historic interest.
9. **Policy EN30 ‘Development in Conservation Areas’** of the Local Plan requires new development to preserve or enhance the special character and appearance of Conservation Areas especially in terms of their scale, massing, roof materials and wall materials.
10. **P1/2 – Environmental Restrictions on Development** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 (“The County Structure Plan”) states that development will be restricted where there could be damage, destruction or loss of areas that should be retained for their biodiversity, historic, archaeological, architecture and recreational value.
11. **P1/3 – Sustainable Design in Built Development** of The County Structure Plan requires a high standard of design for all new development that responds to the local character of the built environment and details aspects of design to be considered.
12. **Policy 7/6 – Historic Built Environment** of The County Structure Plan specifies that Local Planning Authorities will protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the historic built environment.

Consultation

13. **Willingham Parish Council** – In response to the amendment of the planning application, the Parish Council has recommended the approval of the application.
14. **Conservation Manager** – In response to the amendment of the planning application, this officer has recommended the approval of the application. Adding that:
15. “The principle of an extension more or less within the footprint of the existing single storey flat-roofed extension is acceptable. This is an improvement of the initial proposal which involved an extension above the existing lean-to, that would mask the whole of the rear elevation of the chapel and potentially involve the loss of historic fabric.”

Representations

16. Letter of objection including photo mock-ups of proposed extension received from occupier of adjacent dwelling, No 1 Rockmill End. This letter raises the following grounds of objection:
 - a. The proposal would seriously harm the outlook of 1 Rockmill End due to its height and bulk;
 - b. The proposed first floor windows in the eastern elevation of the dwelling would overlook their garden, resulting in an undue loss of privacy;
 - c. The proposed extension is out of keeping with the listed building and “we can see no reason why it cannot be developed without raising its height”;

- d. The proposed extension “would severely impact on the open nature of the surrounding garden areas” and “would be the first intrusion into the open aspect of the surrounding garden areas”;
- e. The proposed extension represents overdevelopment of the plot; and
- f. The proposal represents speculative development

Planning Comments – Key Issues

- 17. The key issues in relation to this proposal are impact upon neighbouring amenities, impact on the listed building and impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and streetscene.

Impact on Neighbouring Residential Amenities

- 18. The proposed extension occupies a similar footprint to existing additions to the building and will have a ridge height of 6.2m, compared to an existing ridge height of 7.9m. The extension will raise the height of building at the northern elevation from 2.6m to 6.2m. First floor windows are proposed on the eastern elevation, which will serve a bedroom and ensuite.
- 19. The extension is setback approximately 9m from the rear garden of 1 Rockmill End and approximately 30m from the dwelling itself. Although the proposal will introduce first floor windows which face the rear garden of 1 Rockmill End, it is considered that there is sufficient distance between the extension and the dwelling to prevent an undue loss of privacy. The distance between the extension and 1 Rockmill End is also considered sufficient to prevent the extension from being unduly overbearing.
- 20. Given the orientation and position of Numbers 63 and 65 Church Street and the setback of No. 63 from the common property boundary with No. 65, the proposed extension is not considered to unduly harm the residential amenities of 63 Church Street, Willingham.
- 21. It is noted that loss of views over adjacent properties is not a relevant matter in the consideration of planning applications, nor is whether the proposal represents speculative development or not.

Impact on Listed Building

- 22. Listed Building Consent has been granted for internal and external alterations to the dwelling, including the extension the subject of this planning application. The extension is not considered to harm the setting, appearance or historic fabric of the listed building.

Impact on Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area and streetscene

- 23. The proposal will be screened from view from surrounding public roads. The extension is not considered to harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area or streetscene.

Recommendations

- 18. Recommendation of approval of application as amended by plans date stamped 25 February, subject to the following conditions:

Conditions of Consent

1. Standard Condition A – Time limited permission (Reason A);
2. Sc22 – No windows of any kind shall be inserted at first floor in the western elevation of the development. Rc22.

Informatives

Reasons for Approval

1. The approved development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:
 - **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003: P1/2** (Environmental Restrictions on Development, **P1/3** (Sustainable design in built development) and **P7/6** (Historic Built Environment);
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004: Policy HG12** (Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings within Frameworks), **Policy EN20** (Unsympathetic Extensions to Listed Buildings) and **Policy EN30** (Development in Conservation Areas)
2. The proposal conditionally approved is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations which have been raised during the consultation exercise:
 - Residential amenity including outlook and overlooking issues
 - Visual impact on the locality and
 - Impact upon setting of Conservation Area
3. All other material planning considerations have been taken into account. None is of such significance as to outweigh the reason for the decision to approve the planning application.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- Planning file ref: S/0144/04/F
- Listed Building file ref: S/428/04/LB
- Planning file ref: S/1107/03/F

Contact Officer: Allison Tindale – Planning Assistant
Telephone: (01954) 713159

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	2 nd June 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

**S/0373/04/F – OVER
EXTENSION, OUTBUILDINGS AND CHANGE OF USE AT 8 ELSTOW CLOSE, OVER
FOR J. LAMOON**

Recommendation: Refusal

Members will visit this site on Tuesday 1st June 2004.

Site and Proposal

1. 8 Elstow Close is a modern two-storey detached dwelling situated on a corner plot at the intersection of Anglesey Way and Elstow Close, Over. Public Footpath No. 2 runs along the pavement to the south and south-east of the dwelling, before crossing to the opposite side of Anglesey Way further north. To the east of the dwelling is a brick wall some 1.8m in height, which encloses the side garden of the property. To the east of this brick wall is a strip of land measuring up to 2.6m in width and 13.5m in length within the ownership of the applicant, but outside the current residential curtilage of the dwelling. An established hedge is present on this land. Separating this land from Anglesey Way is a grass strip of land approximately 2m in width, not within the ownership of the applicant.
2. It is noted that the adjacent property to the north (No. 1 Hemington Close) also has an unenclosed strip of land to the east of the dwelling, although of narrower width. Dwellings along Anglesey Way are characterised by open frontage layouts.
3. This full planning application received on 26 February 2004, proposes the erection of a single storey rear extension to the dwelling, alterations to the front elevation of the dwelling to create a front gable and bay windows, and a timber lean-to entrance and bike store and brick and tiled workshop on the east side of the dwelling. In addition a change of use is proposed to the land to the east of the existing brick boundary wall from amenity to garden land. The proposed workshop will require the demolition of a section of garden wall and will be constructed partly on amenity land.

Planning History

4. Planning permission was given for an extension to the dwelling in 1989 (**Ref: S/0187/87/F**). It is also noted that the original garage on the property has been converted into additional accommodation under permitted development rights.
5. Planning permission was given for the erection of the dwelling as part of a larger estate in 1978 (**Ref: S/1293/78/F**). The layout plan for the estate illustrates that land to the east of the existing side boundary wall was not intended to form part of the residential curtilage of the adjacent dwelling, and was intended to be landscaped.

Planning Policy

5. **Policy HG12 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings within Frameworks’** of the Local Plan establishes that proposals to extend dwellings should have regard to the issues of scale, design, materials and the degree of impact upon surrounding properties and street scene.
7. **P1/3 – Sustainable Design in Built Development** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 (“The County Structure Plan”) requires a high standard of design for all new development that responds to the local character of the built environment and details aspects of design to be considered.

Consultation

8. **Over Parish Council** – No recommendation
9. **Cambridgeshire County Council, Definitive Map Officer** – No objection. In the event that the application is approved, they recommend the use of informatives to maintain access to public footpath No. 2 Over.
10. **Councillor Monks** – Recommendation of Approval

Representations

11. None received.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

12. The key issue in relation to the proposal is the impact of the proposed extensions and outbuildings on the visual amenities of the streetscene. Other important considerations are impacts on the residential amenity of adjacent properties and the accessibility of the adjacent public footpath.
13. I have no objection to the proposed alterations to the front elevation of the dwelling, the single storey rear extension, timber lean-to entrance and bike store, and change of use of land to the side of the dwelling. These works are considered to have an acceptable visual impact on the streetscene, with no serious harm to the residential amenities of adjacent properties. The determination of the application thus rest on the issue of whether the proposed brick and tiled workshop has an adverse impact on the visual amenities of the streetscene along Elstow Close and Anglesey Way.
14. The Anglesey Way estate is characterised by open frontages along roads, and narrow grassed strips separating built development from the road on corner plots. The partial development of amenity land to the side of the dwelling, would represent a form of development out of keeping with this character. The position of the proposed workshop to the side of the dwelling, adjacent the side property boundary on a prominent corner location is also considered to introduce an alien and incongruous feature into the streetscene, inconsistent with the existing pattern of development within the area.

Recommendation

15. In light of concerns relating to impacts on the visual amenity of the streetscene, my recommendation is one of refusal.

Reason for Refusal

16. The proposed workshop by virtue of its size and siting on amenity land to the side of the existing dwelling and adjacent the side property boundary on a prominent corner plot, would introduce an alien and incongruous feature into the streetscene that does not relate well to the existing pattern of setback of development from surrounding roads, characteristic of this section of the Elstow Close/Anglesey Way estate in Over. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy P1/3 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003, which requires new development to respond to the local character of the built environment. The proposal is also contrary to Policy HG12 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 which states that extensions will not be permitted where there would be an unacceptable visual impact upon the streetscene.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- Planning File Ref: S/0373/04/F
- Planning File Ref: S/1293/78/F

Contact Officer: Allison Tindale – Planning Assistant
Telephone: (01954) 713159

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation
Control Committee

2nd June 2004

AUTHOR/S: Director of Development Services

S/0765/04/F – COMBERTON**EXTENSION AT 78 BARTON ROAD, COMBERTON FOR MR AND MRS LAYTON****Recommendation: Approval**

Members will visit this site on 1st June 2004

Conservation Area**Site and Proposal**

1. No. 78 is a brick and slate two-storey semi-detached dwelling with a single storey rear protrusion, situated on the southern side of Barton Road, Comberton, adjacent the eastern boundary of the Comberton Conservation Area. The dwelling is set approximately 0.7m above street level. Adjoining the pair of semi-detached buildings, is an identical pair of semi-detached dwellings to the west and a pair of semi-detached dwellings of lower height to the east.
2. This full planning application was received on 14 April 2004 and proposes the demolition of the existing rear projection and the erection of a two storey side and rear extension with hipped roofs. The extension is intended for use as a kitchen, utility room, study with two bedrooms and bathroom above.

