

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



28 September 2004

To: Chairman – Councillor RGR Smith
Vice-Chairman – Councillor Dr JPR Orme
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 **COUNCIL CHAMBER** at South Cambridgeshire Hall on **WEDNESDAY, 6 OCTOBER 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
PROCEDURAL ITEMS	
1. Apologies	
2. Minutes of Previous Meeting To authorise the Chairman to sign, as correct records, the Minutes of the meetings held on 4 th August 2004 and 1 st September 2004.	
3. Local Development Framework - an update	
PLANNING APPLICATIONS	
4. S/1372/04/F - Great Shelford	1 - 4
5. S/1204/04/O - Hardwick	5 - 12
6. S/1648/04/F - Hardwick	13 - 16
7. S/1385/04/F - Newton	17 - 22
8. S/1540/04/O - Newton	23 - 26

9.	S/1637/04/F - Haslingfield	27 - 28
10.	S/1519/04/F & S/1518/04/LB - Histon	29 - 34
11.	S/1188/04/F - Impington	35 - 38
12.	S/1763/04/F - Heydon	39 - 46
13.	S/1691/04/F - Ickleton	47 - 50
14.	S/1742/04/F - Little Shelford	51 - 54
15.	S/0696/04/RM - Longstanton	55 - 72
16.	S/1766/04/F - Meldreth	73 - 76
17.	S/1770/04/F - Milton	77 - 80
18.	S/1032/04/F - Papworth Everard	81 - 84
19.	S/0771/04/F - Sawston	85 - 94
20.	S/1512/04/F - Sawston	95 - 98
21.	S/1521/04/F - Sawston	99 - 100
22.	S/1555/04/F - Sawston	101 - 104
23.	S/1606/04/F - Sawston	105 - 110
24.	S/1705/04/F - Sawston	111 - 114
25.	S/1453/04/F and S/1452/04/LB - Swavesey	115 - 120
26.	S/1419/04/F - Teversham	121 - 126
27.	S/1858/04/F - Teversham	127 - 130
28.	S/2301/02/Circular 14/90 - Stow-Cum-Quy, Fen Ditton and Horningsea	131 - 134
29.	S/1612/04/RM - Waterbeach	135 - 138
30.	S/1217/04/F - Waterbeach	139 - 144
31.	S/0856/04/F - Willingham	145 - 150
32.	S/1585/04/F - West Wrating	151 - 154
33.	S/0055/04/F - Grantchester	155 - 162
34.	S/0690/04/F - Grantchester	163 - 172
35.	S/1472/04/F - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth	173 - 180

36.	S/1676/04/F - Castle Camps	181 - 186
37.	S/1164/04/F - Comberton	187 - 190
38.	S/1367/04/F - Foxton	191 - 194
39.	S/1237/04/F - Gamlingay	195 - 198
40.	S/1708/04/F - Gamlingay	199 - 200
41.	S/1592/04/F - Girton	201 - 206

APPEALS AND ENFORCEMENT

42.	Appeals against planning decisions and enforcement action	207 - 216
43.	Enforcement Action Progress Report	217 - 252

TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS

44.	07/04/SC - To make an Order in Teversham	253 - 256
45.	05/04/SC - To confirm an Order in Arrington	257 - 258

PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY

46.	To comment on a proposal to create a new bridleway in Oakington	259 - 260
-----	-----------------------------------------------------------------	-----------

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

DEVELOPMENT AND CONSERVATION CONTROL COMMITTEE

At a meeting held on Wednesday, 4 August 2004 at 10.00 a.m..

PRESENT: Councillor RGR Smith– Chairman
Councillor Dr JPR Orme – Vice-Chairman

Councillors	Dr DR Bard	RE Barrett
	JD Batchelor	RF Bryant
	SM Edwards	R Hall
	Mrs SA Hatton	Mrs EM Heazell
	Mrs CA Hunt	HC Hurrell
	SGM Kindersley	RB Martlew
	MJ Mason	DH Morgan
	Mrs JA Muncey	Mrs CAED Murfitt
	CR Nightingale	EJ Pateman
	A Riley	Mrs DP Roberts
	NJ Scarr	Mrs DSK Spink MBE
	RJ Turner	

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mrs PS Corney, Mrs J Dixon, Mrs A Elsby, Mrs JM Healey, JH Stewart, Dr JR Williamson, TJ Wotherspoon and SS Ziaian-Gillan.

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

1. **S/1090/04/LB & S/1091/04/F - GREAT WILBRAHAM**
Erection of single storey rear extension, 15 Angle End, Great Wilbraham for Mr and Mrs Ryan
REFUSED for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services.
RESOLVED to issue an Enforcement Notice to remove the single-storey rear extension.
2. **S/1310/04/F - GREAT WILBRAHAM**
Erection of a Dwelling on Land to the Rear of Rookery Farm, Frog End, Great Wilbraham for Wilbraham Estates Trustees
REFUSED for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services.
3. **S/1119/04/F - WATERBEACH**
Erection of Building to provide 8 Guest Rooms "Travellers Rest" Public House, Ely Road, Chittering for C. Crickmore
DELEGATED APPROVAL, subject to the receipt of satisfactory amended plans detailing proposals permanently to stop-up the existing access to and from the A10 Ely Road, and ensuring that all vehicular traffic accesses the site from School Lane, and subject also to drainage concerns being addressed to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.
4. **S/1217/04/F - WATERBEACH**
Redevelopment of Existing Caravan Park to Comprise 39 Touring Pitches, New Toilet / Shower / Laundry Block, Reception Building and Internal Road. Extension to Season to 11 Months from 6th February to 5th January. "Travellers Rest" Caravan Park, Chittering for C. Crickmore
DEFERRED to enable officers to explore, with the applicant, a number of outstanding issues, including drainage and visibility splays and conditions on the length of stay of caravans.
5. **S/0249/04/F - THRILOW**
Erection of 2 Dwellings and Garages Following Demolition of Existing Dwelling and

Outbuildings at 42 Church Street for David Reed Homes

APPROVAL, as amended by drawing nos. 04001-02A (x2) and 04001-03A date stamped 26th May 2004, for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services and to the Conditions referred to therein.

Councillor RGR Smith declared a personal interest in this item as having been a part-owner of the land until late 2003.

6. S/1232/04/F - THRIFLOW

Conversion of one Dwelling into two Dwellings at 15 Woburn Place For T & J Ryan
APPROVAL, in accordance with the amended recommendation of the Director of Development Services following the receipt of amended plans showing existing and proposed window and door openings, for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services and subject to the deletion of Condition 1 therein, to Condition 2 becoming Condition 1, and to Condition 3 becoming Condition 2 and being reworded to the effect that, within three months of planning consent being granted, or such other timescale as may be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the parking will be provided in accordance with the amended plan and thereafter maintained.

7. S/0983/04/F - WHITTLESFORD

Extension – 16 Royston Road For Mr & Mrs Blackburne-Maze

APPROVED for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to the Conditions referred to therein, and an additional Condition requiring appropriate boundary treatment.

8. S/0103/04/F - WILLINGHAM

Erection of two houses, Land at 3, Fen End for Black Silk Ltd

APPROVAL, as amended by plans date-stamped 22nd June 2004, for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to the Conditions referred to therein.

9. S/1253/04/F - BABRAHAM

Erection of House and Garage Following Demolition of Village Hall – Village Hall Site, High Street for M Winter

Erection of House and Garage following demolition of Village Hall – Village Hall Site, High Street for M Winter

DELEGATED APPROVAL, for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, on the casting vote of the Chairman, following the receipt of amended plans but subject to the applicant agreeing to re-locate the garage to an area behind the existing Village Hall. Approval would be subject to there being no material objections from the Trees and Landscape Officer, to the Conditions referred to in the report from the Director of Development Services, and to two additional Conditions requiring the frontage wall to be protected during construction work and the removal of permitted development rights.

DELEGATED REFUSAL if the applicant does not agree to re-locate the garage on the grounds of the adverse impact on the amenity of the occupiers of Ember House.

10. S/1278/04/F - CROXTON

Change of Use to Hand Wash and Security Fencing (Retrospective) at Former Q8 Petrol Filling Station, Cambridge Road (A428), Croxton for T. Mason

REFUSED, contrary to the recommendation contained in the report from the Director of Development Services. Members expressed concern about highway safety and the

appearance of the proposed security fencing.

11. S/1061/04/F - CASTLE CAMPS

Dwelling on land to the rear of The Shrubbery, High Street for C Wenham
REFUSED, contrary to the recommendation contained in the report from the Director of Development Services. Having visited the site, Members raised concerns about the size, design and location of the proposed dwelling and the necessary surfacing of the access in terms of the resulting adverse effect on the character of the village in general and the amenity of the occupiers of Pear Tree Cottage and Serena in particular, and the desirability of protecting Green Lane for the benefit of the entire village.

12. S/0511/04/F - FOWLMERE

Extension and Conversion of Buildings into a Dwelling and Erection of Garage / Carport, Mill Farm, Fowlmere Road, Melbourn, for Plum Developments
DEFERRED for a site visit.

13. S/1294/04/F - FULBOURN

Erection of extensions, 9 Haggis Gap, Fulbourn for Mrs S.J. Doggett
DELEGATED APPROVAL subject either to the prior completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement or to an addendum to the existing Agreement referred to in paragraph 18 of the report from the Director of Development Services, for the reasons set out, and subject to the Condition referred to, therein.

Councillor NJ Scarr declared a prejudicial interest in this item, due to the applicant being his partner, and withdrew from the Chamber.

Councillor Mrs DP Roberts declared a personal interest, as a close friend of the applicant, and withdrew from the Chamber.

14. S/1302/04/F - GAMLINGAY

Variation of Condition 1 of Planning Permission S/1737/01/O) to Allow a Further Period of 3 Years for the Submission of Reserved Matters for Industrial Development (Class B1 and B2), Land South of Station Road for Merton College
APPROVAL of a variation of Condition 1 of planning permission S/1737/01/O but for a lesser period of one year to encourage the early submission of a Reserved Matters application, subject to the Conditions previously imposed.

Councillor Mrs DSK Spink declared a personal interest in this item as a Governor of Gamlingay Village College, but remained in the Chamber and contributed to the debate.

15. S/1018/04/F - GREAT SHELFORD

Relocation of Mobile Home to House Temporary Staff Together with Siting of Portakabin – 144 Cambridge Road for Shelford Lodge Ltd
DELEGATED APPROVAL subject to confirmation that the portacabin is to be included in the application; the receipt of a plan which shows the mobile home on the existing hardstanding and as close as possible to the adjacent planted area between the hardstanding and the main building whilst still allowing the mobile home doors to face the main building and be opened; and the relocation of the portacabin to a position on the grassed area between the main building and the planted area but not adjacent to the boundary to No.138 Cambridge Road. Conditions referred tin in the report plus a fifth condition stating that the portacabin shall only be used for the storage of those items listed in the applicant's letter.

Councillor Dr DR Bard declared a prejudicial interest in this item, due to a close relative having once been a resident in the Home, and withdrew from the Chamber.

- 16. S/1078/04/F - HIGHFIELDS CALDECOTE**
Erection of House, Land Between 62 & 66 West Drive for I G M Construction
DELEGATED APPROVAL, for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to the receipt of satisfactory details relating to finished height and to the Conditions referred to in the report.
- 17. S/1065/04/O - HASLINGFIELD**
Erection Of An Additional Dwelling And Change of Use of Land from Residential to Public House Use, 2 Badcock Road and Land Adjoining Road, for J A Jessop
DELEGATED APPROVAL for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to there being no new material objections as a result of further consultation with neighbours not previously carded, and to the Conditions set out in the report.
- 18. S/0844/04/F - HISTON**
Erection of rear extension and conversion into 8 flats, 3-5 Station Road for Mr J and Mrs A Gordon
APPROVAL, as amended by letters dated 20th May 2004 and 1st June 2004 and plans date-stamped 9th June 2004, for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, and subject to the Conditions set out therein (with Condition 6 being strengthened) and an additional Condition requiring details of surface water drainage from the car park.
- Councillor DH Morgan declared a personal interest in this item, due to significant family connections with Histon, and withdrew from the Chamber.
- 19. S/1159/04/F - LITTLE SHELFORD**
Erection of Dwelling Following Demolition of Existing Dwelling at 40 High Street for Mr & Mrs D Munro
DEFERRED for a site visit.
- 20. S/1066/04/F - LONGSTANTON**
Erection of Fence and Gate and Change of Use of Land to Domestic Garden at 4 Magdalene Close, Longstanton for R Hinde
REFUSED contrary to the recommendation contained in the report from the Director of Development Services. Having visited the site, and taken into account both the character of the estate and planning policy, including Policy P1/3 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003, Members took the view that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the estate as a whole and that, as a result, the land subject of this application should remain as amenity land.
- Councillor A Riley declared a personal interest in this item because he had contributed to the debate at Longstanton Parish Council. Although he also contributed to the debate at the current meeting, he did not vote.
- 21. S/1127/04/F - LONGSTANTON**
Extension at 90 Thornhill Place, for Mr and Mrs Abbott
APPROVAL for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to the Conditions referred to therein.

Councillor A Riley declared a personal interest in this item because he had contributed to the debate at Longstanton Parish Council. Although he also contributed to the debate at the current meeting, he did not vote.

22. S/1172/04/CIRCULAR 18/84 - LONGSTANTON

Continuation of Use of Land And Buildings as an Immigration Centre for a Further Temporary Period to 31st December 2006, Oakington Barracks, for The Home Office **RESOLVED** that, subject to no new material adverse comments being made by Longstanton Parish Council, officers be authorised to inform the Home Office that South Cambridgeshire District Council has no objection to the use of Oakington Barracks as an immigration centre for an additional period up to 31st December 2006, for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services and subject to the Conditions stated therein. Should the Parish Council come forward with new material adverse comments, this issue would be reported back to a future meeting of the Development and Conservation Control Committee for further consideration.

Councillor A Riley declared a personal interest in this item because he had contributed to the debate at Longstanton Parish Council. Although he also contributed to the debate at the current meeting, he did not vote.

23. S/1118/04/O - MELDRETH

24 Affordable Dwellings, Land adj. West Way, for Mr and Mrs M Sole
Having visited the site, Members were **MINDED TO APPROVE** the application, contrary to the recommendation contained in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to it being advertised as a departure from the Development Plan, referred to the Secretary of State, and not being called in by him for determination. Prior to such advertisement and referral, the applicants would be required to undertake that they would enter into a Section 106 Legal Agreement requiring that the affordable housing be for rental only, that that status would continue in perpetuity, and that public open space and a children's play area would be provided. In addition matters of visibility, health and safety and flood risk should be resolved prior to referral to the Secretary of State.

The local Member, Councillor Dr S van de Ven sent apologies for not being able to attend this meeting, although she was not a member of the committee.

24. S/1080/04/F - ORWELL

Extension to Bungalow to Form Two Storey Extension, 27 Hillside, for Mr Heffernan **DELEGATED APPROVAL** subject to the submission of revised plans showing increased projection of screens and methods and materials of construction, contrary to the recommendation contained in the report from the Director of Development Services. Having visited the site, and taken into account Policy P1/2 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 and Policies HG12 and HG13 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004, Members did not consider the proposal to have any significant adverse effect on the immediate locality.

APPEALS AND STATISTICS**25. APPEALS AGAINST PLANNING DECISIONS AND ENFORCEMENT ACTION**

The Committee **NOTED** the following from the report prepared by the Director of Development Services:

- Decisions notified by the Secretary of State
- Summaries of recent decisions of interest
- Appeals received
- Local Inquiry and Informal Hearing dates scheduled before the next meeting of the Committee on 1st September 2004
- Appeals withdrawn or postponed

- Advance notification of future local inquiry and Informal Hearing dates (subject to postponement or cancellation)

26. APPLICATIONS AWAITING DECISIONS FOR MORE THAN 13 WEEKS

Members **RECEIVED** and discussed a list of applications over 13 weeks old awaiting decision as at 23rd July 2004.

27. PERFORMANCE CRITERIA

Members **NOTED** performance criteria for the three-month period ended 31st March 2004.

28. GRAPHICAL DATA

Members **NOTED** graphs in respect of:

- Total decisions issued quarterly by South Cambridgeshire District Council
- Planning Decisions for the period from January to March 2004
- Planning Decisions for the year ended 31st March 2004
- Percentage of applications determined within eight weeks
- Planning Decisions by development type and speed of evaluation for the three-month period and year ended 31st March 2004

STANDING ITEM

29. CAMBOURNE SECTION 106 LEGAL AGREEMENT - FACILITIES AND TIMING OF PROVISION

The Committee received a further report on progress being made by the Developers of Cambourne in complying with their obligations under the Section 106 Legal Agreement dated 20th April 1994. The New Village Senior Planning Officer gave a verbal update which included the following:

- the requirement for a new planning application in respect of amendments to the design of the proposed cricket pavilion at Lower Cambourne
- A letter from the LTA sent to the Cambourne Consortium requiring changes to the Tennis Courts at the MUGA
- The playing fields to be completed September 05
- The Council await a report from ROSPA as to the fitness of the Skateboard park.

Members raised the following issues:

- the need to ensure proper maintenance
- the need for tennis courts to be amended at the developers' expense
- soil preparation at the burial ground
- outstanding cost implications
- staffing implications
- the determination of trigger points
- the need for Cambourne Parish Council to become free-standing
- Ongoing discussions aimed at providing a sprung floor for the Community Centre

Councillors DH Morgan and Mrs DSK Spink (local Members) thanked officers for their significant efforts in spearheading the District Council's stance to date.

RESOLVED that the Council reaffirm its stance in relation to seeking substantial compliance with the Section 106 Legal Agreement dated 20th April 1994, and that the Development and Conservation Control Committee request a further update at its next meeting on 1st September 2004, specifying a date on which it would reimpose its embargo on planning consents for market housing should the improvement in compliance with the Section 106 Agreement not continue.

The Meeting ended at 4.13 p.m.

This page is intentionally left blank

DEVELOPMENT AND CONSERVATION CONTROL COMMITTEE

At a meeting held on Wednesday, 1 September 2004 at 10.00 a.m..

PRESENT: Councillor RGR Smith – Chairman
Councillor Dr JPR Orme – Vice-Chairman

Councillors	Dr DR Bard	RE Barrett
	JD Batchelor	RF Bryant
	Mrs PS Corney	Mrs J Dixon
	SM Edwards	Mrs A Elsby
	R Hall	Mrs SA Hatton
	Mrs JM Healey	Mrs EM Heazell
	Mrs CA Hunt	HC Hurrell
	SGM Kindersley	RB Martlew
	MJ Mason	DH Morgan
	Mrs JA Muncey	Mrs CAED Murfitt
	CR Nightingale	EJ Pateman
	A Riley	Mrs DP Roberts
	NJ Scarr	Mrs DSK Spink MBE
	Dr JR Williamson	NIC Wright
	SS Ziaian-Gillan	

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors JH Stewart, RJ Turner and TJ Wotherspoon.

PROCEDURAL ITEMS

1. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Committee authorised the Chairman to sign, as a correct record, the Minutes of the meeting held on 7th July 2004, subject to:

1. the addition of Councillor Mrs J Williamson to the list of those in attendance
2. the insertion into Minute no. 23 (S/0951/04/F - Histon - Variation of Condition 3 of Planning Permission S/0242/01/F to allow hot food Takeaway service between 11.00am and 2.30pm, and 5.00pm and 11.00pm at 44 Station Road for R Dias) of the sentence, "Councillor MJ Mason, a member also of Histon Parish Council, stated for the record that he had taken no part whatsoever in the Parish Council's consideration of this planning application.", immediately prior to the section in parentheses.

2. S/2625/03/F - CASTLE CAMPS

Alterations and conversion of existing building into 7 dwellings. Camps Castle Public House, High Street for Mr and Mrs Hart

APPROVAL of drawing no. 03/40/7c as an amendment to the approved scheme, subject to confirmation of hard and soft landscaping details. Members requested that the grassed areas be left substantially free of trees to allow overflow parking on these areas.

3. S/1093/04/0 - COTTENHAM

Agricultural Dwelling, Causeway Farm, Smithy Fen, for Mr & Mrs R Jones

DEFERRED pending the receipt of an application for planning consent to construct the two cattle sheds with both applications then being considered concurrently and a report being presented to the Committee at its meeting on 1st December 2004, should no progress be made.

Councillor Mrs J Dixon declared a prejudicial interest in this item because she knew the applicant and was friends with the neighbours, and withdrew from the Chamber.

4. S/0511/04/F - FOWLMERE

Extension and Conversion of Buildings into a Dwelling and Erection of Garage/Carport, Mill Farm, Fowlmere Road, Melbourn, for Plum Developments

MINDED TO APPROVE for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, there having been no representations made following the advertisement of this proposal as a departure from the Development Plan. The application would be referred to the Secretary of State as a departure.

5. S/1597/04/F - FOWLMERE

Erection of Dwelling and Conversion of Barn into Garage/Carport/Workshop and Store following Demolition of 2 Existing Dwellings

REFUSED contrary to the recommendation contained in the report from the Director of Development Services. Having visited the site, Members considered that the proposal conflicted with Policy HG/15/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 by virtue of its size and bulk, and because its design and character would be out of keeping with the bungalows to be replaced.

6. S/1308/04/F - GIRTON

Extension to 34 Woodlands Park, for Dr Russo and Ms Gillespie

REFUSED for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services. (Councillor NJ Scarr abstained from voting as he had not attended the site visit.)

7. S/1436/04/F - GIRTON

Extension and Conservatory at 6 St. Margarets Road, for Mr & Mrs Barresi

REFUSED, contrary to the recommendation contained in the report from the Director of Development Services. Having visited the site, Members considered that the proposed two-storey extension conflicted with Policy HG/12 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 by virtue of its size, height, depth and proximity to the western boundary of the site, and that it would have an overbearing impact on the neighbouring property at no. 4 St Margarets Road.

(Councillor NJ Scarr abstained from voting as he had not attended the site visit.)

8. S/1430/04/F - HASLINGFIELD

Raising of Roof Height and Addition of Dormer, 2 The Hemlocks for Mr and Mrs McKenzie

REFUSED, contrary to the recommendation contained in the report from the Director of Development Services. Having visited the site, Members considered that the additional height and dormer window would have an adverse impact on the Conservation Area, contrary to Policy EN/30 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004, and that the proposal would lead to a loss of amenity for the neighbouring property at no. 28 High

Street, contrary to Policy HG/12 of the Local Plan.
(Councillor NJ Scarr abstained from voting as he had not attended the site visit.)

9. S/1320/04/O - HISTON

Erection of Three Dwellings Following Demolition of Existing Dwelling at 81 Park Lane for Mr Betson

APPROVAL for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to the Conditions referred to therein and to an additional Condition requiring that a tree survey be carried out.

10. S/1188/04/F - IMPINGTON

Erection of Eleven Houses, Two Flats and Garages following Demolition of Existing Dwellings (15-17 Mill Road), 15-17 Mill Road and Land Rear of 13-23 Mill Road and Rear of 17-23 Highfield Road for Hogger Homes Ltd

DEFERRED, pending the receipt of comments, from Anglian Water, on foul water drainage issues.

11. S/1297/04/LB & S/1298/04/F - LINTON

Alterations and Replacement of Beam and Strengthening of Wall in Basement of Stair Tower and Construction of Brick Extension for Porch and Shower Room. New Dwarf Wall and Steps and Extension.

REFUSED for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services.

12. S/1159/04/F - LITTLE SHELFORD

Erection of Dwelling Following Demolition of Existing Dwelling at 40 High Street for Mr & Mrs D Munro

DELEGATED REFUSAL, contrary to the recommendation contained in the report from the Director of Development Services. Having visited the site, Members considered that, by virtue of its unsatisfactory scale and design, the proposed dwelling would have an adverse impact on the Conservation Area, and conflict with Policies P1/3 and P7/6 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 and SE5 and EN30 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004. Comments awaited from the Trees and Landscape Officer could provide, if adverse, an additional reason for refusal.

13. S/1247/04/F - LONGSTANTON

Extension at 87 Magdalene Close, for Mr BJ Less and Miss J Phipps

APPROVAL, on the Chairman's casting vote, for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, and subject to the Conditions referred to therein.

14. S/1421/04/F - OVER

Change of Use of Amenity Land to Staff Sitting Area together with Extension to Provide Store and Erection of Security Fencing to the Front and Rear of the Premises, Unit 15/16 Norman Way, Over for S M Page

APPROVAL for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to the Conditions referred to therein.

RESOLVED formally to endorse Condition 4, namely that Enforcement Action be taken in the event that, within three months of planning consent being granted, the security fence at the entrance to the estate has not been removed.

15. S/1301/04/F - SAWSTON

House at Land Between 14 and 16 Brookfield Road for T Coppolaro

APPROVAL as amended by drawing no. SD/2004/09/A date stamped 27.8.04 for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to the Conditions referred to therein, to an additional Condition requiring that suitable provision be made for the storage of wheeled refuse bins, and to the deletion of General Informative no. 3.

16. S/1194/04/F- FEN DITTON

Erection of extract duct and cladding, The Blue Lion Public House, Fen Ditton for Greene King Pub Co

REFUSED for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services.

17. S/1476/04/F - WILLINGHAM

Siting of Mobile Home as Annexe for dependent parent at 130 Rampton Road, for Mr and Mrs S. Webster

APPROVAL for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to the prior completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement restricting use of the mobile home to dependent family members, to the Conditions referred to in the report and to an additional Condition requiring that the mobile home be removed once no longer required for occupation by Mr A Webster.

18. S/1425/04/F - WEST WRATTING

House Adj 9 Six Mile Bottom Road for T Mendham

REFUSED for the reason set out in the report from the Director of Development Services.

19. S/0260/04/F - OAKINGTON

Erection of Greenhouses at College Street Market Gardens for Oakington Tomato Farm

DEFERRED pending the receipt of a detailed response from the Local Highways Authority, comments from the Environment Agency relating to proposals for incorporating a balancing pond into the development, and accurate site and block plans.

20. S/1340/04/F - BARRINGTON

Erection of Garages and Stores with first floor Flat, Land at Barrington Hall, for T J Fernandes

REFUSED for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services.

21. APPEALS AGAINST PLANNING DECISIONS AND ENFORCEMENT ACTION, AND ESTABLISHMENT OF A SUB-COMMITTEE RESPONSIBLE FOR DETERMINING ENFORCEMENT ACTION RELATING TO TRAVELLERS

The Committee **NOTED** the following from the report prepared by the Director of Development Services:

- Decisions notified by the Secretary of State

Acknowledging the dismissal of eight appeals in Swavesey (Plots 1-8 Scotland Drove/Rose and Crown Road), the Head of Legal Services introduced a discussion among Members on how best the Development and Conservation Control Committee should proceed in relation to identifying the most appropriate method of enforcement on a case by case basis. In response to a Member's assertion that this topic could not be discussed because it had not been on the agenda, the Head of Legal Services expressed his satisfaction that there was no cause for challenge on this point; the issue was merely a procedural one, seeking to ensure operational efficiency; no specific sites were under consideration; no specific action was being discussed; no information was being promulgated. The Sub-Committee's Terms of Reference would include the full responsibility for determining and carrying out direct enforcement action.

Members made the following points:

- it would be sensible to establish a small sub-committee, which should report to the Development and Conservation Control Committee rather than to the Travellers Consultative Group
- Cabinet had already delegated many executive functions relating to Travellers to a group consisting of Councillors Mrs DSK Spink, Dr DR Bard and Mrs DP Roberts
- discussion should be in confidential session
- relevant local Members should be invited
- the sub-committee should have a wider membership than was currently the case with executive powers

RESOLVED

- (1) that a sub-committee, consisting of Councillors Dr DR Bard, Mrs DP Roberts, Mrs DSK Spink, and local Members who are on the Development Control and Conservation Committee in relation to the area under consideration be set up to authorise, project plan and – subject to approved resources and relevant human rights considerations - carry through direct enforcement action in relation to Travellers, with any other local Members who are not on the Committee and the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee being invited to attend as appropriate but not as members of the sub-committee; and
- (2) that an item be included on the agenda for the Development and Conservation Control Committee meeting on 3rd November 2004 to enable Members to review operation of the sub-committee to date, and, if appropriate, to endorse its continuation as currently constituted
 - Summaries of recent decisions of interest
 - Appeals received
 - Local Inquiry and Informal Hearing dates scheduled before the next meeting of the Committee on 6th October 2004
 - Appeals withdrawn or postponed
 - Advance notification of future local inquiry and Informal Hearing dates (subject to postponement or cancellation)

22. BRIDLEWAY NO. 5 - SOUTHERN BYPASS (PARISH OF CAXTON)

The Committee received a report on progress made in extinguishing the route of part of Bridleway no. 5 in the Parish of Caxton (where it crosses the Caxton southern bypass) and creating a replacement section of bridleway passing through an underpass.

RESOLVED that the Committee authorises officers to confirm the Extinguishment and Creation Order relating to part of bridleway no. 5 as described in the report from the Finance and Resources Director, to coincide with Caxton southern bypass being adopted by Cambridgeshire County Council.

23. FOOTPATH NO. 7 (PARISH OF OAKINGTON)

The Committee received a report on progress made in extinguishing Public Footpath no. 7 in the Parish of Oakington in accordance with planning consent S/2491/03/RM.

RESOLVED that the Committee authorises officers to make an Order extinguishing Footpath no. 7 in Oakington and, subject to there being no objections to formal consultation, to confirm the Order in due course, and concurrently with Cambridgeshire County Council adopting the estate road and pavement at Coles Lane, Oakington and confirming creation of a proposed new bridleway between the northern most point of the adopted highway and further development to the north..

24. CAMBOURNE SECTION 106 LEGAL AGREEMENT - FACILITIES AND TIMING OF PROVISION

The Committee received a further report on progress being made by the Developers of Cambourne in complying with their obligations under the Section 106 Legal Agreement dated 20th April 1994.

The Senior Planning Assistant gave a verbal update indicating, among other things, that there were currently 1,411 homes occupied in Cambourne, and progress made with regard to the skateboard park, playing fields, extension of the Multi-Use Games Area, tennis courts and burial ground

A local Member expressed appreciation of the efforts made by officers in addressing the various issues outstanding in Cambourne, and summarised steps being taken by the new Parish Council to put it in a better position to play a greater role locally in that process.

Members discussed a proposal from officers that future reports be presented to Committee every three months, with the proviso that reports should be made more frequently, if circumstances dictated. There were some reservations that such a move might give the impression that the issue of non-compliance with the Section 106 Agreement was now seen as less of a priority. A Member proposed that future reports should contain a new section highlighting changes in circumstances since the previous report.

RESOLVED

- (1) that the Council reaffirm its stance in relation to seeking substantial compliance with the Section 106 Legal Agreement dated 20th April 1994;
- (2) that the next report on this subject be presented, upon the proposal of

Councillor SGM Kindersley (seconded by Councillor Mrs DP Roberts) at the meeting on 3rd November 2004 and every two months thereafter, subject to the proviso that, should there be an urgent issue requiring Committee input, a report should be presented sooner; and

- (3) that future reports should contain an additional section, highlighting changes in compliance with the Section 106 Legal Agreement dated 20th April 1994 since presentation of the previous report.

The Meeting ended at 3.23pm

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	6 th October 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

**S/1372/04/F – Great Shelford
Extension and change of use to restaurant (Class A3) + construction of car park at
Station House and land opposite, Hinton Way for A Kasim**

Recommendation: Refusal

Members will visit the site on Monday 4th October 2004

Site and Proposal

1. This application relates to a brick and slate part two-storey, part single storey building attached to the rear of Shelford rail station. It is currently vacant. Plans submitted at the time of a previous application on the site in 2002 indicated that the building was most recently used as a station master's residence. The application also relates to an area of land on the opposite side of Hinton Road to the rear of No.2 Leeway Avenue and alongside the railway line. No.2 Leeway Avenue and its garden is set up above the level of this land.
2. This full application, received on the 1st July 2004 and amended by plan date stamped 2nd September 2004, proposes to use the ground floor of the existing building as a restaurant and erect extensions which would add a further 62 square metres approximately of floor area to the building. The plans show approximately 80 square metres of public floor area and show 48 covers. 13 car parking spaces would be provided, 5 adjacent to the building and 8 within a new car park on the opposite side of Hinton Way and to the rear of No.2 Leeway Avenue. The amended plan excludes land erroneously included on the original plan. A letter submitted with the application states that the applicant is looking to increase the area of the restaurant and take into account the latest requirements of Part M of the Building Regulations.

Planning History

3. Planning permission was granted in November 2002 for a 22 square metres approximately single storey extension to and use of the building as a restaurant (**S/0224/02/F**). The approved plans showed approximately 47 square metres of public floor space and showed 30 covers. Nine parking spaces were shown on the approved plan. This permission included conditions stating that the restaurant shall be closed and vacated by customers between 2300 and 0800 hours and there shall be no take-away sales from the premises between the hours of 2130 and 0800.