Planning History

3. Planning application **S/2068/03/F** for a two storey side and rear extension to the dwelling with apex roof was refused in November 2003 on the grounds that the proposal would have an adverse impact on the visual appearance of the streetscene, the character and appearance of the Comberton Conservation Area and an undue loss of privacy to the adjacent dwelling, No 76 Barton Road.

Planning Policy

4. **Policy HG12 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings within Frameworks'** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 ("The Local Plan") establishes that proposals to extend dwellings should have regard to the issues of scale, design, materials and the degree of impact upon surrounding properties and street scene.
5. **Policy EN30 'Development in Conservation Areas'** of the Local Plan requires new development to preserve or enhance the special character and appearance of Conservation Areas especially in terms of their scale, massing, roof materials and wall materials.

6. **P1/3 – Sustainable Design in Built Development** of The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 (“The County Structure Plan”) requires a high standard of design for all new development that responds to the local character of the built environment and details aspects of design to be considered.
7. **Policy 7/6 – Historic Built Environment** of The County Structure Plan specifies that Local Planning Authorities will protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the historic built environment.

Consultation

8. **Comberton Parish Council** – Recommendation of refusal. It states:
9. “This extension is still too big, although the roofline is improved. In this elevated position in a conservation area, this extension is inappropriate. It changes the character of the group of dwellings because it is not sympathetically extended to compliment the others. We refuse.”
10. **Conservation Manager** – No objection adding “the proposed extension will have no significant impact on the character of the Conservation Area, as it remains subservient to key streetscape elevations. The main issue would appear to be the relationship to the adjoining property.”
11. **Councillor Harangozo** – objects “I am very concerned about the loss of amenity to the neighbours east of the proposed extension. The extension is enormous, is hard up against the eastern boundary and also extends considerably beyond the rear of the adjacent property.
12. As a result, I feel strongly that the two storey extension is significantly overbearing on the neighbour’s garden of its massing and its proximity. Some loss of light to the neighbour’s garden and the south frontage of the house (with its patio door) is also inevitable when the sun is low and in the west, typically in spring and autumn but also in the summer to a lesser degree.
13. At the very least I would like to see the entire extension moved towards the front by at least 1-1.5m. This could be achieved without detrimental impact and would certainly reduce the impact on the neighbour. Alternatively, the rear extension should be reduced in sized”.

Representations

12. Letter of objection received from the occupants of the adjacent dwelling, No 80 Barton Road on the following grounds:
 - Undue loss of light to No. 80, “the extension will cut out a significant amount of light from both my bathroom and upstairs landing window and our glazed back door and give my house a much gloomier aspect than it has at present. The fact that the extension is both closer to our house and goes back further at two storey’s, means that we would only get direct sunlight for a very limited part of the day to the upper window and no direct sunlight to the lower window or door. Because it is a semi-detached house we rely on light from this side of the house.”
 - The proposal is overbearing due to its size and position “very close to our shared boundary at two stories and will have a significant visual impact.”

13. A letter has also been received from the occupier of the adjacent dwelling, No 76 Barton Road, which states that they have no objection to the proposal, including the first floor window on the western elevation.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

14. The key issues in relation to this proposal are impact on the character and appearance of the Comberton Conservation Area and the visual amenities of the streetscene, in addition to impact on amenities of adjacent properties.

Impact on Conservation Area and Visual Amenities of Streetscene

15. The extension is setback 2.3m from the front elevation of the dwelling, with a lower ridge height of 7.6m, compared to the existing ridge height of 8.4m. The front elevation of the extension has a hipped roof, of similar pitch to the existing roof of the dwelling. The extension will increase the width of the dwelling from 5.5m to 7.7m.
16. I am of the view that the proposal is compatible in appearance with the existing dwelling and adjacent pairs of semi-detached dwellings. As a result of the setback of the extension, its lower ridge height, similar roof pitch and use of matching materials, the proposal is considered to have an acceptable visual impact on the streetscene and preserve the character and appearance of the Comberton Conservation Area.
17. Given the different orientation, height and building materials between the pair of semi-detached dwellings Nos. 76-78 and 80-82, in addition to the minimum separation distance between dwellings Nos 78-80 of approximately 3m, the proposal will not, in my opinion create a cramped appearance in the streetscene.

Impact on Neighbouring Residential Amenities

18. The proposal is positioned approximately 3m to the west of No. 80 Barton Road. Along the western elevation of No. 80 are a ground floor and first floor window serving a bathroom and landing respectively, in addition to a glass door. Whilst the proposal will result in a loss of some light to these windows and door serving non-habitable rooms, this impact will not be of such significance as to warrant the refusal of the planning application. Impacts on the lighting of the adjacent property have been minimised by the setback between the two dwellings and hipped roof on the eastern elevation of the extension.
19. The extension will extend approximately 3m beyond the rear elevation of No. 80 and given the separation distance and orientation of the two dwellings is not considered to result in an undue loss of light to windows and doors along the rear elevation of No. 80. Nor is the proposed considered to serious harm the outlook of this dwelling.
20. The extension is setback 3.2m from the rear elevation of the adjacent dwelling, No. 76 Barton Road. This separation distance, in addition to the hipped roof on the western elevation of the extension is considered to prevent an undue loss of light to this dwelling.
21. First floor windows in the side elevations of the extension are to be obscure glazed to protect the privacy of adjacent dwellings. The proposed window in the rear elevation will face down the rear length of the garden and will not result in an undue loss of privacy for adjacent dwellings.

Recommendations

22. Recommendation of approval subject to the following conditions.

Conditions of Consent

1. Standard Condition A – Time limited permission (Reason A);
2. Sc5a – Details of materials for external walls and roofs (Rc5a(ii));
3. Sc22 – No windows at first floor level in the east or west elevation of the development (Rc22);
4. Sc23 – First floor windows in the eastern and western elevation to be fitted and permanently maintained with obscure glass (Rc23).

Informatives

Reasons for Approval

1. The approved development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:
 - **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003: P1/3** (Sustainable design in built development) and **P7/6** (Historic Built Environment);
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004: Policy HG12** (Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings within Frameworks) and **Policy EN30** (Development in Conservation Areas).
2. The proposal conditionally approved is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations which have been raised during the consultation exercise:
 - Residential amenity including light and outlook issues
 - Siting and design
 - Visual impact on the locality
 - Impact upon character and appearance of Conservation Area
3. All other material planning considerations have been taken into account. None is of such significance as to outweigh the reason for the decision to approve the planning application.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- Planning file Ref. S/0765/04/F
- Planning file Ref: S/2068/03`/F

Contact Officer: Allison Tindale – Planning Assistant
Telephone: (01954) 713159

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	2 nd June 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

S/0797/04/F – Bar Hill**Extensions and change of use at 110 Watermead, Bar Hill for S. Godsell****Recommendation: Refusal****Site and Proposal**

1. No 110 Watermead is a modern detached two storey dwelling with integral garage situated on a corner plot along Watermead. Separating the dwelling from surrounding roads is a landscaped strip of land with an approximate width of 2.1m and length of 15m, to the north of the existing side garden wall. This landscaped strip is considered outside the existing residential curtilage of the dwelling.
2. This full planning application was received on 16 April 2004 and proposes a single storey side and front extension to the dwelling, in addition to a change of use of land outside the existing residential curtilage from amenity to garden land. The extension is intended to be used for a new water closet and enlarged kitchen and living room.

Planning History

3. Planning permission was given in 1986 for the erection of the dwelling as part of a larger residential estate (**Ref: S/0056/86/F**). There are no records of previous extensions to the dwelling. The original layout plan for this development, clearly indicates that land to the side and front of the dwelling was intended to be landscaped.

Planning Policy

4. **Policy HG12 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings within Frameworks’** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 (“The Local Plan”) establishes that proposals to extend dwellings should have regard to the issues of scale, design, materials and the degree of impact upon surrounding properties and street scene.
5. **P1/3 – Sustainable Design in Built Development** of The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 (“The County Structure Plan”) requires a high standard of design for all new development that responds to the local character of the built environment and details aspects of design to be considered.

Consultation

6. **Bar Hill Parish Council** – Recommendation of Approval

Representations

7. None received at the time of writing the agenda report.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

8. The main issue to consider in the determination of this application relates to the impact of the extension and change of use upon the visual amenity of the area. Another important consideration is the impact of the proposal on the residential amenities of adjacent properties.
9. The Watermead estate is characterised by landscaped and grassed strips separating the built development from the road. These lend the estate a sense of spaciousness and are considered important features of the character of the area and contributing to the visual amenities of the streetscene. The erection of the side extension on this landscaped strip and consequent removal of plantings, would represent a form of development that would be out of keeping with this character and inconsistent with the original landscaping plans for the estate. The side extension would also create a harsh boundary feature adjacent the road.
10. In addition there are many instances within the estate where such development and change of use of land could be repeated, and the proposal, if approved, would set an undesirable precedent for future development of this nature, thereby further eroding the visual amenities of the streetscene.
11. The proposal would not cause serious harm to the residential amenities of adjacent properties.