Planning Policy

4. There are no Local Plan policies which relate specifically to the extension and change of use of a building to a restaurant. Local Plan 2004 **Policies SH5** and **SH9** relate to new shops and extensions to shops respectively. **Policy CS9** relates to the protection of village services, which would include restaurants.

5. Structure Plan 2003 **Policy P3/3** states that Local Planning Authorities will encourage the retention of local facilities and services within urban areas and assess the need for additional provision.
6. Local Plan 2004 **Policy TP1** states that the Council will promote sustainable transport choices through its decision on planning applications and one of the ways in which it will seek to achieve this is through the application of maximum car parking standards. For restaurants, the maximum standard is 1 space per five square metres of public floor space (which equates to a maximum of 16 spaces in this instance).

Consultation

7. **Great Shelford Parish Council** makes no recommendation but states that “The car parking provided is insufficient to meet the Council’s car parking standards and this needs to be resolved. We do not support take-away facilities because of the traffic and parking implications and if this is part of the application it should be refused.”
8. **Chief Environmental Health Officer** raises no objections but recommends that a condition be attached to any approval requiring details of the location and type of any power driven plant or equipment to be agreed.
9. **HM Inspector of Railways** states that any vehicles turning into the development must not cause traffic to block back onto the crossing therefore preventing or delaying the crossing being closed to road traffic.
10. **Local Highway Authority** and **Network Rail** have been consulted but no comments have been received.

Representations

11. Objections have been received from the occupiers of 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 15, 24 (also signed by occupiers of 10, 20, 22, 26, 36 and 39) 29, 32 and 37 Leeway Avenue; 3, 15 and 18 Shelford Park Avenue; 17 Poplar Close; 56 and 58 Chaston Road; 2 and 5 Hinton Way; 11 Orchard Road; and Transact Group Ltd, Transact Management Services Ltd, Global Media Services Ltd, Rayshield Ltd, Station Court on the following grounds:
 - Insufficient parking leading to patrons parking in nearby roads thus causing annoyance to local residents;
 - Late night noise/disturbance from patrons leaving the premises;
 - Smells from the kitchens;
 - Increased traffic congestion in Hinton Way and surrounding roads;
 - Safety concerns as a result of the proximity of the site to the level crossing;
 - Highway and pedestrian dangers;
 - Devaluation of properties;
 - Litter associated with a take-away use;

- Who will police any time restriction for a take-away use?
- There is already an adequate number of restaurants in the village;
- Subsidence of No.2 Leeway Avenue's rear garden;
- The proposed security fence would be visually intrusive;
- Character of village would be spoiled;
- The parking spaces to the rear of 2 Leeway Avenue are far too close to the railway re: health and safety;
- Drainage problems;
- Additional policing challenges;
- Overlooking from first floor windows of 3 and 5 Hinton Way's back gardens; and
- Noise during construction period.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

12. The key issues in relation to this application are:
- Parking provision, highway and railway safety;
 - Impact on character of the area; and
 - Affect on amenity of nearby residents, and occupiers of No.2 Leeway Avenue and 3 and 5 Hinton Way in particular.
13. The principle of extending the existing building and using the resulting building as a restaurant has already been established by the approval of application S/0224/02/F in 2002. This application proposes a 30 square metre approximately larger restaurant and 4 more parking spaces. Members will need to consider what harm, if any, would result from the creation and use of a larger building with particular reference to the key issues referred to above.
14. In order to provide an appropriate level of parking for a restaurant of the size proposed (13 spaces compared to the standard of a maximum of 16 spaces), a new parking area is proposed adjacent to the railway line and level crossing on the south side of Hinton Way. In my opinion, the use of the proposed vehicular access located in such close proximity to the railway line would create an unacceptable risk of traffic blocking back onto the crossing by virtue of a vehicle waiting to turn right into the site, thereby having an adverse impact upon the safety and free flow of traffic across the level crossing.

There is an existing access in this position but it is only used infrequently. If this proposed parking area was omitted from the scheme to overcome this concern, I could not support the proposal as it would result in only 5 designated parking spaces for a 48 cover restaurant. Whilst the Local Plan sets out maximum parking

standards, I consider that such a shortfall in provision would not be acceptable. All this indicates to me that the approved scheme rather than the proposed scheme represents an appropriate size for any restaurant use of the site.

15. I consider that the design and appearance of the resulting building would be acceptable.
16. I do not consider that the building or its use would have an unacceptable additional impact on the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. The occupiers of No.2 Leeway Avenue would suffer some noise and disturbance resulting from the use of the proposed car park to the rear. However, on balance, as the parking area is set down below the level of No.2's garden, the railway line runs alongside the proposed parking area, and lighting and times of use could be controlled by condition if the proposal was considered to be acceptable in all other respects, I do not consider that the use of this area for parking would have a serious impact on the amenity of the occupiers of No.2 Leeway Avenue.
17. A further amended plan is required before the application can be determined as the height of the extension as shown on the proposed elevation drawings is not consistent.

Recommendations

18. Refusal (as amended by drawing no. H1771/02/B date stamped 2.9.04 and subject to the receipt of a further amended plans showing a consistent height for the proposed extension on all elevations) for the following reason:

The use of the proposed vehicular access located in close proximity to the railway line would create an unacceptable risk of traffic blocking back onto the crossing by virtue of a vehicle waiting to turn right into the site, thereby having an adverse impact upon the safety and free flow of traffic across the level crossing.

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/0224/02/F and S/1372/04/F

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

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	6 th October 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

**S/1204/04/O - Hardwick
Outline for Residential Development (37 Dwellings and 5 Live/Work Units),
Enterprise Café, St Neot's Road for Mr M Middleton**

Recommendation: Minded to Approve

Departure application

Site and Proposal

1. This 1.22 ha (3 acres) site is located on the southern side of the St Neots Road, just south of the Dry Drayton/Hardwick roundabout. The original Enterprise Café, now closed, is on the front of the site. Set further back in the site, on the western side, is the former café operative's bungalow, sitting in its own garden. An old accommodation block, a long low brick building, sits fairly central in the site. Much of the rear of the site is a rough, potholed parking area, with a wide hardcored accessway along the eastern side of the site. Hawthorn hedges form the eastern and western boundaries; the southern boundary is open to the countryside. All commercial use of the site appears to have ceased, although lorries continue to park on the site.
2. To the east and west is ribbon development along the St Neots Road frontage, predominantly well spaced single storey residential properties with long back gardens.
3. This outline application, received 9th June 2004, seeks the principle of residential development with all matters reserved. It is accompanied by an indicative layout for 37 dwellings including 11 affordables and 5 live-work units. (34 dwellings per hectare), a statement summarising the marketing of the site following the grant of planning permission for B1 uses in November 2000, a Planning Statement and a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). A covering letter states that the indicative layout plan does not form part of the application.
4. In support of the application the agent states that: "The site's development for residential purposes will enable the future of this brownfield site to be restored in a manner which will improve the character and appearance of St Neots Road as well as the amenity of surrounding residential properties. The scheme in the form proposed within this application, will enable the provision of affordable housing in a manner which is deliverable in funding terms within the next 12-18 months and would therefore ensure the early delivery of much needed affordable housing to meet identified local needs. This will also ensure that the development of the site and the resolution of its future can be secured at the earliest possible opportunity".
5. The site has been marketed for three years for B1 purposes. The marketing summary advises that there have been nearly 150 specific enquiries and that there are one or two negotiations still ongoing, but at this point in time they have been

unable to agree terms with prospective purchasers. It suggests that there is at present a decline in the commercial property market in the Cambridge area, particularly in the edge and out of town sector where there is a vast oversupply of category A space, resulting in a significant decline in rental rates. It is not envisaged that the situation is likely to improve for another 3 years.

Planning History

6. The Enterprise Café was established on the site many years ago.
7. Permission for a pallet business at the rear of the site was granted in the late 1980's.
8. In 2000 outline planning permission was granted for redevelopment of the site for 2.975 sq m of B1 commercial units.
9. An application under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the variation of condition 2 of the 2000 permission to allow for an extension of time for submission of Reserved Matters was approved on 9 January 2004. Consequently, permission S/0830/00/O remains extant.
10. In August 2003, the applicants submitted an outline planning application for the residential development of the site. The application was refused on 6th November 2003 for the following reasons.
 - a. "The application site lies well outside of the defined village framework of Hardwick, towards the end of a long ribbon of predominantly low-rise residential property. Development of the site for residential use would be contrary to Policy P5/5 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 2003 and Policy SE13 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan: Deposit 1999 (as proposed to be modified 2002 and 2003) (Policy H5 of the 1993 Local Plan), which require housing development to be within the defined physical framework of the villages and Policy P1/2 of the Deposit Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 2003 which restricts new development in the countryside unless the proposals can be demonstrated to be essential in a particular rural location.
 - b. Notwithstanding its location outside the village framework, this site of 1.22 ha would provide a scale of development well in excess of that which would be permissible within Hardwick, which is defined as a Group Village under Policy SE6 of the Local Plan, and consequently would undermine the settlement strategy for the district which seeks to concentrate housing development within the larger, more sustainable villages that have a full range of services and facilities.
 - c. An estate of housing within this ribbon of development would be out of keeping with the character of the area and would set a precedent and increase the pressure to allow further development and expansion of the village between the application site and the village framework to the east, further undermining the settlement strategy of the district"
11. In a covering letter the applicants were advised:

"Members expressed concern at the current state of the site and suggested your client hold a meeting with representatives from the Parish Council and Council Offices to try and find a way forward. If the residential option was pursued, policies would only allow affordable housing on the site",

12. Government Policy, incorporated in Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 3, "Housing" and PPS, 7, "Sustainable Development in Rural Areas", seeks to, inter alia, give priority to re-using previously developed land in urban areas, reduce car dependence, focus new development on existing towns and villages, determine the pattern of new development through the development plan process and to strictly control new house building in the open countryside, away from established settlements.
13. The site is outside of the village framework of Hardwick: Policy P1/2 of the Structure Plan 2003 restricts development in the countryside unless the proposals can be demonstrated to be essential in a particular rural location. Policy P5/5, referring to homes in rural areas, allows for small-scale housing developments in villages. The supporting text comments that, except for small sites to meet locally identified housing need, housing in the countryside beyond the built up areas defined in Local Plans is not considered appropriate.
14. Policy SE8 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 presumes in favour of housing development within the defined physical framework of the villages. Residential development outside these frameworks will not be permitted.
15. Policy HG8 of the Local Plan allows, as an exception to the normal operation of the Local Plan policies, schemes of 100% affordable housing designed to meet identified local housing needs on sites within or adjoining villages. The number, size, design, mix and tenure of the dwellings should be confined to, and appropriate to, the strict extent of the identified local need and must also comply with certain criteria of Policy HG7 regarding affordable housing.
16. Policy HG10 of the Local Plan requires new housing developments to incorporate a mix and range of house sizes, types, and affordability to make the best use of the site and promote a sense of community which reflects local needs.
17. Policy SE4 of the Local Plan defines Hardwick as a group village. Within the framework development may exceptionally consist of up to 15 dwellings, if this would make the best use of a brownfield site.

Consultation

18. Hardwick Parish Council recommends approval but comments:
 - a. 42 dwellings is more than we expected; and
 - b. the affordable houses are afforded to Hardwick people first.
19. Local Highways Authority raises no objections subject to standard conditions. It is suggested that discussion take place before the submission of a reserved matter application.
20. Highways Agency has no objections as the proposal will as the proposal will not adversely affect the A428 trunk road.
21. Environment Agency considers the Flood Risk Assessment to be acceptable. Conditions are recommended to be imposed in relation to surface water drainage and ground contamination investigation.

22. Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service requests that adequate provision is made for fire Hydrants.
23. County Chief Financial Planning Officer requires a contribution for 8 places at Comberton Village College. Adequate Primary School provision is available in the area.
24. County Archaeology Office recommends that the site is subject to a programme of archaeological investigation. This can be secured by the inclusion of a condition in any planning consent.
25. The Council's Ecology Officer recommends that the perimeter hedgerows should be enhanced. Provision of nest boxes upon new buildings would be desirable.
26. Police Architectural Liaison Officer has no comments at this stage.
27. The Trees and Landscape Officers comments:

"There is nothing of outstanding merit within the site in relation to tree cover, although a young Horse Chestnut could be considered for retention.

A well established hedge on the eastern boundary, and, or part, of the western boundary should be retained. The layout as shown will compromise that hedge in some areas i.e. plot 15 garage block at southern end of site."
28. **Housing Development Manager** comments that:
29. "The proposed affordable provision can be supported by the housing need survey.
30. An alternative exception site was under consideration but residents and Parish Council expressed a preference for the development of this site to meet housing need.
31. The Housing Corporation funding for affordable housing programmes for the next two years has now been allocated. The next opportunity to bid for funding will arise in December 2005, with the allocation being made in March 2006. There could be an opportunity to bid for funding before this if there is "slippage" on schemes which have funding but are not progressing but there is no guarantee of this. In fact, current Housing Corporation policy is to restrict funding to Section 106 schemes in an attempt to force LAs, RSLs and developers to produce self-financing affordable schemes. Therefore, taking all factors into account, I would suggest that it is extremely unlikely that this would be funded prior to March 2006 and I wouldn't hold out much hope thereafter. I would, therefore, agree with the statements in 3.3 of FPD Savills' supporting statement.
32. One way in which non-funded schemes can be made to stack up financially is by increasing the number of key worker or shared-ownership units on a scheme, as these obviously bring a capital receipt to the RSL which can subsidise the rented units. We are currently working with several RSL partners on schemes which did not receive funding and are being re-modelled on the basis of a higher percentage of shared ownership units. The statement in 3.4 is correct in that with all units being shared-ownership the scheme would be self-financing.

However, most of the other schemes we are looking at can be made to work with an element of rented units and, generally speaking, 2 shared ownership units should

subsidise 1 rented unit. Therefore, I would have thought that this proposed scheme could be made to work on the basis of, say, 8 shared ownership and 3 rented and would be happy to discuss this with Hereward.”

33. No comments have been received from **Anglian Water**.
34. **The Chief Environmental Health Officer** does not object in principle but recommends conditions to protect proposed dwellings from noise from the workshop premises and to require a site contamination investigation and remediation.

Representations

35. The application has been advertised as a Departure from the Development Plan.
36. One resident of St. Neots Road (No. 303) has misgivings regarding the number of houses in terms of traffic generation but is hopeful that an application will be granted this time. Hardwick people should be given preference to the affordable housing.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

37. This 1.22ha (3 acre) site is some 300 metres west of the defined village framework. Its development for housing is contrary to the settlement policies of the Development Plan, which require new housing development to be located within defined village frameworks, rather than in the countryside. Development at the proposed scale is also significantly greater than that which would be allowed as part of the settlement of Hardwick, a Group Village, and would be contrary to the broader aims of the settlement policies in the Development Plan that seek to concentrate development in the larger settlements which have a full range of facilities.
38. Exceptionally, a site outside the village framework may be developed for housing where it would be forward 100% affordable housing. This is not the intention in this case; 11 affordable dwellings (30% of 37) are proposed. Furthermore an exceptions site should be located within or adjoining the village. This site is some 1.3km from village facilities, such as shop and school.
39. At the Local Plan Inquiry in 2001 the Planning Inspector considered representations seeking to extend the village framework to include properties along the St Neots Road to the west of the village, including the Enterprise Café site. He noted that, overall, local services and facilities in Hardwick do not extend beyond the requirements for Group Village designation under **Policy SE4**, which would allow development within the village framework of groups of 8, or exceptionally up to 15, dwellings. He considered the various proposals to extend the village framework, taken together, would constitute a major enlargement of the village which could not be justified by current housing need. He recognised the poor state of the application site but concluded that not including it within the framework would not necessarily preclude its future redevelopment, as evidenced by the grant of planning permission in November 2000 for B1 purposes.
40. The applicants have put forward a number of exceptional circumstances to weigh against Development Plan Policies:
 - a. Brownfield Land;

- b. Proximity of existing continuous built frontage along St. Neots Road (at least 500 metres in extent);
 - c. Extant permission for employment development;
 - d. The market is not favourable towards commercial property; office supply exceeds demand;
 - e. Former use is un-neighbourly to residents on traffic, visual and environmental health grounds;
 - f. Residential use would be compatible with the predominant use along St. Neots Road; local services including a primary school are available in Hardwick; bus stops are nearby;
 - g. Scheme will add to the range and mix of housing within Hardwick; and
 - h. Provision of affordable housing, along with 5 live/work units. Further to the Housing Development Manager's comments, the applicant has agreed to the provision of eight shared equity dwellings with a further three socially rented affordable dwellings. This would be viable and self-financing.
41. Under the terms of Section 54A of the 1990 Planning Act local planning authorities are obliged to determine planning applications on the basis of the policies within their Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Both the Structure Plan and Local Plan have been adopted very recently and provide a restrictive policy background in respect of development outside village frameworks.
42. The presumption against residential development in this location should be balanced with the considerations at Paragraph 40 above. In my opinion, none of these considerations individually warrant over-riding Development Plan Policies, but cumulatively they form a compelling case. In addition, there appears to be local support for the principle of residential development, no doubt reflecting the difficulties experienced by residents with the former use.
43. I would also refer Committee to Paragraph 2.28 of the Local Plan, which is supporting text to Policy SE8:
- "Frameworks have not been defined around small clusters of houses or areas of scattered development where such buildings are isolated in open countryside or detached from the main concentration of buildings within a nearby village. Although it is recognised that such dwellings may be considered locally as 'part' of the nearest village in community terms it is important in planning policy terms to limit the amount of new development that can take place in rural areas with few services and little or no public transport."
44. This particular site is within walking and cycling distance of services within Hardwick and has access to a regular public bus service on the St. Neots Road. In that regard, and taking into consideration the circumstances in Paragraph 40 above, I consider that there does now exist justification for supporting residential development as a Departure from the Development Plan.
45. My reservation relates to the scale of development proposed in relation to the character of the very low density of housing in the immediate vicinity and the relatively low percentage of affordable housing proposed. Both are no doubt factors

of the particular costs associated with the development. The Planning Statement in support of the application is silent on this matter. I shall invite the applicant to address this issue. In that regard I draw Committee's attention to the need at September 2003 identified by the Housing Development Manager for 20 affordable dwellings proposed in a planning application on land at the rear of 124-158 Main Street, Hardwick. The application was ultimately withdrawn.