Recommendations

12. In light of concerns regarding impact on the streetscene, my recommendation is one of refusal.

Reasons for Refusal

13. The erection of the extension on the landscaped strip to the side of the dwelling on a prominent corner plot, would create a harsh boundary feature, out of keeping with the existing character of the Watermead estate, which features open and landscaped spaces separating dwellings from roads. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy P1/3 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003, which requires new development to respond to the local character of the built environment. The proposal is also contrary to Policy HG12 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 which states that extensions will not be permitted where there would be an unacceptable visual impact upon the streetscene.
14. Notwithstanding this, the proposal would set an undesirable precedent for the further development of open and landscaped spaces within the estate, thereby further eroding the character of the area and the visual amenities of the streetscene.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003

- Planning File Ref: S/0797/04/F

Contact Officer: Allison Tindale – Planning Assistant
Telephone: (01954) 713159

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation Control
Committee

2nd June 2004

AUTHOR/S: Director of Development Services

S/0728/LB – HISTON

ALTERATIONS AND EXTENSION INCLUDING REPLACEMENT OF CONSERVATORY / LINK WITH ENLARGED FLAT ROOFED GARDEN ROOM. CONVERSION OF OUTBUILDING TO ANNEXE WITH TWO BEDROOMS, BATHROOM, SHOWER ROOM AND KITCHEN; RELOCATE ROOFLIGHT ON SE ELEVATION AND INSTALL ROOFLIGHT ON NW ELEVATION. GLAZE EXISTING DOOR OPENING AND BLOCK EXISTING WINDOW. REPLACE FRENCH DOORS IN SITTING ROOM WITH ENLARGED GLAZED OPENING AND BLOCK UP HIGH LEVEL WINDOW

&**S/0729/04/F - HISTON
EXTENSION**

**AT 4-6 CHURCH STREET
FOR MRS J ELLIOTT & MR T BOMBER**

Recommendation: Refusal

Conservation Area**Site and Proposal**

1. The Grade II Listed Building dating from the 17th century is a traditional three-unit plan cottage and is timber framed with a thatched roof. The modest scale and character of the cottage has been somewhat compromised by the 20th century extensions on the rear elevation. These comprise a 20th century one and a half storey, thatched extension to the side and rear, a single storey flat roofed extension to the rear and a conservatory with a link to the outbuilding.
2. The outbuilding runs along the south eastern boundary of the site with the gable facing Church Street. The gault brick outbuilding has been constructed in two phases; the lower part, which is nearest to the road, has a pantiled roof and has been converted to a bedroom with a shower. The larger and possibly earlier building also gault brick, has a slate roof and is currently used as a store/workshop.
3. The rear garden is well enclosed by high brick walls. A mature yew tree is sited to the rear of the glazed link. The property falls within the Histon Conservation Area
4. This full planning application, received on the 6th April 2004, proposes to convert the remaining area of outbuilding, including internal alterations to form an additional bedroom with en-suite shower room and a kitchen. In addition, it is proposed to demolish the existing glazed link between the house and outbuilding and to replace it with a larger garden room, linking the house with the annexe accommodation and providing a sitting area for the occupants of the annexe.

5. The Listed Building Application is for the same proposals, however specifically includes additional minor changes to the building including; relocating a rooflight in the south-east roof slope (facing no. 2B), installing an additional roof light in the north-west elevation, glazing a door to the rear part of the outbuilding and remove a window (facing into the site), and widening and glazing an existing door opening, and blocking an existing high level window (north west elevation of house).
5. Written statements from the architect and applicants indicate that these proposals are required to provide accommodation for two elderly, but unrelated relatives who currently live independently within the village.

Planning History

6. **C/71/0916/D** gave planning permission for the erection of a single storey rear extension to provide a kitchen and rear hall in 1971.
7. In 1987 planning permission (ref: **S/0196/87/F**) and listed building consent (ref: **S/0197/87/LB**) were granted for a two storey side/rear extension, conservatory link to the outbuildings and conversion of the outbuilding to a bedroom, study and en-suite facilities.
8. In 1994 a listed building consent was granted under reference **S/0388/94/LB** for the demolition of an outbuilding.

Planning Policy

9. Policy **HG12 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 ("Local Plan") sets out the requirements that must be met in order for proposals to extend or alter dwellings within village frameworks to be considered for approval.
10. Policy **EN20 'Unsympathetic Extensions'** of the Local Plan identifies circumstances in which planning permission for extensions to Listed Buildings will be refused including when the works are not necessary for the continued use of the building and when they would detract from the Listed Building in scale, massing or appearance.
11. Policy **EN30 'Development in Conservation Areas'** of the Local Plan requires development within these areas to preserve or enhance the special character and appearance of the area, especially in terms of scale, massing, roof materials and wall materials.
12. Policy **P1/3 'Sustainable Design in Built Development'** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 states that a high standard of design and sustainability should be adopted for all new forms of development.

Consultations

13. **Histon Parish Council** recommended approval.
14. **The Conservation Manager** recommends the application be refused, commenting that:
15. There are no objections to the conversion of the remainder of the outbuilding, subject to minor amendments to the openings.

16. The rear elevation has been extensively altered and compromised by the existing extensions and the replacement of the conservatory and link with a larger garden room would compound rather than reduce the impact of the existing extensions and would not improve the appearance of the building.
17. The additional floor space is not considered to meet the test of being necessary for the continued use of the building.
18. The proposal is considered to fail to meet the tests in the local plan policy and is inappropriate and detracts from the special character of the cottage and outbuilding. The replacement of the existing conservatory and link with a larger garden room will significantly increase the impact on the listed building. The result will neither preserve nor enhance its character and appearance nor that of the Conservation Area.
19. **The Trees and Landscape Officer** – Does not object to the removal of the yew to the rear of the existing glazed link.

Representations

20. The occupier of 2B Church Street has commented that the window treatments should not be harmful to the amenities they enjoy and suggest appropriate conditions should be placed to ensure this remains the case. They also comment that the extensions proposed should not be detrimental to their own chances of success should they apply for a rear extension.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

21. The key issues to consider in respect of this application are the impacts upon the Listed Building and Histon Conservation Area, and the neighbouring residential amenities.

Listed Building

22. The proposed extension in its current form is contrary to Local Plan policy, in that the extension proposed is unsympathetic to the Listed Building. The design is not in keeping with the 17th century elements of the building, which include a steep roof pitch design in which first floor accommodation is provided. The extension will add to a previous two-storey addition to the building, which is reasonably successfully related to the original 3-plan frontage building. The extension now proposed has a poor relationship to this element of the building, by way of its design, including a flat roof and its size, which increases the footprint of the buildings such that a ‘sprawl’ of single storey modern additions will detract from the special features of the original historic building.
23. In addition to the above considerations relating to the design, it has been noted that the proposals are not required to ensure the continued use of the building, which currently is occupied as a dwelling and remains suited to this purpose.

Conservation Area

24. The comments of the Conservation team indicate that the proposal will not preserve or enhance the special character of the Conservation Area, as required in policy EN30. The inappropriate nature of the extensions, as outlined in the paragraphs above, will detract from the special character of the cottage and outbuildings and therefore, are considered to be contrary to Conservation policy.

The link building and extensions are partially visible from the road and therefore have a negative impact on the appearance and character of the Conservation Area.

Residential Amenity

25. The neighbouring dwelling will not be harmed as a result of these proposals. The house at no. 2B has no first floor side windows that would be affected by moving the existing rooflight in the south-east roof slope. This is a high level window, through which views out are limited. If no. 2B were to be extended at the rear, the distance of an extension from this rooflight would be such that views into the window would be unlikely. These proposals will not prejudice the ability of the neighbours to extend their own property. The remainder of the proposals are screened by the house or out buildings so that no loss of privacy, overlooking, loss of light or overbearing visual impact will result.

Recommendation

26. In light of the concerns raised in relation to the impact upon the Listed Building and Conservation Area, refusal of both applications is recommended.
1. The rear elevation has been extensively altered and compromised by the existing extensions. The replacement of the conservatory and link with a larger garden room would compound rather than reduce the impact of the existing extensions and would not improve the appearance of the building. They would therefore, have a detrimental impact upon the special architectural and historic features of the building and its setting. In addition, the extension is not required for the continued use of the building and so the proposals are contrary to the requirements of policy EN20 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, adopted 2004.
 2. The proposed garden room is partially visible to the public from the road. Due to the design, which is inappropriate as a result of its impact on the special character of the Grade II Listed cottage, it will detract from the appearance and character of the Histon Conservation Area and as such is contrary to policy EN30 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, adopted 2004.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- Planning files refs: S/0728/2004LB and S/0729/04/F

Contact Officer: Melissa Reynolds – Senior Planning Assistant
Telephone: (01954) 713 237

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	2 nd June 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

S/0562/04/F – TEVERSHAM

Extensions at 11 Fennec Close for Mrs. Abbas

Recommendation: Approval

Members of Committee will visit the site on Tuesday 1st June 2004.

Background

1. This application was deferred at the Planning Committee held 12th May 2004 (item no. 21) to enable members to visit the site prior to making a decision.
2. This is in response to concerns raised by Teversham Parish Council in its letter dated 6th May 2004, in which it reiterated its earlier concerns that the proposal will cause a loss of amenity to the neighbouring dwellings, and that the proposal will result in overdevelopment of the site. A discussion of the Parish's comment regarding overdevelopment of the site follows in this report.
3. The previous committee report is attached as an appendix.

Additional Planning Comments

4. The proposal will result in the site being fully developed across its plot width, however a path on the north side of the house will not be built on, ensuring that separation between the neighbouring house is maintained. On the opposite side of the house, the extension will abut a driveway serving houses to the south, such that visual separation within the street scene will not be reduced. In my opinion the proposal will not result in overdevelopment across the plot width.
5. The private amenity space to the rear of the dwelling will be reduced as a result of the extension to a minimum depth of four metres increasing to a maximum of six metres. The garden is currently on average approximately eight metres deep. The reduced garden area will be relatively small in comparison to other dwellings in the road however, it will be adequate for its purpose as a private amenity space for the occupants. In a high-density development, such as the one in which the site is located, a relatively small garden area does not harm the amenities of the occupants and will cause no harm to the amenities of the surrounding area.

Recommendation

6. Whilst noting the Parish Council's concerns, on balance the harm caused as a result of this proposal is not sufficient to warrant a refusal and as such the recommendation remains one of approval subject to the following suggested conditions:
 1. Standard Condition A – Time limited permission (Reason A);

2. SC5a – Details of materials for external walls and roofs (RC5aii);
3. SC22 – No further windows in the north and south elevations (RC22)

Reasons for Approval

1. The approved development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:
 - **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003: P1/3** (Sustainable design in built development)
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004: HG12** (Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings within Frameworks)
2. The proposal conditionally approved is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations which have been raised during the consultation exercise:
 - Residential amenity
 - Overdevelopment
3. All other material planning considerations have been taken into account. None is of such significance as to outweigh the reason for the decision to approve the planning application.

Background Papers

The following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- Planning file refs. S/0562/04/F, S/0045/04/F and S/1957/03/F

Contact Officer: Melissa Reynolds – Senior Planning Assistant.
Telephone: (01054-713237).

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	2 nd June 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

S/0483/04/F – SHEPRETH
Erection of 18 metre high telecommunications tower and associated development at
Barrington Park Equestrian Centre, Shepreth
For Hutchison 3G Ltd

Recommendation: Delegated approval

Site and Proposal

1. The site lies approximately 60m north of the Cambridge – Royston railway line and 650m north of the A10 at the Barrington Park Equestrian Centre between the villages of Shepreth, Barrington and Foxton but within the parish of Shepreth. It lies adjacent to a track which leads down to the Equestrian Centre. There are several trees and shrubs in the vicinity with one large tree (approximately 17m high) approximately 3-6m south of the site.
2. The full planning application, received on 8th March 2004, proposes the erection of an 18m high lattice type mast with 3 vertical antennae and 3 dishes attached. The compound surrounding the mast has an area of 30m² and its erection will involve the loss of a number of bushes and small trees.
3. The closest residential properties are in Angle Lane, Shepreth. The closest of these, 1 Edieham Cottages, lies some 400m away from the mast (from the dwelling and 335m away from the closest point of the rear of the garden).
4. A Tree Preservation Order covers a line of trees that run north-south through the application site. The order refers specifically to the willow trees within this belt.
5. A public footpath lies approximately 400m to the west running north-south.
6. The application is accompanied by a Declaration of Conformity with ICNIRP Public Exposure Guidelines.

Planning History

7. There is no history of relevance to the application.

Planning Policy

8. **Planning Policy Guidance Note No. 8 - Telecommunications**
9. This guidance note is a material consideration to which significant weight should be attached. Its general policies are set out below:

10.
 1. "The Government's policy is to facilitate the growth of new and existing telecommunications systems whilst keeping the environmental impact to a minimum. The Government also has responsibility for protecting public health.
 2. The aim of telecommunications policy is to ensure that people have a choice as to who provides their telecommunications service, a wider range of services from which to choose and equitable access to the latest technologies as they become available.
 3. The Government places great emphasis on its well established national policies for the protection of the countryside and urban areas - in particular the National Parks (including the Broads and the New Forest), Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Sites of Special Scientific Interest, the Green Belts, the Heritage Coast and areas and buildings of architectural or historic importance.
 4. Whilst local planning authorities are encouraged to respond positively to telecommunications development proposals, they should take account of the advice on the protection of urban and rural areas in other planning policy guidance notes.
 5. Material considerations include the significance of the proposed development as part of a national network. In making an application for planning permission or prior approval, operators may be expected to provide evidence regarding the need for the proposed development.
 6. Authorities should not seek to prevent competition between different operators and should not question the need for the telecommunications system which the proposed development is to support".
11. With regard to Health Considerations Planning Policy Guidance Note No. 8 states:
 - "29. Health considerations and public concern can in principle be material considerations in determining applications for planning permission and prior approval. Whether such matters are material in a particular case is ultimately a matter for the courts. It is for the decision-maker (usually the local planning authority) to determine what weight to attach to such considerations in any particular case.
 30. However, it is the Governments firm view that the planning system is not the place for determining health safeguards. It remains central Governments responsibility to decide what measures are necessary to protect public health. In the Governments view, if a proposed mobile phone base station meets the ICNIRP guidelines for public exposure it should not be necessary for a local planning authority, in processing an application for planning permission or prior approval, to consider further the health aspects and concerns about them.
 31. The Governments acceptance of the precautionary approach recommended by the Stewart Groups report "*mobile phones and health*"¹ is limited to the specific recommendations in the Groups report and the Governments response to them. The report does not provide any basis for precautionary actions beyond those already proposed. In the Governments view, local planning authorities should not implement their own precautionary policies e.g. by way of imposing a ban or moratorium on new telecommunications development or insisting on minimum distances between new telecommunications development and existing development".
12. **Policy 6/5** of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 2003 states:

"Growth of new and existing telecommunications systems will be encouraged to ensure people have equitable access to a wide range of

services and the latest technologies as they become available, and to reduce the need to travel”.

The supporting text states (in part):

“Coverage and capacity of broadband services, cable and mobile phone network infrastructure will be encouraged”.

“The LPA’s will need to take into account environmental and health impacts of telecommunications development when drawing up Local Plans or considering planning applications”.

13. **Policy CS8** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 states:

“In determining whether approval of siting and appearance is required, or considering applications for planning permission for telecommunication installations, the District Council will need to be satisfied that:

(1) the siting and external appearance of apparatus have been designed to minimise the impact of such apparatus on amenity, while respecting operational efficiency;

(2) in the case of radio masts, the applicant has shown evidence that it has explored the possibility of erecting antennas on an existing building, mast or other structure;

(3) Antenna have, so far as is practicable, been sited so as to minimise their effect on the external appearance of the building on which they are installed;

(4) Applicants have considered any need to include additional structural capacity to take account of the growing demands for network development, including that of other operators, to facilitate future mast sharing.

Proposals for the location of telecommunication installations will not be permitted where they have an unacceptable visual impact on the urban or rural landscape, unless the applicant can demonstrate that no alternative more appropriate site is available”.

14. **Policy EN1** of the Local Plan states:

“Relevant parts of the Landscape Character Areas of England are defined on the Proposals Map. In all its planning decisions the District Council will seek to ensure that the local character and distinctiveness of these areas is respected, retained and wherever possible enhanced. While recognising that landscape is a dynamic concept, planning permission will not be granted for development which would have an adverse effect on the character and local distinctiveness of these areas”.

Consultations

15. **Shepreth Parish Council** recommends refusal. It states:
There are already 2 masts in this area.

16. **Foxton Parish Council** makes no recommendations.

17. **Chief Environmental Health Officer** states: “I have considered the implications of the proposals in terms of emission of electromagnetic radiation (EMFs).

Currently clinical and epidemiological studies cannot clarify health effects associated with low level RF exposure. However, it is believed that further studies are required to confirm whether or not the findings are correct.

It is proposed that the minimum standards in the UK should follow the recommendations of ICNIRP. To this end, the applicant should be encouraged to provide monitoring data that proves that installations meet current guidelines at a minimum and should be encouraged to look for sites which, so far as is practically possible, minimise potential exposure of local residents, avoiding proximity to sensitive areas, e.g. residential developments and school grounds. Transmitter antennae should be positioned so that they project their energy beams towards the horizon and not below. The beam of greatest intensity should not fall on any part of the sensitive location (e.g. school grounds or buildings) without agreements from the occupier(s) (e.g. school and parents). The developer should be discouraged from mounting antennae on building walls where rooms immediately behind such walls will be regularly occupied by people.

From a public health protection standpoint, the above approach is justifiably precautionary. The measures outlined will ensure that any potential health residues are minimised, whilst allowing flexibility to raise thresholds if scientific data permits.”

17. **Trees and Landscape Officer and Environment Agency’s** comments are awaited.

Representations

None received. The consultation period on the Press Notice expires on 25th May.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

18. The key issues are: The visual impact of the development on the surrounding countryside including loss of existing vegetation; alternative masts, buildings, other structures and sites; perceived impact on health and amenity of nearby residents.
19. ***Visual impact.***
The mast will be visible from the public footpath that runs to the west of the site, from the A10 and the railway line as well as from the Equestrian Centre and other vantage points within the countryside. However, apart from the views from the Equestrian Centre, public views are largely from significant distances away, visually reducing the apparent height of the mast. The existing trees will provide a degree of screening, particularly one large 17m high tree, and there are already a number of telegraph poles and railway structures that interrupt the horizon. The lattice structure is not heavy in appearance and in my opinion the mast will not have an unacceptable visual impact on the rural countryside.
20. ***Existing buildings masts or other structures***
Policy CS8 requires the operator to show evidence that it has explored the possibility of erecting antennas on existing buildings, masts or other structures. A mast share has been considered to the north east at Hoffers Brook Farm but discounted as being too far north from the search area. No other existing masts, buildings or other structures have been suggested.

21. The Parish Council has stated that there are already 2 masts in the area. I have asked the Council to specify which masts it is referring to and Members will be updated verbally at the meeting.
22. I am not aware of any existing masts, buildings or other structures that would meet the needs of the operator (with the exception of a railtrack mast opposite Shepreth Station but I consider this would be too light a structure to carry the necessary equipment and is in any case in close proximity to residential buildings). However I consider that the operator may not have fully explored the issue and the question of clarification regarding Hoffers Brook Farm remains. I will therefore be requesting further information once the Parish Council has clarified its comments. Members will be updated verbally at the meeting.

Alternative sites

23. Seven alternative sites have been suggested and none are considered by the operator to be satisfactory. The following table contains information supplied by the operator:

Site Name and Address	NGR	Reason
BT TRS site, Royston Road, Foxton	540629, 248397	There is an existing consent for a T-Mobile mast at this site. The height of the trees would result in the need for a 25m+ mast very close to the road for both operators to share.
College Farm land, Barrington Road, Foxton	540600, 248800	Too close to the power lines and rail track, and nearer to residential properties.
Network Rail compound, Royston Road, Foxton	540950, 248820	Close proximity to the rail track.
Street furniture, Royston Road	540950, 248820	The height needed would be 15m, which would be incongruous for a streetworks solution.
Andrews Coaches, Royston Road	541000, 248950	The site would be more likely to raise objections from nearby residential dwellings.
Anglia Water site, Barrington Road		The site provider is not willing.
Land to either side of A10, Royston Road		The site provider is not willing.

24. Consent has been granted for a mast at Bexwell Farm adjacent to the railway line near to Shepreth Station but not yet implemented. As such this site should be regarded as an alternative site and not an existing mast. However, it would appear that the operator has not considered this site for either a mast share or for an additional mast.
25. There are three main issues in relation to consideration of alternative sites (as opposed to existing masts, buildings or other structures) these are:
26. Availability
The site has to be available, as stated in Policy CS8. This requires that the landowner is willing to enter into an agreement with the telecommunications operator.