46. In conclusion, I consider that the residential redevelopment of this brownfield site outside but close to the village framework of Hardwick, a village with services including a primary school and public bus service, can be supported as a Departure from the Development Plan, taking into consideration the material and exceptional circumstances in Paragraph 40 above, but subject to further consideration of the scale of development and numbers of affordable dwellings.

Recommendations

47. That, subject to the receipt of a satisfactory justification for the scale of development and percentage of affordable housing, the Committee be minded to support the application as a Departure from the Development Plan.
48. That the application be referred to the Secretary of State as a Departure.
49. That, subject to the Secretary of State not calling the application in for his determination and to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement in respect of affordable housing, education contributions and open space management and maintenance, the application be approved, subject to conditions related to:
- a) Time limited consent
 - b) Submission of reserved matters
 - c) Highway matters
 - d) Details of surface and foul water drainage
 - e) Scheme of ground contamination investigation
 - f) Provision of fire hydrants
 - g) Archaeological investigation
 - h) Landscaping scheme and implementation
 - i) Open space provision link between work and residential units
 - j) Link between work and residential units

Informatives

Reasons for Approval

1. In determining this application the Local Planning Authority has had regard to Policies in the approved development plan.

In resolving to approve the application as a departure from the plan consideration has been given to the fact that site benefits from an extant consent for employment development, is brownfield land, has a lawful use which is un-neighbourly to residents on traffic, visual and environmental health grounds, is close to local services including a primary school and public transport and provides an opportunity to include affordable housing within the proposed 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:

County Structure Plan 2003

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004

Planning Application Files: S/1204/04/O, S/1777/03/O and S/1812/03/O

Contact Officer: David Rush – Development Control Quality Manager
Telephone: (01954) 3153

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation Control Committee 6th October 2004
AUTHOR/S: Director of Development Services

**S/1648/04/F - Hardwick
Extension to 2 Ashmead Drive, for Mr and Mrs Heathcote**

Recommendation: Approval

Members will visit this site on Monday 4th October 2004

Site and Proposal

1. Number 2 Ashmead Drive is a modern two-storey detached property that sits on the junction with Egremont Road. It has a block of two single garages with a pitched roof, which is attached to the southern elevation of the dwellinghouse. On the northern elevation there is a lean-to extension, and the front elevation has been extended by way of a porch. The property falls within the Hardwick village framework.
2. Ashmead Drive is a residential street that is characterised by two-storey detached dwellinghouses. A large majority of these dwellinghouses have attached pitched roof garages. The village playing fields are opposite the entrance to Ashmead Drive, and adjacent to Egremont Road.
3. The application, received on 6th August 2004, proposes to increase the height of the garage roof in order to accommodate a fourth bedroom, with en-suite facilities. The height of the extended garage would be 4 metres to the eaves and 6 metres to the ridge. There would be Velux windows in the rear roofslope and a dormer window on the front.

Planning History

4. Planning consent was granted in 1999 (S/0264/99/F) for the aforementioned lean-to side extension and porch.

Planning Policy

5. **Policy HG12 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan: Adopted 2004 – Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings within Frameworks.**
This policy 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.

Consultation

6. Hardwick Parish Council – Recommended that planning officers refuse the application due to concerns over lighting; it also requested a Committee site visit. Councillor Stewart – No comment on the merits of the application, but has also requested a Committee site visit.

Representations

7. One letter has been received from the occupier of number 4 Ashmead Drive, who strongly objects to the application for the following reasons:
 1. He has lived in his property since new and one of the considerations he made before purchase was that nothing could be built between his property and number 2 Ashmead Drive.
 2. The principle of a two-storey extension right up to the boundary is going to erode the detached character of the residential area and is going to have an unacceptable impact on his property.
 3. The overbearing and overpowering of the extension, size, scale and bulk will have an un-desirable impact upon him with loss of residential amenity.
 4. There is only a 1 metre pathway between his property and 2 Ashmead Drive. It is a narrow gap that will result in overpowering by an extension. As far as he can see there are no other examples of two storey extensions extending right up to the boundary. With such a small space in between the properties it is totally unacceptable.
 5. He will have a loss of outlook from his kitchen window and door that he has enjoyed for over 20 years and loss of light due to the close proximity of the extension.
 6. He will not give permission for anyone to enter his land for building works or any future maintenance necessary. How can such an extension be built without interfering with his property?
 7. They have a shared driveway and un-doubtedly there will be major disruption to this if such a scheme went ahead.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

8. The key issues for consideration in the assessment of this application are the visual impact upon the street scene and the impact upon the neighbouring property's amenities.

Visual Impact on the Street Scene

9. Number 2 is set back some five metres from the adjacent highway (Ashmead Drive), and the garage block is set back by a further 3.3 metres from the front elevation of the house. There is 1.1 metre wide passageway that separates the garage block from the side elevation of number 4. The eaves of the existing garage block are 2 metres in height, and the roof extends to 4 metres at its ridge.
10. The proposed two-storey extension would be a new feature in Ashmead Drive, and would certainly increase the prominence of the property on the street scene. The scale of the extension, and the fact that it would be well set back from both the front of the main dwellinghouse and the adjacent highway helps to reduce its impact. Its ridge height would be 1.4 metres lower than the ridge height of the main dwellinghouse, and it would be set back 3.3 metres from the front elevation (8.3 metres from the highway). The extension would be subservient in form to the main dwellinghouse and would not lead to an increase of its footprint. The dormer window

would not be an unacceptable addition to the street scene, and its pitched roof would relate well to the roof of the existing porch.

11. The extension would reduce the gap between numbers 2 and 4 Ashmead Drive, though the main dwellinghouse would screen views of the extension from Egremont Road. Again the set back nature of the extension, and the fact that it would be 1.4 metres lower than the two adjacent properties, would help to maintain a visual separation between them both.
12. As well as the two single garages there is an area of hard standing at the front of the property that serves as provision for further off street parking. No parking will be lost as a result of the proposal.

Impact upon the Amenities of Number 4 Ashmead Drive

13. The closest neighbour is number 4 Ashmead Drive, which is set back from both the road and the applicants' property. Number 4 is another two-storey detached dwelling with a detached garage block. The side elevation of number 2's garage block and a close-boarded fence define the property boundary.
14. The proposed extension would be located to the north of number 4, so any loss of direct sunlight to the property is considered minimal. The openings in the north elevation of number 4 consist of a small toilet window, which is obscure glazed, and a glazed kitchen door and small kitchen window. The kitchen also has a large window in the rear elevation of the property, which will not be affected by the proposal. This window would appear to be the main source of light entering the kitchen. The extension will not extend past the rear elevation of number 4 and would only extend by one metre forward of the front elevation. The proposal would not lead to a serious loss of light to the openings in the front elevation, and the rear garden of number 4.
15. None of the windows in the extension would result in a loss of amenity by way of overlooking. A condition would be used to prevent any openings being inserted in the south elevation of the extension.
16. At present the occupiers of number 4 already face a blank wall when using the aforementioned kitchen door. This blank wall would increase by 2 metres in height and would clearly have an impact on the outlook of the adjacent passageway. However, such a passageway is not considered to be an area of the property where the occupiers spend a large amount of time.
17. The outlook from the kitchen door would again clearly be reduced, though the loss of such an outlook is not considered to be sufficiently adverse to result in a refusal of this application.

Recommendation

18. Approval
 1. Standard Condition A – Time limited permission (Reason A);
 2. Sc22 – No windows at first floor level in the south elevation of the development (Rc22);
 3. Sc19 – Details and materials to match existing (Rc19)

Informatives

Reasons for Approval

1. The approved development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:
 - **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
 - Visual impact in the locality

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

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan: Adopted 2004;
- Planning Application File S/1648/04/F

Contact Officer: Edward Durrant – Planning Assistant
Telephone: (01954) 713082

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	6 th October 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

**S/1385/04/F – Newton
Bungalow and Garage – Land r/o 22 Town Street for Mr & Mrs Russell**

Recommendation: Approval

Members will visit the site on Monday 4th October 2004.

Site and Proposal

1. The application site is a 0.1 hectare plot of land located to the rear of, and forming part of the garden area to, No.22 Town Street, a 2 storey detached dwelling. The site is served by a grassed access situated between Nos. 6 and 10 Town Street. Surrounding development is a mix of 2 storey and 1¹/₂ storey dwellings, save for No. 16 which is a bungalow. To the northeast is a plot of land upon which planning permission has been granted for one dwelling. There is a 2 metre high mixed hedge along the field boundary to the northwest, a chain link fence together with hedging/trees along the boundary with Nos. 24 and 26 Town Street and a 1.7 metre high beech hedge defining the boundary with No. 30. The north east and south east boundaries of the site are undefined whilst there is 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. On the site itself is a row of 6 silver birch trees.
2. The full application, submitted on 5th July 2004 and amended on 31st August 2004, seeks to erect a 3-bedroom detached bungalow and double garage on the site. The bungalow would be 5.3 metres high to ridge and 2.5 metres high to the eaves. It would comprise brick walls and a tiled roof. The silver birch trees and conifer would be removed. Vehicular access to the site would be via the track sited between Nos. 6 and 10 Town Street which it is proposed to continue directly beyond the rear boundaries of Nos. 10, 14, 16 and 22 Town Street. The density of the development equates to 10 dwellings per hectare.

Planning History

3. **S/2306/89/O** – An outline application for 3 dwellings on this site together with the plot of land to the north-east was refused on the grounds that such development would not constitute infilling; it would be out of keeping with the linear character of development in the vicinity; the vehicular movements associated with the development would result in loss of amenity to occupiers of 6 & 10 Town Street; and would detract from open aspect and outlook from Nos. 10, 14, 16, 22 and 24 Town Street.
4. **S/0439/90/O** – A further application for 3 bungalows on the same site as above was also refused for the first 3 reasons referred to above. The application was subsequently dismissed at appeal with the Inspector agreeing with all 3 reasons for refusal in this Authority's decision.

5. **S/1597/02/F** – An application for a bungalow on the adjacent plot to the north-east was refused on the grounds that the use of the driveway would result in disturbance and loss of privacy to occupiers of the adjacent properties; the development would be out of character with the linear pattern of development in the area; 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 commenting 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.
6. **S/0759/04/F** – An application for a 1½ storey dwelling on the above plot was approved at Committee in June 2004.

Planning Policy

7. The site is within the village framework of Newton, an Infill-Only Village as defined in the Local Plan 2004.
8. **Policy P1/3** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 requires a high standard a design which responds to the local character of the built environment for all new development.
9. **Policy SE5** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 states that residential development within the village will be restricted to no more than two dwellings provided the site does not form an essential part of village character and development is sympathetic to the character and amenities of the locality.
10. **Policy HG10** of the Local Plan states that the design and layout of residential development should be informed by the wider character and context of the local townscape and landscape.
11. **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; or
 - Be out of character with the pattern of development in the vicinity.

Consultation

12. **Newton Parish Council** objects to the application stating:

“The previous appeal APP/W0530/A/03/1110733 for a bungalow on land adjacent to the plot in question covered many of the arguments relating to development within this area. However the proposed development will provide a further loss of amenity and privacy to the dwellings of both Town Street and Harston Road, given the increases in both (additional) vehicle movement and general noise that yet another dwelling would cause. Inevitably there would be additional requirements for servicing

the plot – utilities, sewage, rubbish, post, and visitors ignoring the extra vehicle movements from the occupiers. There will also be the necessity for more boundary/fencing/demarcations increasingly spoiling the 'open plan' nature of the village and landscape. The development could be considered 'over development' of the land giving a) even more possibility of other, future applications for the land(s) at the back of 24/26/30 Town Street and even off Coach House Lane itself and b) opening the way to possible extensions/alterations of any approved dwelling(s) as has already happened with the 'appeal' bungalow, allowing both a larger unit and increased on-site parking after the initial appeal/approval/design”.

13. **The Trees and Landscape Officer** raises no objections to the loss of the trees subject to replacement planting being undertaken by means of a landscaping condition.
14. The comments of **The Chief Environmental Health Officer** are awaited and will be reported verbally at the Committee meeting.
15. **The Building Inspector** confirms that the submitted plan appears to demonstrate that a fire engine could negotiate the bend in the access. He also confirms that: a fire engine will need to turn to exit the site and this needs to be clearly shown; the access will need to be maintained clear of growth and parking; and the applicant should have some legal control over the access in the future to maintain access provisions.

Representations

16. Letters of objection have been received from 5 local residents – No.6 Town Street, Nos. 7, 9 and 15 Harston Road and The Queens Head. The main points raised are:
 - The application must be seen in the context of the recent approval for the bungalow on land to the rear of Nos. 10-16 Town Street. This proposal represents planning creep;
 - The land behind Nos. 10-16 must originally have been sold by the applicants with an easement to give a right of way along the south east boundary of the site to their boundary at No.22. The existence of this right of way was not made clear at the time of the application on the adjacent site. Would the Inspector have come to the same view had he known this?
 - The access is so tight that removal or emergency vehicles would not be able to negotiate it;
 - With the exception of Whittlesford Road and Coach House Lane, development in Newton takes the form of houses along the roads with a buffer of gardens and trees bordering the edge of the Green Belt;
 - The development would result in the loss of trees which contribute to the rural aspect of adjacent properties;
 - The development would result in another building line along the edge of the Green Belt;
 - Approving this application would set a precedent for further backland development;

- The access track is of insufficient width to serve two properties. The tight right angled turn could not even be negotiated in a small car;
- The use of the access by twice the number of vehicles would result in noise and disturbance to adjoining properties, Nos. 6, 10, 14 and 16 Town Street;
- The new dwelling will be unacceptable close to the Green Belt boundary;
- Contrary to comments made by the Inspector in the appeal decision on the adjacent plot, No.6 Town Street has a bedroom window in its side elevation.
- The development is backfill and thereby contrary to the Local Plan.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

17. The key issues to consider in the determination of this application relate to:
 - The impact of the development upon the character and appearance of the area;
 - Neighbour impact;
 - Loss of trees; and
 - The suitability of the access.
18. Concerns have been raised about this application due to the adverse impact upon the character of the area. Historically, applications to erect dwellings on this site and the adjacent land were rejected by this Authority on the grounds that such development would be out of keeping with the character of the area and would affect the amenities of adjoining residents through use of the access. The successful appeal on the adjacent plot, however, supersedes the appeal decision relating to the erection of 3 bungalows on the larger site and means that it is now difficult to resist the principle of backland development on this site on the basis that it would be out of keeping with the character of the area.
19. The proposed dwelling would be a 5.3 metre high bungalow. That approved on the neighbouring backland plot is a 6.3 metre high 1¹/₂ storey dwelling and the new dwelling would therefore not appear incongruous on this backland site. It is in excess of 30 metres away from the rear elevations of No. 22 Town Street and the bungalow at No. 16. As such, it would not affect the outlook from these neighbouring properties nor would there be an overlooking problem given that the dwelling is single storey. The boundary with No. 22 is presently open and a condition requiring details of the treatment to this boundary would be required.
20. It is considered essential that the hedge along the countryside/north-western boundary be retained in order to minimise the visual impact of the bungalow upon its surroundings. As such, the scheme has been amended to site the bungalow a total of 5 metres away from the hedge, a distance that the Trees and Landscape Officer considers to be sufficient to ensure its retention.
21. No objections have been raised by the Trees and Landscape Officer to the loss of the trees. The requested replacement planting can be secured by standard landscaping condition.