27. Suitability
The site has to be suitable to the operator – there are limited options due in part to range and topography but also many other technical restraints.
28. Preference
If an alternative site will meet the operators technical requirements and is available a refusal of an application can only be justified where there is unacceptable visual impact and not because it would be preferable.
29. Policy CS8 states: “Proposals for the location of telecommunication installations will not be permitted where they have an *unacceptable* visual impact on the urban or rural landscape, *unless* the applicant can demonstrate that no alternative more appropriate site is available.”
30. Visual Impact
In my opinion Members should first consider if this mast has an unacceptable visual impact.
31. Acceptable
If the mast is not considered to have an unacceptable impact there is no requirement for the operator to demonstrate that no alternative site is available. There may be a better site but to refuse this application because there is a better alternative would not be justified.
32. Unacceptable
Members should still consider granting consent in line with the above policy but Members should be confident that the applicant has demonstrated that there are no alternative more appropriate sites. If not a refusal could be justified.
The applicant has considered alternative sites but in my opinion the proposed mast does not have an unacceptable visual impact and I do not believe a refusal could be justified because there is or may be a better alternative.
33. ***Landscaping***
The compound would in my view be visible from the wider landscape due to the poor screening that would be achieved by the existing planting in the vicinity of the site. A landscaping condition is therefore necessary in order to secure additional planting. I note, however, that the site location plan does not provide adequate land for additional planting. A revised plan is therefore required.
34. ***Perceived threat to health.***
The mast is some 400m from the nearest dwelling. At this distance I do not consider there is any material perception that health could be affected. Many other examples of this proximity exist and many masts and antennae are considerably closer to residential properties particularly in urban areas. Whilst this site is in a rural and not an urban setting the issue of effect on health is constant and I consider that an approval of this mast at this distance from dwellings is consistent with taking a precautionary approach. In addition I note that there have been no representations made. Two site notices were erected, one in Angle Lane and one at the entrance to the Equestrian Centre and a notice published in the Cambridge Evening News advertising the proposal.

35. ***Amenity of nearby residents***

As stated above the closest residents are in Angle Lane. There is a change in gradient between this location and the application site which coupled with the distance of some 400m will not result in the mast having an overbearing impact on these residents as it will not be readily visible.

Recommendations

36. Delegated powers of approval are sought subject to a revised plan showing an increased area of land for landscaping and further information and clarification regarding alternative existing masts, buildings, or other structures and subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard Condition A – Time limited permission (Reason A);
2. Sc51 – Landscaping (Rc51);
3. Sc52 – Implementation of landscaping (Rc52);
4. Within one month of the development hereby permitted ceasing to be used for telecommunications purposes the Local Planning Authority shall be notified accordingly in writing. Within four months of such notification all apparatus (including any mast), equipment, fencing and hard surfacing shall be removed from the land; and all buildings and structures shall be demolished and removed from the land; and the land shall be restored in accordance with a scheme submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.
(Reason: To ensure that the mast and associated equipment is removed from the site when the need for the structure ceases in order to avoid dereliction in the countryside).

Informatives

37. The provisions of the Telecommunications Code indicate that the operator is not entitled to keep apparatus if it no longer required for telecommunication purposes.

38. **Reasons for Approval**

1. The approved development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:
 - **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003: P 6/5** (Telecommunications);
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004: CS8** (Telecommunications),
 - **EN1** (Landscape Character Areas)
2. All other material planning considerations have been taken into account. None is of such significance as to outweigh the reason for the decision to approve the planning application.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report: Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 2003, South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004, Planning Policy Guidance Note No. 8 and Application File Reference S/0483/04/F.

Contact Officer: Nigel Blazeby – Senior Planning Assistant
Telephone: (01954) 713256

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	2 nd June 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

**S/0592/04/F – Toft
Erection of B1 Offices, Bennell Farm, West Street, Comberton (In the Parish of Toft) for
R W S Arnold**

Recommendation: - Refusal

Departure

Site and Proposal

1. Bennell Farm sits on the western edge of Comberton, opposite the Village College. The farmhouse and former farm buildings, largely converted to office use, are set back from West Street in a rural setting.
2. The full application, received on the 22nd March 2004, proposes the erection of a B1 office building measuring 5.4m x 24.4m and adjoins the existing farm store. The building is pitched roofed with a ridge height of 4.8m, and is timber clad to give a “barn-like” appearance.

Planning History

3. Since 1993 planning permissions have been granted to convert the former farm buildings to B1/B2/B8 (office, light industrial, research, general industrial and storage), although they are predominantly used for B1 office/research use. One building is retained as private stabling. The farm storage building adjoining the proposed building is of recent origins.

Planning Policy

4. The following policies area relevant:
 - 5. The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
Policy P1/2 - Environmental Restrictions on development. It states development in the countryside will be restricted unless the proposals can be demonstrated to be essential in particular rural location.
 - 6. **Policy P1/3** - Sustainable Design in Built Development.
 - 7. **Policy P2/6** - Rural Economy
 - 8. **Policy P9/2a** - Green Belt
 - 9. The South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
Policy GB2 – Green Belts states planning permission will not be granted for inappropriate development in the Green Belt unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated.

10. Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 3 Green Belts repeats the presumption against inappropriate development.

Consultations

11. Toft Parish Council approves, but in view of the increased traffic, signage should be installed warning motorists leaving the site to slow down due to the risk of injury to the users of the cycle path.
12. Comberton Parish Council approves, stating further development of the site must be carefully monitored, and the increase in vehicular movements managed. Also light pollution is now creating some negative comments, and should be carefully examined.
13. Local Highway Authority has no comment.
14. Environment Agency recommends the imposition of a condition regarding the provision and implementation of a surface water drainage scheme.
15. The comments of the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service and Chief Environmental Health Officer will be reported verbally.

Representations None received

Planning Comments

16. Key issue
Have very special circumstances been demonstrated to warrant approving inappropriate development in the Green Belt?
17. The proposal involves erecting a new single storey (128 sqm) office building abutting an existing agricultural building situated in the Green Belt.
18. In a covering letter it is explained that the building is required to provide offices for an existing tenant who needs additional space for expansion and who has been unable to find alternative accommodation in the locality.
19. The proposal is "inappropriate development" in the Green Belt as defined in Policy GB2 of the 2004 Local Plan. Inappropriate development is by definition harmful to the Green Belt. It is prominently sited in front of the existing complex of buildings. I do not consider that there are any "very special circumstances" to override the presumption against the proposal.

Recommendations

20. Refusal

1. The site is within the Cambridge Green Belt. The proposal to erect a 128sqm office building is "inappropriate development" and no "very special circumstances" have been advanced to overcome the presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy P9/2a of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 and Policy GB2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 which seek to maintain the setting of Cambridge and to preserve the rural character and openness of the Green Belt.

2. The site is in the countryside, outside the village frameworks of Comberton and Toft defined in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004, and the proposal would be contrary to Policy P1/2 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 which restricts development in the countryside to that which is essential to a rural location.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- Planning application file Ref: S/S/0592/04/F

Contact Officer: Mr Robert Morgan – Area Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713169

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation
Control Committee

2nd June 2004

AUTHOR/S: Director of Development Services

S/0356/04/F – Haslingfield

Extension at Chestnut House, 45 New Road, Haslingfield for J Miller

Recommendation: Approval

Site and Proposal

1. The site is a generous plot with a newly built two storey, six-bedroom house that was erected with planning permission in 2001. There is a 3 bay garage positioned to the front of the property with on-site turning space. There are numerous mature trees on the site along the front and western boundaries that have been retained, hence the positioning of the dwelling house, approximately 1.8 metres off the eastern boundary and 17 metres from the public highway.

The full planning application received 24th February 2004 proposed a two-storey rear extension. This was amended on 29th April 2004 to a rear single storey extension, creating an extended kitchen and dining area.

2. **Planning History**

S/1556/01/F – Erection of a house and triple garage. Approved.

Planning Policy

3. **Policy HG12 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings within Frameworks’** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 (“The Local Plan”) establishes that proposals to extend dwellings should have regard to the issues of scale, design, materials and the degree of impact upon surrounding properties and street scene.
4. Structure Plan 2003 **Policy P1/3** requires a high standard of design, which responds to the local character of the built environment for all new development.

Consultation

5. **Haslingfield Parish Council** recommends refusal.
“The proposed increase in size of the building would make it out of proportion with the surrounding properties”
6. **Trees and Landscape Officer** has no objections

Representations

7. One letter of objection was received from the occupiers of 1 Trinity Close with reference to the amended plans franked 29th April 2004 stating the proposal is

8. *“Too large for the available land and encroaches into the green area created by the back gardens of the surrounding properties”. The writers are also concerned that approval would prepare the way for a future application to build a second storey.*

Residents of Nos. 1A and 5 Trinity Close objected to the original two storey proposal. No comments have been received in respect of the amended scheme.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

9. **Neighbour Amenity** – The house is a large dwelling and there are existing windows that look towards the bungalows at the rear. These were addressed at the time of the previous application S/1556/01F. The two storey proposed extension would have moved closer to the neighbouring properties and would have increased over looking. Having reduced the extension to single storey only it causes no further impact on the properties in Trinity Close by means of overlooking and as a result no loss of neighbour amenity, in my opinion.
10. **Loss of garden space** – The extension to the rear, which has a footprint of 4.8m x 3.9m, is to be built over what is currently used as terrace space. It is laid to concrete slabs in keeping with the materials of the house. There is garden land beyond this and remaining amenity space around the rear and western boundary of the site. I do not feel that the proposed extension encroaches adversely on to the garden and would not negatively impact upon the properties to the rear.
11. **Character** – The dwelling house is newly built and already of a large magnitude compared to the properties located behind it, of which there is a various arrangement of bungalows, semi detached and detached properties. However, the proposals located to the rear of the property, is not out of character with that of the existing house and is not evident from the street.

Recommendations

12. Approve
1. Standard Condition A – Time limited permission (Reason A);
 2. SC19 – Materials to match existing (Reason RC19 and in accordance with the requirements of Policy HG12 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004).

Informative

Reasons for Approval

1. The approved development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:
 - **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003: P1/3** (Sustainable design in built development).
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004: HG12** (Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings within Frameworks).

2. The proposal conditionally approved is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations, which have been raised during the consultation exercise:
 - Residential amenity including noise disturbance and overlooking issues
3. All other material planning considerations have been taken into account. None is of such significance as to outweigh the reason for the decision to approve the planning application.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

- Planning File reference S/0356/04/F
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003

Contact Officer: Saffron Garner - Assistant Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713162

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	2 nd June 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

S/0470/04/F- Bourn

**Removal of agricultural occupancy condition (condition 1 of planning permission
S/0017/86/fF, Beck Farm, Toft Road for Mr C White**

Recommendation: Approval**Site and Proposal**

1. The application relates to a two-storey chalet-style bungalow located at Beck Farm to the south of the B1046 at Bourn.
2. The accommodation includes five bedrooms and a separate single bedroomed annex. The holding consists of 4.8ha (12 acres) pasture land and a range of agricultural buildings. In addition the applicant rents pasture land at Caldecote, which brings the total current holding to 17.0ha (42 acres). The applicant has a herd of 24 cattle.
3. When the Beck Farm dwelling was approved in 1986 the applicant farmed some 36.4 ha (90 acres). In 1993 the applicant took on full-time employment in Cambridge as the farm was not providing sufficient income. He and his wife now wish to move away from the area.
4. The property has been marketed in the national farming press and in the Cambridge Evening News. Potential farmers in the locality were contacted to bring the property to their attention. The property has also been placed on the agent's website. Marketing started in September 2002 and continued until February 2004. There were 33 requests for particulars and 2 viewings, but no offers.
5. The applicant is seeking to have the condition that restricts the occupation of the dwelling to a farmer or forestry worker, and their dependants, lifted. The application is supported by a detailed statement from the agent that sets out the circumstances of the applicant and the steps that have been taken to market the property.

Planning History

6. **S/0841/04/LDC** Continuation of existing use without compliance with agricultural occupancy condition In progress
S/0017/86/F Agricultural dwelling Approved
Condition 1 reads "*The occupation of the dwelling shall be limited to a person solely or mainly employed in the locality in agriculture as defined in Section 290(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1971, or in forestry (including any dependants of such person residing with him) or a widow or widower of such person*".
S/0773/85/O Agricultural dwelling Approved
S/1118/82/F Mobile home for stockman Approved
S/1034/81/O House and garage Refused/ appeal dismissed

Planning Policy

7. Governmental advice contained in Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 7 “The Countryside” states that:

“Changes in the scale and character of farming in response to market changes may affect the longer-term requirement for dwellings for which permission has been granted subject to an occupancy condition. Such dwellings should not be kept vacant, nor should their present occupants be unnecessarily obliged to remain in occupation simply by virtue of planning conditions restricting occupancy which have outlived their usefulness. Applications for the removal of occupancy conditions should be considered on the basis of realistic assessments of the existing need for them, bearing in mind that it is the need for someone solely, or mainly, or last working in agriculture in an *area* as a whole and not just on the particular holding that is relevant.”
8. **Policy P1/2 – Environmental Restrictions on Development** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 states that development will be restricted in the countryside unless the proposals can be demonstrated to be essential in a particular rural location.
9. **Policy HG17** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 states that the relaxation of an agricultural occupancy condition will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that the dwelling is no longer required by the unit or those working, or last working, in the locality in agriculture or forestry or a widow or widower of such a person, and to any resident dependants. When considering applications to relax such a condition, the District Council will require evidence of the steps taken to market the dwelling with the occupying condition.

Consultation

10. **Bourn Parish Council** recommends refusal of the application. It is of the view that “approval would be inappropriate considering the recent date (1986) of the permission and that having 12 acres attached is very different from a small dwelling divorced from any land”.
11. **The Senior Farms Manager, Cambridgeshire County Council** has provided a detailed appraisal of the proposal. He considers that this large house and small-sized holding would have only limited interest to a potential farmer. He considers that the property has been marketed fully and at a reasonable asking price. He is of the opinion that it is now unlikely that a willing buyer who would comply with the planning restriction will be found. This report is attached as Appendix 1.

Representations

12. None received.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

13. The key issue is whether the agricultural occupancy condition has effectively outlived its usefulness.

14. Members will no doubt share the concern of the Parish Council that the holding ceased to generate a full-time farming income within seven years of the provision of the house. However, in line with PPG7 advice, an independent appraisal has been undertaken which is unequivocal in concluding that there is no realistic prospect of the dwelling being occupied by a full-time farmer in the current market conditions. In these circumstances the approach set out in PPG7 and Policy HG17 indicate that the occupancy condition should be lifted.
15. Members will note that an application for a Certificate of Lawfulness of Existing Use or Development (S/0841/04/LDC) has been submitted on the grounds that the agricultural occupancy condition has not been complied with for ten years. This application is still being considered, on the evidence and facts of the case.
16. The application to discharge the condition is a matter of judgement based on the circumstances of the case. But I am satisfied that the application and supporting information complies with the requirements of Policy HG17 of The Local Plan.

Recommendations

17. Approval (no conditions).

Informatives

Reasons for Approval

1. The approved development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:
 - **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003: Policy P1/2 –** (Environmental Restrictions on Development.)
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004: Policy HG17** (Relaxation of agricultural occupancy condition.)
2. The proposal conditionally approved is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations which have been raised during the consultation exercise:
 - size of the house and holding and the potential for full-time farming income to be derived from it;
 - the marketing of the property and the valuation placed upon it, and the offers to purchase received.
3. All other material planning considerations have been taken into account. None is of such significance as to outweigh the reason for the decision to approve the planning application.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

- PPG7 The Countryside: Environmental Quality and Economic and Social Development (1997);
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003;

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004; application forms, documents, plans and correspondence on file. Ref: S/0470/04/F.

Contact Officer: Ray McMurray – Senior Planning Assistant
Telephone: (01954) 713259

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	2 nd June 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

**S/2437/03/F - ORWELL
CHANGE OF USE OF AGRICULTURAL BUILDINGS TO B2 USE WITH ASSOCIATED
OFFICE FACILITIES, MALTON FARM, MALTON ROAD, FOR R HOOLE**

Recommendation: Refusal

Site and Proposal

1. The buildings are located midway between the villages of Orwell and Meldreth, to the south of the entrance to Malton Golf Course. To the south east is Malton Farmhouse, a Grade II* Listed Building and beyond that the River Cam. Opposite the site is agricultural land and to the rear land associated with the golf course.
2. This full application, as amended by drawings received on 23rd February 2004, proposes the change of use of modern agricultural buildings at Malton Farm, Malton Road, Orwell to Class B2 Industrial use with ancillary office facilities. The scheme involves some demolition of existing buildings.
3. There are currently three main buildings, which are prominently located in the landscape, close to the road frontage. Building 3 is currently the tallest building within the site and is viewed from distance when approaching from the Meldreth direction. The application, as amended, proposes the demolition of the rear section of Building 3 (231m²), the tallest part of the building at 11m, and a reduction in height of the remainder of the roof so that the new ridge height is 7m. A 207m² curved roof building at the north end of the site (Building 1) is to be removed, and the front 2 bays of Building 2 (178m²) demolished, along with the removal of an existing link between the two buildings.
4. The remaining elements of Buildings 2 and 3, totally 1260m², are to be converted into Class B2 Industrial Use. The site is to be accessed via an upgraded entrance at the northern end of the site with the provision of 33 car parking spaces. Adopted car parking standards require a maximum of 26 spaces. An existing farm entrance at the southern end of the site is to be retained to access land to the rear.
5. The walls and roofs of the retained buildings are to re-clad with box profile colour coated steel sheeting.

Planning History

6. Planning consent was granted in 1990 (**Ref S/1989/00/F**) for the change of use of part of the site for the parking of up to four lorries.

Planning Policy

7. **Policy P2/6** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 (“The County Structure Plan”) supports small-scale employment development in rural areas where, amongst other considerations, it would enable the re-use of existing buildings.
8. **Policy P7/6** of the County Structure Plan states that Local Planning Authorities will protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the historic built environment.
9. **Policy EM10** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 (“The Local Plan”) states that outside village frameworks planning permission will be granted for the change of use and conversion of rural buildings to employment use provided that: the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction and are capable of conversion without major or complete renovation; conversion does not lead to dispersal of activity on such a scale as to prejudice town and village vitality; the form, bulk and general design of the buildings both before and after conversion are in keeping with their surroundings; the buildings are capable of re-use without materially changing their existing character or impact upon the surrounding countryside; safe and satisfactory vehicular access can be provided together with adequate space within the curtilage to accommodate ancillary requirements such as car parking and lorry manoeuvring without significant detriment to the setting of the building and the landscape within which its located and; where the scale and frequency of traffic generated by the proposal can be accommodated on the road system without undue adverse effects.
10. **Policy EM28** of the Local Plan states that the District Council will resist and refuse applications which would damage the setting, well-being or attractiveness of a Listed Building and which would harm the visual relationship between the building and its formal or natural landscape surroundings.
11. **Policy TP1** of the Local Plan states that the District Council will restrict car parking to the maximum levels set out in Appendix 7/1.

Consultation

12. **Orwell Parish Council** recommends approval of the amended application.
13. **Meldreth Parish Council** recommends approval of the amended application. “Meldreth Parish Council has no objections to the application and considers that there would be no demonstrable harm to the community. Meldreth Parish Council remains concerned at possible increase of heavy traffic. However, the possibility of employment would be advantageous.”
14. The **Local Highways Authority** comments in respect of the amended drawings that a total floor area of some 1266m² has the potential to generate between 114-278 vehicle trips per day. The existing/past level of trips associated with the site when the buildings were in agricultural use, given by the applicant, is not this high. Previous comments that the proposal should be significantly reduced to a level that would not generate a greater level of vehicular traffic than continuing agricultural use of the buildings on the site. If the applicant is unable or unwilling to appropriately amend the scheme it is suggested that the proposal be refused on the grounds that Malton Lane, by reason of its narrow carriageway, is unsuitable to take the type and amount of traffic likely to be generated by the proposal.

15. The **Conservation Manager** objects on the grounds of the potential impact on the setting of the Listed Building from development, both physical impact of buildings/associated vehicular access points and intensification/change in use of the site which is held to change the rural setting of the area.
16. The **Chief Environmental Health Officer** suggests that a condition be imposed on any consent restricting the hours of operation of machinery during the alteration and construction period.
17. The **Environment Agency** recommends conditions requiring the submission of a scheme of pollution control, including foul and surface water drainage and makes safeguarding comments.

Representations

18. One letter was received in respect of the original submission from the occupiers of Malton Farm expressing concerns. The current agricultural use of the site is accepted despite the fact that neither Malton Farm, nor Malton Lane can be said to be entirely suitable for such large vehicles, being so narrow. However a B2 designation would allow much noisier and potentially smelly activities immediately adjacent to a residential property and could well result in significant increases in vehicle movements. Malton Lane in particular is very narrow in parts, barely wide enough for two cars to pass, and is extremely hazardous for larger vehicles, especially at the bridge across the Cam next to Malton Farm, where the road is particularly narrow and has several tight bends in succession. In principle it is considered that a B1 designation would be more appropriate. B2 General Industrial is a very wide use class and would not normally be considered an appropriate use in close proximity to residential properties, particularly Malton Farm a Grade II* Listed Building. If consent is granted it should be for a specific use only and change to other uses without a further application prevented. Any consent should be personal to the applicant with controls of hours of working and traffic movements commensurate with the rural locality. Any alterations to the building should be in keeping with the rural surroundings.
19. In respect of the amended scheme the occupiers of Malton Cottage expressing similar concerns to those outlined above in respect of a B2 use.