22. Concerns have been raised in respect of the width of the access and its suitability for two vehicles as well as larger emergency and delivery vehicles. The access is a minimum of 5 metres wide for a distance of some 40 metres back from the highway boundary. There is enough room for 2 cars to pass for a sufficient distance back from the highway to ensure that vehicles would not be forced to back out onto the road. The remainder of the access is 4 metres wide. A 3.7 metre wide access is required for fire engines and the width of the access is therefore adequate in this respect. A plan showing how a fire engine would negotiate the tight corner has been submitted and the Building Inspector has confirmed that it shows that a fire engine could negotiate the corner.
23. In the application on the adjacent site that was eventually allowed at appeal and in the subsequent approved application, a belt of landscaping was shown along the rear boundaries of Nos. 10 – 16 Town Street and in the position of the presently proposed access. Whilst previous applications did show landscaping along this boundary, it was not considered by the Inspector as being essential in order to protect neighbours from undue noise disturbance or in order to protect the rural character of the area. If the currently proposed development were to proceed, it would not be possible for a hedge to be planted along the rear boundaries of Nos. 10 – 16 Town Street. However, a 1.8 metre high close boarded fence could be erected along this boundary thereby protecting the adjoining residents from undue noise and disturbance arising from the use of the access. I would also argue that the retention of the hedge along the north-western/countryside boundary of this and the adjacent site is more essential, in order to minimise the impact of the development upon the surrounding countryside, than the provision of a new hedge on the inner/built-up part of the site.
24. In the appeal decision relating to planning ref: S/1597/02/F, the Inspector did not consider the relationship of the access with Nos. 6 and 10 Town Street would result in undue noise and disturbance to the occupiers of these properties. No.6 has written in stating that the first floor landing window referred to by the Inspector does, in fact, serve a bedroom. However, given that the access exists at present and that it is intended to erect improved fencing along the boundaries with the adjoining properties, the small increase in the number of traffic movements associated with one extra dwelling would not, in my opinion, result in an unacceptable level of noise and disturbance to the occupiers of Nos. 6 & 10 Town Street.

Recommendation

25. Subject to confirmation that a fire engine could turn within the site, approval, as amended by letters and plans date stamped 31st August 2004, subject to the following conditions:
1. Standard A (Reason A);
 2. Sc5a – Details of materials to be used for external walls and roofs of dwelling and garage (Reason – To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development);
 3. Sc51 – Landscaping (Rc51);
 4. Sc52 – Implementation of landscaping (Rc52);
 5. Sc60 – Boundary treatment details (Rc60)

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: SE5** (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;
 - Impact upon the character and appearance 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.

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; File Refs: S/1385/04/F, S/0759/04/F, S/0328/04/F, S/1597/02/F, S/0439/90/O and S/2306/89/O.

Contact Officer: Lorraine Casey – Senior Planning Assistant
Telephone: (01954) 713251

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	6 th October 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

**S/1540/04/O – Newton
Erection of Additional Dwelling and New Garage for No. 58 Town Street at 58
Town Street for H Hurrell**

Recommendation: Refusal

Site and Proposal

1. The 0.25 hectare application site is located on the west side of Town Street and is presently a walled garden area to No. 58 Town Street, a semi detached gault brick and tile Grade II Listed dwelling. The site comprises a number of single storey redundant outbuildings. To the south is a detached Grade II listed house whilst to the west is agricultural land that lies within the countryside and Green Belt. Along the front boundary of the site is a 2 metre high clunch wall, which is listed in its own right, and vehicular access at its southern end. There are a number of mature trees on the plot.
2. The outline application, submitted on 22nd July 2004, seeks to erect a dwelling on the site. Details of means of access and siting form part of the application. The submitted block plan shows that the dwelling would be set approximately 22 metres back from the frontage of the site with vehicular access being gained via the existing point of access off Town Street. As the proposal seeks to develop land that has historically been used as access/parking by No. 58 Town Street, the application also seeks to provide a replacement garage and access for the existing dwelling. The garage would be sited to the rear of No. 58 and the existing point of access to Home Farm extend across the rear/western boundaries of Nos. 56 & 58 Town Street.
3. A covering letter submitted with the application states that the dwelling has been deliberately set back within the plot to make the building less obvious and well screened when viewed from the site frontage. As a result the character and appearance of Town Street will remain unaffected and the replacement of the existing structure with a dwelling would not represent development that would be out of keeping with the general form of development in Newton. The existing building on the site is of limited architectural value and unworthy of retention. It contributes little to the character and appearance of the locality as it is virtually hidden from public view by the frontage wall. It has no historical and intrinsic connection to No. 58. Although development along this part of the village is linear in pattern there is an absence of a strong building line. The development would go some way towards making a more efficient use of land in accordance with PPG3.

Planning History

4. None

Planning Policy

5. The site is within the village framework of Newton, an Infill-Only Village as defined in the Local Plan 2004.

6. **Policy P1/3** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 requires a high standard a design which responds to the local character of the built environment for all new development.
7. **Policy P7/6** of the Structure Plan requires development to protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the historic built environment.
8. **Policy SE5** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 states that residential development within the village will be restricted to no more than two dwellings provided the site does not form an essential part of village character and development is sympathetic to the character and amenities of the locality.
9. **Policy EN18** of the Local Plan states that consent for the demolition of Listed Buildings will not be granted other than in exceptional circumstances. When assessing applications for demolition, the Council will consider the intrinsic interest of the building, its condition and the efforts made to keep the building in use.
10. **Policy EN28** of the Local Plan states that the Council will refuse applications which:
 - Would dominate the Listed Building or its curtilage buildings in scale, form, massing or appearance;
 - Would damage the setting, well being or attractiveness of a Listed Building;
 - Would harm the visual relationship between the building and its formal or natural landscape surroundings; and
 - Would damage archaeological remains of importance.

Consultation

11. **Newton Parish Council** raises no objections to the application stating:

“In principle the Council has no objection to this proposal providing that the materials used are sympathetic to the surrounding area, and that the existing ‘clunch’ wall is retained to maintain the existing street scene”.
12. **The Conservation Manager** objects to the application stating:
13. “Occupying the site is the former forge of the estate blacksmith and a few corrugated iron open sheds that are used as carports. The sheds are of no interest but the forge, which dates from the 19th century, is a rare survivor of a once common building type. Constructed of gault brick with a pantiled roof and with two gault brick chimneys, it was extended to the southwest in the early-mid 20th century. Internally, all the fittings survive, the forge, circular bellows (still in working order), the anvil, bench and some of the tools.
14. The site forms part of an important gap space in the built up frontage, which separates the listed properties. Whilst the site is enclosed by clunch walls the existing single storey forge is visible within the street scene. A new residential development to the rear of the site would still be obvious even if the forge were to be retained and would consequently visually close the gap between the listed buildings. It would also substantially alter the architectural hierarchy between the two adjacent listed properties, by creating a substantial dwelling in the form of a new farmhouse.

15. The proposal would conflict with the loose spacing of development within this part of Town Street.
16. The proposal would result in the demolition of a listed building, which is of historic interest, in reasonable condition, structurally sound and not beyond repair and is currently used as a store and garaging for the resident of No. 58. There does not appear to be any reason why the forge could not continue as garage/ancillary storage space for No. 58. Indeed there do not appear to be any other outbuildings associated with the property and the demolition of this building will result in the proposed replacement garage, which will affect the setting of the listed house.
17. The proposal will fundamentally alter the character of the site and affect the setting of the adjoining listed buildings and consequently the character of the listed walls”.
18. The comments of the **Trees and Landscape Officer** will be reported verbally at the Committee meeting.
19. **The Chief Environmental Health Officer** raises no objections in principle although does express concerns about potential noise disturbance to residents during the construction period. As such, it is recommended that a condition restricting hours of use of power operated machinery be applied to any planning consent.

Representations

20. None

Planning Comments – Key Issues

21. The key issues to consider in the determination of this application relate to:
 - a. The impact of the development upon the setting of adjacent Listed Buildings and upon the character and appearance of the area;
 - b. Neighbour impact;
 - c. Impact on trees.
22. The Conservation Manager has raised strong objections to the principle of erecting a dwelling on this site which is considered to form an important gap in the built up frontage. The proposed development would adversely affect the setting of the adjacent Listed Buildings (including the frontage wall) and be out of keeping with the character of the area. The new garage to No. 58 is also considered to affect the setting of the building. In addition, the loss of the old forge building, together with the lack of exceptional circumstances put forward for its demolition, would conflict with the requirements of Policy EN18 of the Local Plan.
23. I am satisfied that a dwelling could be accommodated on this site without compromising the amenities of adjoining residents by reason of overlooking or overshadowing, or by causing noise and disturbance through the use of the access.
24. The proposal involves the creation of a new driveway within the site adjacent to a number of mature trees. In addition, vegetation to the rear of Nos. 56 & 58 Town Street would need to be cleared in order to accommodate the new access. The comments of the Trees and Landscape Officer in respect of these matters are awaited and will be reported verbally at the Committee meeting.

Recommendation

Refusal:

25. The site forms an important gap in the built up frontage along Town Street that separates two Grade II Listed Buildings. The erection of a dwelling on the site would visually close the gap between the adjacent Listed Buildings, thereby adversely affecting their setting and consequently the character of the listed walls, and would conflict with the loose spacing of development within this part of Town Street. It would also substantially alter the architectural hierarchy between the two adjacent listed properties by creating a substantial dwelling in the form of a new farmhouse.

The proposal would therefore be contrary to Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 Policies P1/3 which requires a high standard of design that responds to the local character of the built environment, and P7/6 which requires development to protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the historic built environment; and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 Policies SE5 which requires development in infill villages to be sympathetic to the character of the locality, and EN28 which resists development that damages the setting of Listed Buildings and harms the visual relationship between Listed Buildings and their formal surroundings.

26. The proposal would result in the demolition of the listed forge, which is of historic interest, in reasonable condition, structurally sound and not beyond repair, and in current use as a store and garaging to No. 58 Town Street. No exceptional circumstances have been put forward for the demolition of this building and the proposal therefore contravenes Policy EN18 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 which strongly resists the demolition of Listed Buildings. In addition, the demolition of the former forge building necessitates the provision of a new garage to serve No. 58 Town Street which would result in further harm to the setting of this Listed Building.

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; File Ref: S/1540/04/O.

Contact Officer: Lorraine Casey – Senior Planning Assistant
Telephone: (01954) 713251

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	6 th October 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

**S/1637/04/F - Haslingfield
Extension, 7 Cantelupe Road, for Mrs Khan**

Recommendation: Approval

Members will visit this site on Monday 4th October 2004.

Site and Proposal

1. This full application, registered on 5th August 2004, proposes two extensions to 7 Cantelupe Road, a bungalow sited gable end to the road with an attached single garage to the side.
2. An extension is proposed to the rear of the garage, measuring 3.3 metres x 2.5 metres and a bedroom extension on the rear of the main part of the dwelling, measuring 4.5 metres x 5 metres. Both extensions have a pitched roof lower than the main ridge height of the dwelling.
3. To the west of the site is a semi-detached chalet bungalow and to the east a block of garages separated by a driveway leading to two bungalows at the rear.

Planning History

4. None relevant to this application.

Planning Policy

5. **Policy HG12** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 states that planning permission for the extension and alteration of dwellings will not be permitted where the design and use of materials would not be in keeping with local characteristics; the proposal would harm seriously the amenities of neighbours through undue loss of light or privacy, being unduly overbearing in terms of its mass, or would adversely affect surrounding properties by virtue of its design, layout, location or materials; there would be an unacceptable loss of off-street parking or garden space within the curtilage; there would be an unreasonable visual impact upon the street scene; boundary treatment would provide an unacceptable standard of privacy and visual amenity.

Consultation

6. **Haslingfield Parish Council** recommends refusal. "Whilst the addition of the breakfast room is quite acceptable, the rear bedroom/bathroom proposal constitutes a significant overdevelopment of the area. There are garages at No9 and 9A which are not shown on the site plan."

Representations

7. None received

Planning Comments – Key Issues

8. The application was considered at the Chairman's Delegation Meeting on 20th September and has been brought to Committee at the request of the local member.

9. The key issue to be considered is whether the proposed extensions comply with the criteria set out Policy HG12 of the Local Plan 2004 and in particular, given the comments of the Parish Council, whether the proposal represents overdevelopment of the area.
10. In my view the proposal has no adverse impact on neighbouring dwellings or the street scene. No representations have been received from the occupiers of adjacent dwellings. The bedroom extension is 6 metres from the rear boundary of the site and 7 metres from the west boundary. In my opinion it does not represent overdevelopment of either the site or the area, there-being no harm caused by the proposed.

Recommendation

9. That the application be approved subject to
 1. Standard Condition A – Reason A;
 2. SC19 – Matching Materials – RC19

Informatives

Reasons for Approval

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

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

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.
Planning Application File S/1637/04/F

Contact Officer: Edward Durrant – Planning Assistant
Telephone: (01954) 713082

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	6 th October 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

S/1519/04/F & S/1518/04/LB - Histon**Erection of single storey rear extension, two storey rear extension and alterations to the fenestration of the dwelling, 5 The Green, Histon For Mr and Mrs B Fisk.****Recommendation: Refusal****Conservation Area****Site and Proposal**

1. No 5 The Green is a Grade II Listed Building located within the Histon and Impington Conservation Area, opposite the village pond. This two storey, 'L' shaped property is partly brick, partly render and has been extended to the rear in the form of conservatory/sun room with a utility room provided beneath a cat slide roof. An attached garage and a number of timber built outbuildings are also located within the rear garden.
2. The proposed single storey kitchen extension, sited adjacent to the detached garage, measures 3.6 metres in length, 3.5 metres in width and has a pitched roof, the ridge height of which measures 2.8 metres in height.
3. The full application, received 21st July 2004, proposed a two-storey rear extension which originally measured 7 metres in length and 5 metres in width and provided a study at ground floor level and a bathroom, bedroom and landing at first floor level. It was proposed that the roof of the extension form a gable, the ridge height of which measures 6 metres in height.
4. This two-storey extension has subsequently been reduced in size by 1.5 metres and now measures 5.5 metres in length. The size and siting of windows inserted within this extension has also been amended.
5. An additional door and two windows were also originally proposed within the north facing elevation of the existing dwelling whilst an existing window sited within the rear elevation of the building was to be replaced by a pair of patio doors. These details were also amended so there is now just one additional window and a door proposed in the flank elevation, while the rear facing window is to be retained.
6. The existing flat roof extension is also to be re-roofed in lead.

Planning History

7. Whilst there have been past planning and listed building consent applications for alterations and extensions to the dwelling, none of these are of any particular relevance to these applications.

Planning Policy

8. **Policy P1/3 ‘Sustainable Design in Built Development’** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003, (“The 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.
9. **Policy 7/6 of the Structure Plan** requires all proposals to protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the historic built environment.
10. **Policy HG12 ‘ Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings within Frameworks’** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004, (“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.
11. **Policy EN30 ‘Development in Conservation Areas’** of the Local Plan states that proposals will be expected to preserve or enhance the special character and appearance of the Conservation Area
12. **Policy EN20 ‘Unsympathetic extensions’** of the Local Plan states that extensions to Listed Buildings must be necessary to ensure the continued economic use of the building and must not dominate or detract from the special character of the Listed Building in terms of its scale, form or appearance.

Consultation

13. **Histon Parish Council** – Approves but did question the necessity for roof lights.
14. At the time of writing this report, no further comments had been received with regard to the amended plans. The consultation period does not expire until the 24th September 2004. Any comments raised will be reported verbally to committee.
15. **The Conservation Manager** – Raised objections to the fenestration of the extensions and works to the existing fabric of the building. Objections were also raised with regard to the eaves detailing to the two-storey rear extension.

With regard to the amended plans he has stated that the proportions of the two-storey extension would remain out of scale with the historic part of the building and would form a visually dominant element to the rear elevation of the building. The replacement stairs and formation of a landing area are supported but the forming of a further bedroom is not necessary to the continued economic use of the building. The fenestration of the new extension is considered inappropriate and out of scale with the windows within the rest of the property.