Applicants Representations

20. Two letters submitted by the applicant's agent in support of the application are attached as Appendix 1

Planning Comments – Key Issues

21. The key issues to be considered with this application are whether the proposal complies with the criteria of Policy EM10 of the Local Plan, and in particular the impact of the conversion of the buildings on the surrounding countryside, the impact of the provision of car parking within the site (given the proximity to a Grade II* Listed Building) and the impact of the proposal upon the highway network. In addition the impact of the change of use on the amenity of neighbouring properties needs to be considered.

22. The existing modern agricultural buildings are prominently located. Building 3, which in part is currently 11m high, is visible for some distance when approaching from Meldreth. In my view the reduction in height of this building, the removal of Building 1 and the front 2 bays of Building 2 offer an opportunity to reduce the visual impact of the remaining buildings in the countryside. The additional space achieved at the front of the site will allow for additional planting to be carried out helping soften the impact of the site.
23. Although the proposal currently involves the provision of 33 car parking spaces at the rear of the site that area already contains a significant amount of hardsurfacing. The car parking proposed is in excess of that required to meet the maximum standards set out in the Local Plan (26 spaces) and therefore can be reduced. I am of the view that adequate space exists within the site for adequate additional landscaping to be carried out so that the visual impact of any parking on Malton Farmhouse and the wider landscape is acceptable.
24. I note the concerns expressed by the Conservation Manager but am of the view that overall the proposal represents an opportunity to enhance the visual appearance of the site.
25. The Local Highway Authority has expressed concern about the potential traffic implications of this proposal from the outside. During the course of the application the scheme has been amended to incorporate the removal of Building 1 and a reduction in the floor area of Building 2. The applicant was hoping that this reduction in floor area, and resultant decrease in potential traffic movements, would enable the highway objection to be overcome.
26. The roadway in either direction is narrow and particularly so towards Meldreth where traffic has to negotiate sharp bends when crossing the River Cam. Although the existing buildings have the potential to generate a certain level of traffic in respect of their continued use for agricultural purposes a significant element of this would be seasonal in nature. The Local Highway Authority is of the view that the proposed B2 use of the buildings has the potential to result in a significant intensification in the amount of traffic using the site, which it feels to be inappropriate. I concur with that opinion.
27. I note the concerns of nearby residents about the possible affect on amenity of a B2 use however the Chief Environmental Health Officer has not raised an objection. Malton Farm Cottages are 130m from the site to the north and Malton Farmhouse itself some 80m to the south east.
28. Given the concerns of the Local Highway Authority and local residents on potential highway implications of the development I am recommending refusal.

Recommendation

29. That the application be refused for the following reason:
 1. Malton Lane, by reason of its narrow carriageway is unsuitable to take the type and amount of traffic likely to be generated by the proposed scale of development. The proposal is therefore contrary to the requirements of Policy EM10 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- Planning file Ref. S/2437/03/F

Contact Officer: Paul Sexton - Area Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713255

This page is intentionally left blank

APPEALS AGAINST PLANNING DECISIONS AND ENFORCEMENT ACTION

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

This item is intended to update Members on appeals against planning decisions and enforcement action. Information is provided on appeals lodged, proposed hearing and inquiry dates, appeal decisions and when appropriate, details of recent cases in interest.

1. Decisions Notified By The Secretary of State

Ref. No.	Details	Decision and Date
S/1935/02/F	Mr & Mrs M A G Francis Adj The Old Police Station <u>Fowlmere</u> House (Officer recommendation to Approve.)	Allowed 26/04/2004
S/1717/03/F	Mr R Thorpe 45 Church Lane <u>Girton</u> Erection of 2 dwellings following demolition of existing dwelling and outbuildings (Delegated refusal)	Dismissed 28/04/2004
S/1097/03/O	Messers BF, KJ & PA Willers Centenary Works, Button End <u>Harston</u> Residential Development (Delegated Refusal)	Dismissed 29/04/2004
S/0767/03/O	Mrs R Easthope R/o 78 London Road <u>Stapleford</u> Bungalow & garage (Officer recommendation to approve)	Allowed 30/04/2004
S/0760/03/F	Brigadier A N Breitmeyer The Walled Garden, Bartlow Park <u>Bartlow</u> Erection of a house with flat (Delegated Refusal)	Dismissed 04/05/2004
S/1615/03/F	Wheatley Homes Ltd Majestic Motors, Cambridge Road <u>Wimpole</u> Two houses & garages (Non- Determination)	Dismissed 04/05/2004

S/1364/03/F	G A Backhurst Off Orchard Road & R/o 109 & 111 High Street <u>Melbourn</u> Dwelling (Delegated Refusal)	Allowed 06/05/2004
S/0609/03/F	Hogger Homes Ltd 15-17 Mill Road, r/o 13-23 Mill Road & r/o 17-23 Highfield <u>Impington</u> Erection of 12 houses, 4 flats and garages following demolition of existing dwelling (15-17 Mill Road) (Delegated Refusal)	Dismissed 07/05/2004
S/1684/03/F	Hogger Homes Ltd 15-17 Mill Road, r/o 13-23 Mill Road & r/o 17-23 Highfield <u>Impington</u> Erection of 12 houses, 4 flats and garages following demolition of existing dwelling (15-17 Mill Road) (Non-Determination)	Dismissed 07/05/2004
2. Appeals received		
Ref. No.	Details	Date
S/0284/04/F	Mr Ives Brookside Farm, Barrington Road <u>Shepreth</u> Extension and garage (Delegated Refusal)	20/04/2004
S/2058/03/F	FTA Smart 65 Hauxton Road <u>Little Shelford</u> Alteration to vehicular access (Officer Recommendation to Refuse)	20/04/2004
S/2556/03/F	Mr & Mrs Bond The Mill, Royston Road <u>Litlington</u> Garage (Delegated refusal)	22/04/2004
S/2377/03/CAC	R & H Wale Ltd Rectory Farm Site, Rectory Farm Road <u>Little Wilbraham</u> Total demolition of clunch barns and outbuildings (Delegated Refusal)	26/04/2004

S/1215/03/F	R & H Wale Ltd Rectory Farm Site, Rectory Farm Road <u>Little Wilbraham</u> Erection of 7 houses (including 2 affordable dwellings) (Officer Recommendation to Approve)	26/04/2004
S/2344/03/F	R Kennedy & K Meaby The Bungalow, Cambridge Road <u>Girton</u> Extension (Officer Recommendation to Approve)	29/04/2004
S/0019/04/F	Mr P Mansfield 29 Worcester Avenue <u>Hardwick</u> Change of use of land to garden land & extension to dwelling (Delegated Refusal)	04/05/2004
S/2276/03/F	S Vanstone 1 Honey Hill <u>Gamlingay</u> Extension (Delegated Refusal)	07/05/2004

3. Local Inquiry and Informal Hearing dates scheduled before the next meeting on 7th July 2004

Ref. No.	Details	Date/Time/Venue
S/1819/02/F	Mr G North The Bogs, The Cinques <u>Gamlingay</u> Removal of mobile home personal occupancy condition. (Local Inquiry)	08/06/2004 Ground Floor Committee Room 10am
S/0455/03/F	Excelcare Etheldred House, Clay Street <u>Histon</u> Erection of nursing home (95 bed), District nurses centre, and alterations to access following demolition of existing (Informal Hearing)	15/06/2004 First Floor Committee 10am Room

S/1966/02/F S/1973/02/F	L Martin Plots 1-8 Scotland Drove/Rose & Crown Road <u>Swavesey</u> Siting of mobile home and 4 caravans together with vehicular access (Local Inquiry)	16/06/2004 Ground Floor Committee Room 10am To sit for 3 days
S/6182/03/O	MCA Developments Ltd <u>Cambourne</u> Development comprising 1,744 new dwellings, primary schools, public open space and associated infrastructure. <u>Cambourne</u> (Local Inquiry)	22/06/2004 Council Chamber 10am
S/1594/03/F	Keith Collier Engineering Ltd Unit 6, Riverview Farm, Overcote Road, <u>Over</u> Extension to workshop (Informal Hearing)	29/06/2004 First Floor Committee Room 10am
S/1202/03/LB	Mr & Mrs Bryce-Smith Home Farm, 10 High Street <u>Shepreth</u> Extension (Informal Hearing)	30/06/2004 Committee Room 10am
S/1203/03/F	Mr & Mrs Bryce-Smith Home Farm, 10 High Street <u>Shepreth</u> Extension (Informal Hearing)	30/06/2004 First Floor Committee Room 10am
E 501	Mr H Price Primrose Meadow, Cow Lane <u>Rampton</u> Enforcement against use of land as residential caravan site (Local Inquiry)	06/07/2004 Ground Floor Committee Room 10am To sit for 3 days

**5. Advance notification of future Local Inquiry and Informal Hearing dates
(subject to postponement or cancellation)**

Ref. No.	Details	Date
S/0780/03/F	A Duke & Sons Off New Road <u>Melbourn</u> 2 houses (Informal Hearing)	13/07/2004 Confirmed

S/0181/03/LDC	Shelford Lodge Ltd 144 Cambridge Road <u>Great Shelford</u> Certificate of lawfulness for siting & use of mobile home for residential accommodation (Local Inquiry)	14/07/2004 Confirmed
EP246A	Shelford Lodge Ltd 144 Cambridge Road <u>Great Shelford</u> Enforcement of removal of mobile home (Local Inquiry)	14/07/2004 Confirmed
9 Appeals	Plots 7-16 Pineview Smithy Fen <u>Cottenham</u> Siting of travellers' caravan & day room (Local Inquiry)	20/07/2004 Confirmed
E461C	Mr P O'Brien Land off Water Lane <u>Cottenham</u> Enforcement against change of use to residential caravan site (Local Inquiry)	20/07/2004 Confirmed
S/2447/02/F	Mr J Flynn 6A Orchard Drive, Smithy Fen <u>Cottenham</u> 1 Mobile Home, 1 touring caravan and day room (Local Inquiry)	20/07/2004 Confirmed
S/2370/02/F	J Culligan 7 Orchard Drive, Smithy Fen <u>Cottenham</u> Caravan & day room (Local Inquiry)	20/07/2004 Confirmed
S/0177/03/F	Mr J Biddall Kneesworth Road <u>Meldreth</u> Change of use of land to travelling show peoples' quarters (Local Inquiry)	27/07/2004 Confirmed

S/1058/03/F	Mr & Mrs Sherwood R/o 117 High Street <u>Melbourn</u> Erection of a dwelling & double garage (Informal Hearing)	03/08/2004 Confirmed
E 502	Mr H Price Adj Moor Drove, Cottenham Road <u>Histon</u> Operational Development (Local Inquiry)	10/08/2004 Confirmed 2 days
E 502A	Mr H Price Adj Moor Drove, Cottenham Road <u>Histon</u> Enforcement against material change of use to storage and residential use of caravans. (Local Inquiry)	10/08/2004 Confirmed 2 days
S/1934/03/F	Mr J Crickmore The Barn, Chesterton Fen Road <u>Milton</u> Change of use to tropical plant nursery comprising erection of 3 glasshouses, general purpose shed, alteration and extensions (Local Inquiry)	07/09/2004 Confirmed
S/1559/03/F	Taylor Woodrow Developments Off Chivers Way (Access off Kay Hitch Way) <u>Histon</u> 57 Dwellings (Informal Hearing)	03/11/2004 Confirmed
S/2624/03/F	Country Homes and Gardens Royston Garden Centre, Dunsbridge Turnpike <u>Shepreth</u> Variation of conditions 1, 2, 10, & 11 of S/1333/02 in respect of revised landscaping details (Informal Hearing)	09/11/2004 Confirmed
S/2089/03/F	Heddon Management Ltd 12 Pieces Lane <u>Waterbeach</u> 8 Houses (Informal Hearing)	05/01/2005 Offered/Accepted

S/2194/03/F

Mr C Taylor
45 Spring Lane
Bassingbourn

Construction of raised decked area,
path and sunken patio/lawn
(part retrospective)
(Informal Hearing)

11/01/2005

Offered/Accepted

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation 2nd June 2004
Control Committee

AUTHOR/S: Finance and Resources Director

**PUBLIC FOOTPATH: PROPOSED DIVERSION OF PART OF FOOTPATH 6 IN
BARTLOW**

Recommendation: To respond to consultation by Cambridgeshire County Council

Purpose

1. To consider a proposal from Cambridgeshire County Council, and to respond to consultation by that Authority.

Effect on Corporate Objectives

2. Provision and maintenance of the Rights of Way network promotes sustainability and helps improve the quality of village life.

Background

3. Cambridgeshire County Council intends to divert part of Public Footpath 6 in Bartlow from its current line, A-B-C on the plan attached at Appendix 1, to a new line (A-D-E-F-C). The current line is partially obstructed by a carport (not yet plotted by the Ordnance Survey) which was erected prior to the footpath being added to the Definitive Map and Statement earlier this year. The diversion would move the legal line of the path onto a route that is available on the ground.

Financial Implications

4. None.

Legal Implications

5. None.

Staffing Implications

6. None.

Risk Management Implications

7. None.

Consultations

8. The Area Planning Officer, Senior Planning Policy Officer (Transport), Conservation Manager and local Member (Councillor SJ Agnew) have been consulted. The **Conservation Manager** does not object to the proposal, and any other comments

received subsequent to publication of the agenda will be reported verbally to the Committee.

Recommendations

9. The Committee is invited, on behalf of South Cambridgeshire District Council as a statutory consultee, to comment on this proposal so that Cambridgeshire County Council can conclude the process.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report: Letter Ref: C311/19/6 from Cambridgeshire County Council, dated 5th May 2004

Contact Officer: Ian Senior – Democratic Services Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713028

Agenda Item:

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO	Development Control and Conservation Committee	2 nd June 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

**CAMBOURNE SECTION 106 AGREEMENT:
FACILITIES AND TIMING OF PROVISION**

Members of Committee will visit the sites on Monday 31st May 2004

Purpose

1. This matter was deferred from the May Development Control and Conservation Committee to allow a site visit by Members and a further up-date on the required facilities. This Committee received a report at the April meeting on the lack of provision of certain facilities required to be provided at Cambourne as a result of the Section 106 Agreement dated 20th April. It agreed that the Council's stance should be that no further planning permissions for market housing should be granted at Cambourne until the Community Centre, Multi-Use games Area (MUGA) and Burial ground have been provided. A monthly update on progress requested. This report therefore updates Members on the progress of the provision of these facilities, as well as updating Members on the progress of other facilities that should have been provided by now but are not part of the Council's stance.

Background

2. There are now over 1248 houses (updated figures will be available at the end of May) occupied at Cambourne. To recap, the "missing" facilities that should have been provided by the trigger point of 1,000 houses occupied are:
 - a) Community Centre (required by S106 at 1000 houses)
 - b) Multi-Use Games Area (MUGA) comprising part AstroTurf and part hard surface playing courts (required by S106 at 1000 houses)
 - c) Burial Ground (required by S106 at 1000 houses)
 - d) Parish Council funding (required by S106 at 1000 houses)
 - e) Playing fields (required by the S106 to be provided in phases throughout the development).
 - f) Skateboard area and other teenage play equipment to include basketball net (required by Cambourne Play Strategy at 1000 houses)
 - g) Cricket Pavilion (required by the S106 to be phased in accordance with the Masterplan and by planning permission for Lower Cambourne Village Green at 450 homes in Lower Cambourne respectively)
 - h) Allotments (required by the S106 to be provided by phased provision throughout the development)
 - i) Lower Cambourne Village Green cricket pitch, recycling area (required by planning permission for Lower Cambourne Village Green at 31/3/02 and 100 homes in Lower Cambourne respectively)
 - j) Trailer park (required by S106 at 300 houses)

3. The progress at the time of report writing (14th May 2004) with each of the facilities is as follows. Any update or comment from the developers will be reported verbally. Some of the facilities are awaiting the submission of information under planning conditions before they can commence, and these are briefly described below:
- a) Community Centre. The developers commenced on site in February, with an anticipated completion date of November 2004. The steel frame was erected a few days before the May Committee meeting. Conditions outstanding prior to commencement are condition 1 – landscaping scheme; condition 2 – materials; condition 3 – signage, seating, hard surfacing; condition 8 – ecological enhancement; condition 13 – cycle store and bin store. The former Concept Centre is now open as temporary/interim ‘community-centre’, albeit a smaller facility and in a peripheral location.
 - b) Multi-Use Games Area (MUGA). The developers commenced work in February and considerable progress has been made. Anticipated completion is 21st May 2004. A number of planning conditions are still to be met and a completion checking process is to be undertaken.
 - c) Burial Ground. Planning permission was granted on 2nd December. The developers commenced on site in February and at the time of writing (14th May) it is complete with the exception of some landscaping and fencing.
 - d) Parish Council. The Order has now been made and sealed. Elections for the Cambourne’s Parish Council, which will have 13 Members will be on 10th June 2004.
 - e) Playing fields. Planning permission was granted on 10th December. The developers hope to make the playing fields ready for use by May/June 2004.
 - f) Skateboard and play area. A separate application was submitted on 4th December, and meetings have taken place between the developers and young people in Cambourne about the design of the actual equipment. Amended plans to reflect this have been provided, and are currently under consideration. The developers hope to start on site this month, for completion by July (school summer holidays).
 - g) Cricket Pavilion. Planning permission has now been granted.
 - h) Allotments. The developers have started on site, for completion in October 2004.
 - i) Cricket pitch and recycling area at Lower Cambourne Village Green. The cricket pitch has been provided but has not been built to the Council’s satisfaction and remedial works are being discussed between SCDC and the developers. The recycling area is the subject of discussion in terms of providing the bottle banks, etc.
 - j) Trailer park. Planning permission was granted for it in June 2003. The access is via an adjacent housing site which is awaiting planning permission (Section 106 agreement still awaited at the time of writing). The planning permission will be subject to a condition that the houses shall not be occupied until the trailer park is provided, ensuring an incentive for the developers to provide it.

However, there is an existing access which is allowed to be used temporarily and officers are pursuing a commitment to a date for the trailer park's provision on the basis of the temporary use of that access. Meanwhile, several conditions are still outstanding prior to commencement: condition 2 – detailed layout; condition 3 – lighting; condition 4 – boundary treatment; condition 5 – water/electricity/drainage; condition 7 – management regime; condition 10 – access timing.

- k) Landscaping. Officers met with the developers in March to run through progress being made on 27 sites where planting is expected this season, which includes the majority of required sites. The Landscape Design Officer checked progress in April and a number of sites remain to be planted.

Considerations

4. The Council's stance against granting any more market housing permissions until the Community Centre, MUGA and Burial Ground have been provided should remain in force, for the time being. Whilst work has started on site on these three facilities, they are still not complete and available for use. I consider at this stage it would be premature to alter the stance.

5. **Financial Implications**

Not granting planning permission for market housing until these facilities have been provided may result in developers appealing against non-determination once the eight weeks for determining each application expires. There are now two housing schemes affected by this scheme.

6. **Legal Implications**

In the unlikely event of developers not progressing positively with the works, there are, as always, both financial and legal implications of taking the developers to court.

7. **Staffing Implications**

Officers will continue to negotiate future housing schemes on the basis that, once the facilities have been provided, planning permissions can be issued when ready, thereby continuing to spread the workload over time.

8. **Sustainability Implications**

Provision of these facilities is important for community sustainability.

9. **Conclusions/Summary**

Positive work is taking place in terms of the developers submitting information for approval under conditions or as planning applications, and initial ground and structural work has now started on the Community Centre.

It is still going to be several months before the Community Centre is available, in the meanwhile houses continue to be occupied.

It is still premature to alter the stance until these outstanding facilities are nearer usability. Members will see at the site visit progress on this matter

10. **Recommendations**

It is RECOMMENDED that:

Members agree the Council's stance for time being, and receive an update on progress at the next meeting on the 7th July 2004.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

Cambourne Section 106 Agreement dated 20th April 1994
Cambourne Play Strategy December 2000, approved under conditions of the outline planning permission dated 20th April 1994, reference S/1371/92/O

Contact Officer: John Pym, Senior Planning Officer, Telephone: (01954) 713166