It is considered that the proposals even in their revised form fail to meet the requirements of Policies EN20 and EN30 of the Local Plan

Representations

16. One letter of objection was received from the adjacent property, No 3 The Green. Concerns raised related to the side facing windows originally proposed along with the length and resultant overshadowing/overbearing affect of the extension
17. At the time of writing this report, no further comments had been received with regard to the amended plans. Any comments raised will be reported verbally to committee.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

18. The key issues to consider in this application are the impact of the extensions on the adjacent properties and the impact of the extensions/alterations on character and form of the Listed Building and surrounding Conservation Area.
19. **Residential amenity of adjacent properties**
20. The additional door and window now proposed in the north facing flank elevation of the property will not adversely affect the adjacent property, No 5a The Green. The proposed openings will look out over the applicant's driveway and will not increase the overlooking potential of the existing ground floor and first floor openings.
21. The proposed single storey side extension will also have a minimal impact on the adjacent property, No 5a sited to the north. The proposed structure is low and has no flank windows that face the neighbouring dwelling. The majority of the structure will also be screened from view by the boundary hedge/fence and detached garage.
22. The proposed two-storey rear extension is to be set slightly off the boundary shared with No 3. Whilst a number of single storey out buildings currently line this boundary, the two storey structure will significantly increase the built up appearance of the site.
23. The height of the extension is relatively low, (6 metres at the ridge and just 4 metres at the eaves) and the extension is sited to the north of the neighbouring property. Furthermore, No 3 has an unusual window arrangement to the rear of the property, with no first floor openings whilst the nearest ground floor window that serves a habitable room is set some distance away from the site boundary and is situated within the rear elevation of a flat roof extension. This structure extends 3 metres out from the rear elevation of the dwelling.
24. No 3 The Green does have a first floor window sited within the gable of the dwelling however this opening is already overshadowed by the application property.
25. It was originally proposed that a secondary window that served the proposed bedroom be inserted within the south elevation of the extension at first floor level. This window would directly overlook the rear garden of No3. This opening was omitted on the amended plans. The agent has also confirmed that the two roof lights that are to be inserted in the south facing roof slope of the extension are to be fixed shut and obscurely glazed.
26. Given the above it is not considered that the proposed extension will significantly increase the overlooking or overshadowing affect of the application property.
27. Irrespective of the above, an extension of the length proposed, located so close to the boundary will however appear overbearing and oppressive when viewed from within the rear garden of No 3 The Green. At present the rear of garden of this property is heavily overgrown. Whilst the garden space is currently inaccessible, having viewed the proposed from within a small cleared area, it is clear that the two storey rear extension will appear overly dominate and will for this reason detrimentally affect the residential amenity of the adjacent property. The overgrown nature of the neighbour's garden does not justify support being given for an extension in the form proposed.
28. This proposal was discussed pre-application and whilst some concerns were raised with regard to the adjacent property No 3, it was considered that for the reason

mentioned in paragraphs 23 and 24 the relationship might be acceptable. At this pre-application stage it was not possible to view the extension from the adjacent property. Once access was available into the rear garden of No3, it was clear that this relationship was not acceptable.

29. The amended plans that were received do help to reduce the Impact on the adjacent property however a reduction of just 1.5 metres is considered insufficient given the proximity of the extension to the site boundary.

Character and appearance of the listed building and surrounding Conservation Area.

30. The single storey kitchen extension that will replace the existing long conservatory and will form a compact structure, which will appear more in keeping with this historic building. The omission of patio doors in the rear elevation of the dwelling and the retention of the existing window will ensure that the historic fabric of the building is also retained. Following the submission of amended plans, no objections are raised to the proposed door and window to be sited within the flank elevation of the dwelling. As originally proposed, the insertion of a doorway and two windows would have caused an unacceptable degree of harm to the timber frame of the building. The re-roofing of the existing flat roof structure with lead is also welcomed.
31. With regard to the proposed two-storey rear extension, the resulting size of this structure would be out of scale with the existing historic building. The two storey extension is much wider in proportion than the historic cottage and it is considered that the two elements would not only sit uncomfortably together but the proposed structure would form an overly dominant element on the rear elevation of the building. The fenestration of the extension is also of different proportions to the existing and whilst this style of windows without glazing bars is considered to be acceptable, the form, positioning and size of the openings proposed fails to reflect that of the existing windows.
32. For the reasons given above an extension of this form would also fail to enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Following the development to the rear of the site the proposed structure will form a more visible feature within the Conservation Area.
33. The existing property has four bedrooms and it is considered that an additional bedroom, whilst desirable to the current occupiers, is not necessary for the building to remain in economic use. This is a requirement of Policy EN20 of the Local Plan.
34. The proposed works seek to replace the modern second staircase, which is very steep and form a landing area to enable independent access to two of the bedrooms. If the extension were reduced in size these elements could still be accommodated in a more acceptable form.

Recommendations

Refuse Planning and Listed Building Consent

Reasons for Refusal:

1. The proposed two storey rear extension would, by means of its height, length and proximity to the boundary, appear overbearing when viewed from within the rear garden of No 3 The Green, totally dominating the narrow rear garden of this

modest sized cottage. The proposed extension would therefore have a significant detrimental impact on the residential amenity of this property, and is therefore considered contrary to Policy P1/3 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 and Policy HG12 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.

2. The proposed two storey rear extension by reasons of its length and width is considered overly large and out of proportion with the form of this historic, Listed Building. The proposed extension would form a dominant and intrusive element to the rear elevation that would adversely affect the special character of the Listed Building. The extension is also not considered necessary for the continued use of the building.

This proposal is therefore contrary to Policy P7/6 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 and Policy EN20 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004

3. The proposed two-storey extension would form a prominent feature within the Conservation Area and due to the size and poor design would fail to either protect or enhance the special character and appearance of the area. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to the provisions of Policy EN30 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.

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 S/1519/04/F
- Listed Building file S/1518/04/LB

Contact Officer: Charmain Hawkins Historic Buildings Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713178

Paul Belton Planning Assistant
Telephone (01954) 713253

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	6th October 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

S/1188/04/F - Impington**Erection of Eleven Houses, Two Flats and Garages following Demolition of Existing Dwellings (15-17 Mill Road), 15-17 Mill Road and Land Rear of 13-23 Mill Road and Rear of 17-23 Highfield Road for Hogger Homes Ltd****Recommendation: Approval or Delegated Approval (Subject to Drainage)****Site and Proposal**

1. The above application was deferred at the September Committee (Item No. 11) following concerns raised by Councillor Mason at the local problems experienced with regards to foul drainage.

The Report is attached as an Appendix.

2. As a result, officers have written to Anglian Water Services Ltd concerning this problem; - a verbal report will be made on its response and/or requirements.
3. At an earlier application for this site in 2003 Anglian Water Services raised no objections to the proposal. I assume that this is why it chose not to comment further on this revised scheme.

Up-Date

4. The following were reported verbally by the Planning Officer at the September Committee, having been received after the completion of the Agenda.
 - i. With the reduction in the number of dwellings overall, the Chief Financial Planning Officer, Cambridgeshire County Council, is now requesting a financial contribution towards 2 secondary school places, not the three originally requested.
 - ii. A resident of South Road repeats their concerns at the increase in traffic caused by this development and estimates that 50% of Mill Road residents, together with those on the new development, will travel to and from Cambridge Road via South Road, instead of the direct route via The Crescent.
 - iii. The owners of 13 Mill Road have objected and expressed their views as follows: "the planned estate road will now be closer to their property with the resultant noise and disturbance. With inconvenient parking, residents are likely to park on Mill Road. The new building will be closer to my property than that to be demolished. Objections to precedent, character and local concerns are repeated."

- iv. The owners of 19 Mill Road, the property highlighted by the Inspector in dismissing the previous appeal, are still objecting to the proximity of the estate road and repeat that “it is not wanted”.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

5. As explained previously – Paragraphs 14-17 inc. September Committee, the Inspector was satisfied with the planned development with the exception of one issue, namely the relationship of the access to the occupiers of No. 19, Mill Road. The revised plans now overcome this objection. There is still sufficient distance to the garden of No. 13, to the east and the planned block of three units at the front of the site is actually smaller than that of the subject of the earlier appeal.
6. In all other respects the scheme is satisfactory.

Recommendation

7. Subject to Anglian Water Services Ltd maintaining its earlier stance of “No objections”, that Delegated powers of approval be granted subject to the prior signing of a Section 106 Agreement.
8. Alternatively additional information may be required if Anglian Water requires additional information before consent can be issued.

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 Mix and Design)
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
 - Highway safety
 - 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.

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 Ref: S/1188/04/F

Appeal Decision Ref. APP/WO530/A/03/1123842 and 1133651

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	1 st September 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

S/1188/04/F - Impington
Erection of Eleven Houses, Two Flats and Garages following Demolition of Existing Dwellings (15-17 Mill Road), 15-17 Mill Road and Land Rear of 13-23 Mill Road and Rear of 17-23 Highfield Road for Hogger Homes Ltd

Recommendation: Approval

Site and Proposal

1. An irregular shaped site of 0.5ha comprising numbers 15-17 Mill Road, a pair of semi-detached properties with gardens, which widens out to the rear comprising a block of land which were the former rear gardens of numbers 17-23 Highfield Road to the south. The site is surrounded on three sides by existing residential development with the fourth/west boundary being arable land/green belt.
2. The full application, originally received on 8th June, proposed the demolition of numbers 15-17 Mill Road and the construction of a cul-de-sac to serve 4 x 1-bedroom flats (affordable housing) and a 2-bedroom house on that part of the site occupied by numbers 15-17 Mill Road, together with ten houses to the rear. These would comprise 4 x 3-bedroom houses, 2 x 4-bedroom houses and 4 x 5-bedroom houses.
3. Following objections to the original scheme, that section occupied by numbers 15-17 Mill Road has been re-designed whereby the block fronting Mill Road now comprises 2 x 1-bedroom flats and a 2-bedroom house (affordable housing) with a re-aligned estate road. The second block of flats has been omitted. The remainder of the site remains unchanged.

Planning History

4. Two similar applications were appealed in 2003 against a refusal and a non-determination – the reasons for refusal being:-

The site forms part of an established residential area characterised by its linear form and generally long and open rear gardens. It lies on the edge of the built-up part of the village of Impington and adjoining open countryside and the Cambridge Green Belt.

1. The proposed development of this site would not be sensitive to the character of the village and local features of landscape importance. It is therefore contrary to **Policy H15** of the Adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 1993 and **Policy SE3** of the Local Plan No. 2 Proposed Modifications October 2002.
2. The development is not of an appropriate layout which offers sufficient opportunities for landscaping on this edge of village site to minimise its impact on the adjoining countryside. It is therefore contrary to **Policy H6** of the

Adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 1993 and **Policy SE14** of Local Plan No. 2 Proposed Modifications October 2002.

3. The development fails to reflect the wider character and context of the surrounding townscape and landscape and does not achieve high quality design and local distinctiveness. It is therefore contrary to **Policy 12/10** of the Approved Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 1993 and **Policies HG15** and **HG16A(4)** of Local Plan No. 2 Proposed Modifications October 2002.
4. In detail the proposed layout fails to accord with **Policy SP12/10** of the Approved Structure Plan 1995 which seeks to incorporate high standards of design of layout and design. In particular the proposal will have a detrimental impact on:-
 - The amenity currently enjoyed by the occupier of No. 19 Mill Road through the creation of a vehicular access that will run immediately adjacent to the side garden of that property causing noise and disturbance.
 - The amenity currently enjoyed by existing residents that abut the site in that the proposed houses have short gardens of in places only 5 metres causing intense overlooking of the rear gardens.
 - The short rear gardens of some of the proposed properties will put pressure in the future for the removal of the proposed outer landscape buffer. This is contrary to **Policy SE14** of the Local Plan No. 2 Proposed Modifications October 2002.
 - The proposed carriage way does not fully meet requirements of the Local Highway Authority to the potential detriment of highway safety.
5. Both appeals were dismissed, but only on the **one** issue of the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of nearby residents in terms of noise disturbance and privacy.

Planning Policy

i. Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003)

Policy P1/3 includes a requirement for a high standard of design and sustainability, minimising the need to travel through, among other things, the promotion of higher densities. It also requires proposals to respond to local character and to preserve important environmental assets. **SP Policy P5/3** indicates that new housing development should be at the highest possible density compatible with local character. It provides that densities of less than 30 dwellings per hectare (dph) will not be acceptable and 40 should be sought in locations close to a good range of services and facilities. **SP Policy P5/4** includes an indication that local plans should provide for affordable housing and 1 and 2-bedroom homes and **SP Policy P6/1** requires that additional infrastructure and community requirements generated by proposals should be met and secured by condition or planning obligation. **SP Policies P6/3** and **P6/4** seek to ensure that unacceptable flood risks are not incurred or exacerbated.

ii. South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2004)

Policy SE2 identifies Histon and Impington as a Rural Growth Settlement where residential development on unallocated land will be permitted if the following provisos are met. The retention of the site in its present form must not be essential to the character of the village. The development must be sensitive to that character, local features of landscape or ecological importance and the amenities of neighbours. The village must have the necessary infrastructure capacity and residential development must not conflict with another policy in the plan. In any case, development should provide an appropriate mix of dwellings in terms of size, type and affordability and a minimum density of 30 dph, unless there are strong grounds for not doing so. **LP Policy SE8** creates a presumption in favour of residential development within village frameworks provided other policies, including SE2, are satisfied.

Policy SE9 provides that development on the edges of villages should be sympathetically designed and landscaped to minimise the impact on the countryside. **LP Policy HG7** sets out the Council's requirements for affordable housing provision, based on a survey of housing need. Among other things, **LP Policy HG10** also requires a suitable mix of dwelling types, sizes, and affordability and indicates that the wider character of the local townscape and landscape should inform design and layout. **LP Policy HG11** indicates that development to the rear of existing properties will not be allowed if it would have certain results. These include: (1) overbearing, overlooking or overshadowing of existing residential properties; (2) noise and disturbance to such properties through the use of its access; (3) highway dangers through the use of its access; or (4) if it would be out of character with development in the vicinity.

Policy CS1 indicates when the Council will seek to negotiate planning obligations or impose Grampian-style conditions and **LP Policy CS5** concerns flooding and is broadly similar in effect to **SP Policies P6/3** and **P6/4**. **LP Policy CS2** also requires the adequate provision of water supply, sewerage and land drainage systems. Under **LP Policy CS10**, developments of 4 or more dwellings will give rise to a requirement for financial contributions towards the provision of additional accommodation, if they would cause the capacity of schools to be exceeded.

Also of relevance are **Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) Note 1** (General Policy and Principles), **PPG 3** (Housing) and **PPG25** (Development and Flood Risk). Together, **PPGs 1 and 3** encourage the efficient use of land, especially previously developed land and **PPG25** provides advice regarding the assessment of flood risk.

Consultations

6. Impington Parrish Council objected to the scheme as first submitted for the reasons:-

The Planning Committee feel the new layout is not adequate to alleviate the impact identified by the Inspector at Appeal, the disruption being unacceptable including noise reflected back off P4 and P5 (flats). It is also felt materials to the elevation to Mill Road should be shown in character with the properties proposed for demolition. The Committee cannot help but comment on:

- The primary schools being at capacity
- The doctors surgery being at capacity
- The mix of housing (ref. to South Cambs 2002 Housing Needs Survey on market housing)
- The continuing impact on No. 13 Mill Road.

Comments on the revised plans will be reported verbally.

7. The **Environment Agency** recommends the use of a “Grampian” style condition to cover drainage issues; the application is accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment.
8. The **Police Architectural Liaison Officer** recommends that the proposed 1.95m high close boarded fencing be changed whereby the top 600mm is trellis. This has the double advantage of a) creating enhanced supervision of the parking area and b) the trellis provides a deterrent to climbing. Any fencing adjacent to the roadway should be a maximum of 900mm high.
9. The **Chief Financial Planning Officer**, Cambridgeshire County Council, requests a developer contribution towards three secondary school places. There is adequate primary school provision in the area.
10. The comments of the **LHA** will be reported verbally; the cul-de-sac having been re-planned. In addition, the County Council is requesting a financial contribution towards the Northern Corridor Area Transport Plan.
11. **Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service** request the provision of fire hydrants in the layout.
12. The **Council’s Drainage Manager** asks for a condition to cover adequate means of surface water disposal. Apparently further information has come to light and a more thorough Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) is required. The Drainage Manager has been in contact with the Consultant direct in this respect.

Representations

13. Eleven letters, one including a petition, have been received objecting to the scheme for the reasons:-
 - i. Increase in traffic on Mill Road by 100%, creating further congestion on A14 junction. Will conflict with the proposed traffic calming scheme on Cambridge Road. The road will become a “rat run”.
 - ii. Inadequate parking provision in the scheme. Any parking overflow on Mill Road would cause serious congestion. The proposed Guided Busway cannot be considered to solve the transport problem for an increase in population.
 - iii. Danger to pedestrians crossing the new estate road, especially elderly residents, and children walking to the nearby play area.
 - iv. The developers should be told that a road between Highfield Road and Mill Road will never be given.
 - v. Little or no reduction in amount of traffic from scheme discussed at Appeal.
 - vi. Development will alter the special character and spaciousness of the area, being close to the Windmill. Loss of 2 soundly built houses. Loss of wildlife. House and styles inappropriate. Impact on countryside and inadequate space for screening. Over-development and overlooking.

- vii. Question need for more houses as 900 are planned at Arbury Camp, 10,000 at Northstone and 500 at Unwins. Local facilities, i.e. schools, doctors, are at capacity. Little contribution to affordable housing.
- viii. The land is saturated in winter. Increase in flooding. Any agreed “solution” may cause increased problems to adjacent land.
- ix. Could lead to future development adjacent.
- x. Light pollution from street lamps.
- xi. A willow tree at 13 Mill Road, which provides some screening, may have to be felled because of subsidence problems.
- xii. Numbers 9-17 Mill Road have to maintain a private sewer. Possible problems of ground disturbance from site clearance/demolition.
- xiii. Two previous appeals rejected because of “increased traffic and noise”.
- xiv. Noise and disturbance to numbers 13 and 19 Mill Road. The Developer has little regard for the local views or those of the Inspector. The revised scheme does **not** solve the problems highlighted by the Inspector.
- xv. The long length of fence proposed will overshadow the garden. Who will maintain it?

Planning Comments – Key Issues

- 14. As can be seen from the number of letters of objection to this proposal, and the points raised, the local community is strongly opposed to development here but the basic and only issue is “has the revised scheme overcome the **one** objection on which the appeals were dismissed, - that is the effect on No. 19 Mill Road adjacent”.
- 15. In discussing the appeals, the Inspector stated:-

“The same main issues arise in both appeals. The first is the affect of the proposal on the living conditions of nearby residents in terms of noise, disturbance and privacy. The second main issue is the affect on the character and appearance of the area”.
- 16. In great detail, and in a well-argued Report, the Inspector carefully considered all the points of policy, security, traffic, housing mix, character of the area, overlooking and loss of privacy, pattern of development, surface water, flooding and contributions for education and transport. In all these matters he was satisfied that the two schemes before his were **acceptable**.
- 17. The appeals failed on **one** matter only and this was with regard to the “unacceptable harm to the living conditions of nearby residential occupiers through increased noise and disturbance”.
- 18. In one appeal the new roadway would have been immediately adjacent to the boundary with No. 19 Mill Road, in the other appeal it was separated by a 1.8m wide footway. “Such close proximity to No. 19’s hitherto quiet rear garden would give rise to an unacceptable increase in the noise and disturbance suffered by the occupiers of that property” said the Inspector. He went on to say that “It would also be

exacerbated by the noise of engines starting, doors slamming, vehicles manoeuvring at the junction with Mill Road, or to and from the nearby parking spaces, as well as pedestrians using the shared surface or footpath”.

19. The Scheme has now been revised whereby:-
 - i. The two 1-bedroom flats and one 2-bedroom house, designed as one building, has been retained at the front of the site adjacent to No. 13 Mill Road.
 - ii. The second block of flats, formerly plots 4 and 5, have been omitted. This has enabled the roadway to be curved towards the centre of the plot of land thereby achieving fully landscaped areas either side of the access road up to 6.0m – 6.5m in width.
20. With such a width for landscaping and fencing, together with the removal of the parking area/double garage which caused the Inspector concern, the amenities of the two neighbours are safeguarded.
21. It should also be remembered that there will be a slight drop in the traffic generated from the site with the deletion of the two flats although I recognise it will not be substantial.
22. As amended, the scheme is recommended for a delegated approval.

Recommendation

That, as amended by letter dated 20 July 2004 and drg nos. EDG/02/138/36 and 40, delegated approval be granted subject to the prior signing of a Section 106 Agreement to cover i) affordable housing, ii) educational contribution and iii) Northern Corridor Area Transport Plan contribution, and normal safeguarding 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:**
P1/3 (Sustainable design in built development) and
P7/6 (Historic Built Environment)
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:**
SE2 (Development in Rural Growth Settlements)
 - **HG10** (Housing Mix and Design) and
EN30 (Development in/adjacent to 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 noise disturbance and overlooking issues

- Highway safety
 - 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.

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/1188/04F**

Contact Officer: Jem Belcham - Area Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954 713252)

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	6 th October 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

**S/1763/04/F - Heydon
Erection of House and Garage with Annexe Over Following Demolition of Bungalow
and Outbuilding at 43 Fowlmere Road for Mr & Mrs K Esplin**

Recommendation: Delegated Approval

Conservation Area

Site and Proposal

1. The 0.58 hectare application site is located on the western side of Heydon Road and is raised approximately 1.5 metres above the road level and the adjoining dwelling to the north, No.45 Fowlmere Road.
2. The site is occupied by a modern 1960's bungalow, a timber and corrugated iron garage, and a number of small timber outbuildings. A 2 metre high fence defines the northern boundary and a row of leylandii defines the southern boundary. The dwelling to the north is a listed thatched cottage that is sited gable end to the road. A single storey render and pantile annexe is situated hard on the site boundary with one large window facing the site.
3. The full application, submitted on 20th August 2004, seeks to demolish the existing bungalow and outbuildings and to erect a house and garage on the site. The proposed replacement dwelling would be sited approximately 3.5 metres behind the line of the existing bungalow. It would be a 2-storey dwelling standing approximately 8.6 metres high and comprising timber walls and a slate or clay plain tile roof. The proposal also seeks to erect an outbuilding along part of the frontage of the site, at right angles to the road. This would comprise a triple garage on the ground floor with annexe above and would be constructed in flint and brickwork. The outbuilding would be 6 metres to the ridge with two dormer windows facing across the site to the north.

Planning History

4. **S/0574/04/F** - Consent was refused at the July 2004 meeting following a site visit by Members for a similar scheme but which had the proposed outbuilding located parallel to the road rather than at a right angle to it. The application was refused on the grounds that the proposed outbuilding, by virtue of its height, bulk and position, would be unduly overbearing in the street scene and would create a 'tunnelling effect' along this section of Fowlmere Road. In addition the outbuilding would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of development on the west side of the road. The proposal would neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
5. **S/1273/02/CAC** – Conservation Area Consent granted for the total demolition of the existing bungalow, garage and outbuildings.

6. **S/1274/02/F** – An application to erect 2 detached houses and garages on the site was refused as the scale and identical design of the dwellings was considered to be overbearing to No.45 Fowlmere Road, dominant in the street scene and out of keeping with the informal arrangement and varied style of housing within the village.
7. **S/2107/02/F** – A subsequent application to erect a pair of linked-detached dwellings on the site was also refused and dismissed at appeal.

Planning Policy

8. The site lies inside the village framework, within the Conservation Area and to the south of a Grade II Listed Building, No.45 Fowlmere Road.
9. **Policy P7/6** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 requires development to protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the historic built environment;
10. **Policy P1/3** of the County Structure Plan requires a high standard of design that responds to the local character of the built environment;
11. **Policy EN30** of the Local Plan requires development in a Conservation Area to either preserve or enhance the character of the area.
12. **Policy EN28** of the Local Plan states that applications which would damage the setting of Listed Buildings will be resisted.
13. Heydon is identified within **Policy SE5** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 as an Infill-Only Village. In such locations, Policy SE5 states that residential development will be restricted to no more than two dwellings comprising (amongst others) the redevelopment of an existing residential curtilage providing the site does not form an essential part of village character, and development is sympathetic to the historic interests, character, and amenities of the locality.

Consultation

14. **Heydon Parish Council** objects to the application stating “we have reconsidered these plans carefully but the issues we set out in our comments on the original application of 24th March 2004 have not been met by this submission. Therefore, we recommend refusal of this application.”
15. A copy of the Parish Councils comments referred to above are attached as Appendix 1.
16. The **Conservation Manager** comments, “there does not appear to any concern with the design of the principle dwelling. Consequently, I have addressed the garage location issue.
17. I am concerned that in attempting to address concerns with regard to a perception of a ‘tunnelling’ impact presented by the previous location of the garage, the enclosure of the frontage has been lost.
18. While I accept the concern to avoid a tunnel-like approach to the village, I would note that turning the garage at right angles presents other visual issues. The result will be to create an undue focus on the garage/annexe, (which will be located adjacent to the

street) such that the garaging and domestic storage become the dominant feature in the streetscape. This will not preserve or enhance the conservation area. This is in contrast to the previous scheme, which presented a blank flint wall to the street as part of a composition of building units, reflecting local materials, while enabling the house to remain the focus of the group.

19. In my opinion, if the garage is unacceptable then ideally it should be reduced in scale and relocated to the rear of the property. This would still mean the frontage would be very open and I would therefore suggest erection of an enclosing (2m) wall to the boundary, perhaps softened by planting to the streetside.
20. However, if we are now to accept the gable end to the road as the favoured form of the garage then I would stress the need to limit the exposure to the street. This focus on the garage doors might be mitigated by:
21. Removal of the first floor - so that the block becomes a simple single storey block, with deep/overhanging eaves. This would still mean the frontage would remain open and I would therefore suggest erection of an enclosing wall to the street boundary, again with external planting.

Alternatively:

22. Removal of the dormers – The objective has always been to avoid creating a focus on the frontage block and certainly avoid the appearance of an additional dwelling. The use of dormers facing the street would emphasise that the building is not simply an ancillary building and that it will have residential accommodation within it. Consequently, I would suggest an uninterrupted roof slope facing into the garden with conservation rooflights to the light the roof space rooms to the rear.
23. Relocation of stairs and bathroom – This will enable the gable to the road to be kept as a blank elevation, with the stairs lit by a rooflight to the rear. The avoidance of a window in the gable will again strengthen its appearance as an ancillary outbuilding.

Conclusion:

24. In my opinion, while the amended proposal may address some previous concerns it also would create other visual problems, which will require some significant changes to the form of the garage block if they are to be satisfactorily mitigated.
25. I do not think that the development should be approved in the current form, but hope that the above suggestions might help address new concerns.
26. **The Chief Environmental Health Officer** expresses concern about potential noise disturbance to neighbours during the period of demolition and constructions he recommends that conditions be applied to any consent to restrict the hours of use of power operated machinery, requiring details of the method for construction of any driven pile foundations and preventing burning of waste on site.

Representations

27. Letters of objection have been received from three local residents (Four Winds, No.45 Fowlmere Road and Heydonbury Farmhouse). The main points raised are:
 - The tunnelling affect of the garaging still exists with the added impact of cars lining up be seen, giving the effect of a car salesroom forecourt. There should be no building between the garage and the road as this would immeasurably damage the character and appearance of the conservation area;

- Why does any garage need en-suite facilities above unless it is for additional accommodation;
 - The proposed building is of a great density, mass and dominance thus contravening the rules laid down by SCDC for a village in a rural character area. This impact is increased as the site is elevated above neighbouring properties.
 - The mass appears greater than that on the plans rejected by the Inspector on appeal. For example the existing building is approximately 5 metres high and the new proposed height will be approximately 9 metres, an incredulous increase in size and totally dominating the area;
 - The architect seems to have either misunderstood the previous reasons for refusals or, acting entirely for the clients and showing disregard for the views of the Parish Council and villagers of Heydon and the beautiful conservation area;
 - The side windows would result in a loss of privacy to No.45 Fowlmere Road;
 - The dwelling would result in a loss of light to No.45 Fowlmere Road and its garden area.
28. The occupiers of 41 Fowlmere Road have written stating that they have no objections to the application.

Applicants Representations

29. In a letter accompanying the application the applicants' agent states that it is understood that the principle of a replacement dwelling and the detailed design of the proposal was accepted by Members and that the adjoining owner to the south has already written in support of the scheme.
30. It is understood that Members were adverse to the agreed approach of locating the garage and annexe along the street boundary. The revised proposals therefore turn the annexe through 90° leaving a gable end only overlooking the street, very much in line with the layout associated with No. 45 and indeed a number of other properties along this section of Fowlmere Road.
31. It is understood that some Members suggested that the garage could be located on the rear of the building with access around the northern end. It is believed that this would be a wholly inappropriate way of dealing with access. The views to the rear of all these properties along the west side of Fowlmere Road command dramatic views over open rolling countryside. This unique setting for each of the houses along the road would therefore be wholly undermined by incursion of domestic traffic to the rear. As far as the writer is aware this situation does not occur at all along the houses on the western side of the road and the client has specifically purchased this property in order to benefit from such views and it is considered that it would be totally unreasonable to insist upon this position.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

32. The key issues in relation to this application are:

- The impact of the development upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area;
 - The impact of the development upon the setting of the adjacent Listed Building;
 - The affect on neighbours.
33. The site lies within the village framework where the principle of replacing the existing dwelling is acceptable providing the site in its present form does not form an essential part of village character and providing development is sympathetic to the character and amenities of the surrounding area.
34. Conservation Area Consent has been granted for the demolition of the existing bungalow. In addition, in her consideration of the appeal relating to the application for a pair of link-detached houses, the Inspector stated that neither the existing building nor its site adds anything of importance to the appearance or character of the Conservation Area.
35. In light of these comments, it is clear that retaining the site in its present form is not essential to the character of the village. Indeed, it could be argued that the redevelopment of the existing site represents an opportunity to enhance the character of the site and the surrounding area.
36. The recent refusal was based solely around the impact of the proposed outbuilding at the front of the site. Members were of the view that the proposed dwelling was acceptable in terms of its impact on neighbouring properties and character of the Conservation Area. That part of the application remains unaltered in the current application and therefore my comments concentrate on the outbuilding.
37. Much concern has also been expressed by the Parish Council and local residents to the proposed garage/annexe building at the frontage of the site, particularly in light of the fact that the site has a very open frontage at present. This concern was echoed by Members.
38. Whilst there are no frontage buildings on the western side of Fowlmere Road in the immediate vicinity of the site, there are many examples of flint outbuildings directly opposite. However the outbuildings that are sited gable end to the road are simple in form, without dormer windows which is not reflected by the form of the building as currently proposed.
39. I support the view of the Conservation Manager that a building at 90^o to the road would appear acceptable in the street scene, subject to the revisions suggested. I do not consider that it would result in the 'tunnelling effect', which was a concern with the previous application. The introduction of a wall along the frontage between the proposed building and the entrance will help reduce views of the front of the garage and associated parking although the precise height of the wall would need careful consideration. Amended drawings have been sought.
40. I will report the views of the Trees and Landscapes Officer verbally. It is important to ensure that the position of the outbuilding does not prejudice the retention of planting to the south.

41. I am of the view that the occupation of the accommodation of the garage can be dealt with by condition to ensure that it is only occupied as ancillary recommendation to the main dwelling.
42. With regards to the impact of the development upon residential amenity, the first floor master bedroom window in the north elevation is high level and should not result in overlooking. Other windows to a dressing area be obscured glazing.
43. In order to protect the occupiers of No. 45 from any future overlooking, it would be necessary to apply a condition preventing the insertion of any further windows at first floor level in this elevation without planning permission.
44. Within the scheme that was dismissed at proposal, the Inspector raised no objections to the impact of the dwelling upon the outlook from the annexe to No. 45 Fowlmere Road. Given that the current proposal is sited further away from the northern boundary than the previous scheme, it would be unreasonable to raised any objections on this basis. I am also satisfied, in light of the high leylandii that from the southern boundary of the site, that the amenities of the adjoining property to the southern would not be unduly compromised by the development.

Recommendations

45. Subject to the comments of the Trees and Landscapes Officer, the receipt of amended plans, adding the concerns of the Conservation Manager that the application be approved subject to the following conditions:
 1. Standard Condition A – Time Limited Permission (Reason A);
 2. Sc5a – Details and samples of materials to be used for external walls and roofs (Rc5a) and to ensure that the development would not detract from the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and from the setting of the adjacent Listed Building);
 3. Sc5f – Details of materials to be used for hard surfaced areas (Rc5f);
 4. Sc51 – Landscaping (Rc51);
 5. Sc52 – Implementation of landscaping (Rc52);
 6. Sc60 – Details of boundary treatment (Rc60);
 7. Para C3a & b – Permanent turning and parking (Rc10);
 8. Sc5e – Details of finished floor levels (Rc5e);
 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);
 10. Save for the windows shown within the approved drawings, no further windows, doors or openings of any kind shall be inserted at first floor level in the north elevation of the development, hereby permitted, unless expressly authorised by

planning permission granted by the Local Planning Authority in that behalf.
(Reason – To safeguard the privacy of occupiers of the adjoining dwelling to the north, No.45 Fowlmere Road);

11. Sc21 – Withdrawal of permitted development – Part 1 (Development within the curtilage of a dwellinghouse), All Classes and Part 2, Class A (Reason – To safeguard the character of the area and to ensure that additions or extensions which would not otherwise require planning permission do not overdevelop the site with consequent harm to the character of the Conservation Area and to the amenities of neighbours);
12. Sc44 – Garages – Rc44;
13. The garage/annexe building hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling known as 43 Fowlmere Road, Heydon.

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: SE5 (Development in Infill Villages), EN28 (Development within the Curtilage or Setting of a Listed Building) and EN30 (Development in/adjacent to 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 overlooking and loss of light issues;
 - Impact upon character and appearance of Conservation Area;
 - Visual impact in the locality;
 - Use of the annexe
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, then 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 demolition and 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;
3. Before the existing property is demolished, a Demolition Notice will be required from the Building Control Department establishing the way in which the property will be dismantled, including any asbestos present, the removal of waste, minimisation of dust, capping of drains and establishing hours of working operation.

Background Papers: The following background papers were used in the preparation of this report: County Structure Plan 2003; Local Plan 2004; File Refs: S/1763/04/F, S/0574/04/F, S/2107/02/F and S/1274/02/F.

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

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	6 th October 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

S/1691/04/F – Ickleton
Removal of Agricultural Occupancy Condition (Condition 2 of Planning Permission SC/60/222) to Allow Unrestricted Occupation of No. 35 Church Street

Recommendation: Approval

Conservation Area

Site and Proposal

1. The application site is occupied by a detached bungalow sited on the south side of Church Street just inside the village framework. The bungalow is one of a pair constructed in the early 1960's subject to an agricultural occupancy condition.
2. The full application, submitted on 12th August 2004, seeks to remove the agricultural occupancy condition of the original planning consent.

Planning History

3. SC/60/222 – Planning permission granted for Nos. 33 and 35 Church Street subject to agricultural occupancy condition.

Planning Policy

4. **Policy HG17** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 states:

“The relaxation of an agricultural occupancy condition will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated 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 dependents. When considering applications to relax such a condition, the District Council will require evidence of the steps taken to market the dwelling with the occupancy condition”.

The supporting text to this policy states, in paragraph 4.43, that an agricultural occupancy condition will not be discharged “...unless the dwelling has, since construction, become incorporated into an expanded village and now lies within a village framework, under which circumstances the relevant settlement policies will take precedence over Policy HG17”.

5. 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

6. **Ickleton Parish Council** objects to the application stating:

“The Parish Council would prefer to see the proper process of the house being offered for sale with the agricultural occupancy condition for 12 months. It is their policy to encourage any low cost housing. They would like to see the possibility of someone employed locally, who fulfils the agricultural occupancy condition, being given the chance to purchase a house in the village at a cost which is below the open market value.”

7. **The Conservation Manager** raises no objections.

Representations

8. None

Planning Comments – Key Issues

9. The key issues to consider in the determination of this application are:

- The loss of a dwelling with an agricultural occupancy condition;
- Impact upon the Conservation Area.

10. The site lies inside the village framework. Policy HG17 makes it clear that, where a dwelling has become incorporated into a village framework since its construction, settlement policies will take precedence over the normal requirement for a property to marketed with an agricultural occupancy condition for a 12 month period. As any new dwelling constructed within the village framework would not be subject to such an occupancy restriction, there are no planning reasons to prevent the removal of the condition in this instance.

11. The application does not involve any physical alteration to the dwelling. As such, there would be no adverse impact upon the character of the Conservation Area.

Recommendations

12. Approval:

1. Standard Condition A – Time limited permission (Reason A).

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: P7/6** (Historic Built Environment);
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004: HG17** (Relaxation of Agricultural Occupancy Condition) and **EN30** (Development in/adjacent to 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:
 - Loss of agricultural dwelling
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; File Refs: S/1619/04/F and SC/0222/60.

Contact Officer: Lorraine Casey – Senior Planning Assistant
Telephone: (01954) 713251

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	6 th October 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

**S/1742/04/F - Little Shelford
Shed at 69 Hauxton Road for Mr & Mrs Lines**

Recommendation: Approval

Site and Proposal

1. The application site comprises a two-storey semi-detached property on the south west side of Hauxton Road and its garden. The dwelling has a brick base and is rendered in a cream/yellow colour.
2. This full application, submitted on the 18th August 2004, seeks to erect a shed in the rear garden of No.69 Hauxton Road. It would be set 25.4 metres from the rear gable of the property, and just 1.6 metres from the rear boundary of the plot. The storage shed would be 7.3 metres in width, 3.65 metres in depth and 2.5 metres in height, and would consist of rendered block work on a brick plinth to match the existing property, and would have a monopitch corrugated roof. There is currently a smaller sized corrugated shed at the rear of the garden without any doors or windows.

Planning History

3. **S/2281/01/F** – This application for an extension to the dwelling to create a two storey rear and side extension was approved on the 21st January 2002. An amended scheme was then submitted in April 2002 and approved. However, a discrepancy occurred in the scale of the amended scheme, meaning the proposal was actually larger than the original application. The amended plans were then given approval by the Development and Conservation Control Committee at the meeting on the 8th January 2003, following a site visit.

Planning Policy

3. The site lies within the Little Shelford village framework.
4. **Policy P1/3** of the County Structure Plan 2003 stresses the need for a high standard of design for all new development.

Consultation

5. Little Shelford Parish Council objects to the proposal stating:

“We refuse the application on the grounds that the building is not a shed but a permanently erected building and can be used as a workshop which will have an environmental impact on the local residents. We also feel that the new building, with the large extension already exceeds the original footprint of the house considerably”.

(The latter sentence refers to application S/2281/01/F as mentioned above.)

Representations

6. A letter of objection has been received from the neighbour at No. 67 Hauxton Road. The main points of this letter include objections to:
 - a. The size of the shed and its position close to the boundary.
 - b. The windows and glazed door regarding loss of privacy to the rear terrace and kitchen/ need for a 1.8 metre fence to be erected.
 - c. The usage of a shed this size/ the need to ensure that the building is indeed used for domestic storage as proposed.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

7. The key issue in relation to this application is the relationship between the proposal and the neighbouring properties at Nos. 67 and 71 Hauxton Road. The boundaries along the majority of the gardens are 2 metre tall hedging. However, the rear ends of the gardens are very open with no fencing or hedging. For example, the rear 8-10 metres of the boundaries are open, with only sparse vegetation approximately 0.5 metres in height. This will mean the proposed shed will be visible from the garden land of the neighbouring properties, in particular from No. 67. However, given the distance between the proposed building and the neighbouring dwellings, I do not consider that the building would seriously affect the amenity of the occupiers of the neighbouring dwellings. Given this distance, I also do not consider that additional fencing or other boundary treatment is necessary as a condition of any approval.
8. In order to ensure that the shed is used for domestic purposes only, a condition is recommended stating that no business or trade shall be carried out from the premises.

Recommendation

9. Approval
 1. Standard Condition A – Time limited permission (Reason A);
 2. Standard Condition 43 – Domestic Use Only (RC 43)

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)

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 and use of shed
 - Neighbour amenity
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**, File Refs: **S/1742/04/F** and **S/2281/01/F**

Contact Officer: Paul Derry – Development Control Technician
Telephone: (01954) 713169

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	6th October 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

**S/0696/04/RM - Longstanton
Erection of 200 Dwellings and Ancillary Works on Land West of Longstanton
(Phase 2 - Home Farm) for
Cofton Ltd, Peter Stroude, George Wimpey East Anglia and Kings Oak Homes Ltd**

Recommendation: Refuse

Site and Proposal

1. This open and largely featureless site extends to 6.4 hectares (15.8 acres) and has, until recently, been in agricultural use. Over Road bounds the site to the west. Agricultural land extends to the north, beyond a watercourse. High Street is situated to the east, beyond an awarded watercourse. Along its Over Road frontage, the site is bounded by an established hedge. A Public Footpath crosses the site from southwest to northeast.
2. This reserved matters application, received on 1st April 2004 and amended by plans date stamped 9th July 2004, provides details of the siting and design of, the means of access to and landscaping for 200 dwellings on the second of three phases that are intended to provide 500 dwellings (outline planning permission S/0682/95/O). The proposed density is 31.25 dwellings per hectare.
3. The proposal includes six areas of open space within the development which would accommodate Local Areas for Play (LAPs).
4. The development would be comprised of 39 (19.5%) no. 2-bedroom dwellings, 73 (36.5%) no. 3-bedroom, 55 (27.5%) no. 4-bedroom and no. 33 (16.5%) 5 plus-bedroom houses.
5. Approximately 52.5% of the dwellings (105) would be 2-storey, 41.5% (83) 2½ storey and 6% (12) would be 3 storey. The ridge heights of the proposed dwellings range from 6.8 to 10.5 metres with one pyramid roof on a 3 storey element rising to 11.7m.
6. The access would be off Over Road, and this would serve a number of secondary roads, shared surface access ways and 'Home Zones'.
7. The application is accompanied by a Sustainability Statement and a Planning and Design Statement.

A letter received from the applicant in support of the application and dated 24th March 2004 is attached as an Appendix.

Relevant Recent History

8. Outline planning permission for comprehensive phased development to provide B1050 Bypass for Longstanton and related road works together with housing (21Ha), a business park (6.3Ha), extension to village recreation ground (2.8Ha), village green

including land for local shop and surgery, open space, landscaping and related infrastructure` on land west of Longstanton, including the application site, was granted in October 2000 (S/0682/95/O). The Decision Notice was issued following the signing of a legal agreement relating to education contributions and highway works. Condition 16 restricted development to no more than 500 dwellings unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

9. An application to vary conditions 2 and 3 of S/0682/95/O, which relate to the timescales for the submission of details and the commencement of development, was submitted under reference S/1268/02/F but is currently being held in abeyance at the applicant's request.
10. S/1762/03/RM – 91 dwellings and ancillary works (Phase 1) – approved 22.12.03.
11. An appeal against a refusal to vary condition 16 of the Outline Planning Consent S/0682/95/O to allow the construction of more than 500 dwellings is pending. Public Inquiry has been arranged for 5th October 2004.
12. S/0246/04/RM – Duplicate application for 200 dwellings (Phase 2) – Appeal pending against non-determination.
13. S/0625/04/RM – Reserved Matters application for the construction of on-site roads and sewers (Phase 2) – In progress.
14. S/0845/04/RM and S/1429/04/RM – Duplicate Reserved Matters applications for 103 dwellings on part Phase 3 – In progress.
15. S/1379/04/F and S/1864/04/F – Applications for balancing pond and scheme of ditch widening to serve development approved by virtue of outline planning permission S/0682/95/O – In progress.

Planning Policy

16. The site forms part of the 21 hectare area of land allocated for some 500 dwellings on land north of Over in South Cambridgeshire Local Plan: 2004 **Policy HG5**.
17. The principles of development are encapsulated in **Policy Longstanton 1** of the Local Plan 2004. The supporting text at Paragraph 67.17 states:

”The District Council has granted outline planning permission for residential, employment and recreation uses, which includes the provision of a development related bypass. The bypass between Hatton Road, Over Road and Station Road would provide access to Over or Willingham and onto Fenland without passing through the village. The District Council considers that the provision of the bypass is crucial for the village and therefore allocated a larger area for a housing estate than would otherwise be appropriate. In this instance there is no requirement for affordable housing as set out in **Policy HG7** because of the need to ensure the provision of the bypass and other community facilities such as a village green, shop and surgery”.
18. Longstanton is defined as a Group Village in South Cambridgeshire Local Plan: 2004 (**Policy SE4**).
19. Structure Plan 2003 **Policy P1/3** requires all new developments to incorporate high standards of sustainability and design and to provide a sense of place which:

- “responds to the local character of the built environment;
 - is integrated with adjoining landscapes;
 - creates distinctive skylines, focal points, and landmarks;
 - includes variety and surprise within a unified design;
 - includes streets, squares and other public spaces with a defined sense of enclosure;
 - includes attractive green spaces and corridors for recreation and biodiversity;
 - conserves important environmental assets of the site;
 - pays attention to the detail of forms, massing, textures, colours and landscaping.”
20. Structure Plan 2003 **Policy P5/3** states that densities of less than 30 dwellings per hectare will not be acceptable “Local Planning Authorities should seek to maximise the use of land by applying the highest density possible which is compatible with maintaining local character”.
21. Local Plan 2004 **Policy HG10** states that residential developments will be required to contain a mix of units providing accommodation in a range of types, sizes (including 1 and 2 bedroom dwellings) and affordability, making the best use of the site and promoting a sense of community which reflects local needs. It also states that the design and layout of the scheme should be informed by the wider character and context of the local townscape and landscape and schemes should achieve high quality design and distinctiveness, avoiding inflexible standards and promoting energy efficiency.
22. Local Plan: 2004 **Policy TP1** states that the Council will seek to promote more sustainable transport choices and one of the ways this can be achieved is restricting car parking for residential developments to a maximum of an average of 1 ½ spaces per dwelling with a maximum of 2 spaces for 3+ bedroom dwellings in poorly accessible areas.
23. A development brief for the Home Farm site, covering matters such as development aims, design philosophy, scale of development, built form (advocating a series of townscape zones including greenways, village lanes, village streets and hamlets), architectural form and open space was adopted by the Council as Supplementary Planning Guidance in 1998. Whilst design guidance has evolved since this brief was adopted, many of the principles contained within the brief remain relevant.
24. Government’s **Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 3**, “Housing” (March 2000) aims to avoid developments which make inefficient use of land (those of less than 30 dwellings per hectare). In terms of village expansion, development should be designed sympathetically and laid out in keeping with the character of the village. Design and layout should be informed by the wider context, having regard to the townscape and landscape of the wider locality.

Consultation

25. **Longstanton Parish Council** recommends refusal for the following reasons:
- ”The Outline Consent for the total Home Farms development is for 500 Homes. Consent has already been granted for 91 homes on the Phase 1 site (2.995 Ha). The

Phase 2 site is 6.545 Ha. That means that this development will be at a higher density than Phase 1, although it has always been stressed by SCDC Officers that the density of Phase 2 would be below that of Phase 1 (and the density of Phase 3 would be below that of Phase 2). The Parish Council considers that 160 would be a more appropriate figure than the currently proposed 200. If you examine the table below, you will see how the densities work out:

Phase	Area (Ha)	# of Homes	Density
Phase 1	2.995	91	30.4
Phase 2 (200 homes)	6.545	200	30.6
Phase 3 (Phase 2 = 200)	11.5	209	18.2
Phase 2 (160 homes)	6.545	160	24.5
Phase 3 (Phase 2 – 160)	11.5	249	21.7

26. Committee Members can see for themselves that if the current application is accepted then Phase 3 will almost certainly be submitted for substantially more than 209 homes. The Parish Council is completely opposed to any increase in the total Home Farms development beyond the agreed 500. Even this number represents an increase of over 70% in the size of our community. One of the biggest problems with this development remains its background. Originally there was only going to be one developer (Beazers). Now we have already had 3 or 4. That is causing major difficulties on two fronts:

- Enforcement of Section 106 and Planning Conditions, and
- A fair allocation of houses to land. There is a serious risk of “devil take the hindmost” with Phases 1 and 2 grabbing far more housing than would have happened under one contractor, leaving Phase 3 uneconomic. Local Plan **Policy H15**, adopted by South Cambs DC, requires that “housing development on unallocated land in Rural Growth Settlements should be sympathetic to the character and amenities of the locality”. This Application would clearly fail to achieve that objective.

Carpenter’s submission makes frequent reference to PPG3 and the high densities it proposes. However, PPG3 also expects Affordable Housing. This application makes no mention of Affordable Housing. Outline Consent was granted for this development before the days of PPG3 and the only reason the development is as large as 500 homes is to fund the Longstanton Bypass. Increasing our community by 70% is surely quite enough.

27. Our specific objections can be summarised as:

- Density
The current density is incompatible with the rural location.
- Lack of amenities
The development needs more incidental open space.

- **Compromising Phase 3**
The proposal for 200 homes would clearly result in Phase 3 being a very unattractive proposition for any developer – unless its housing numbers were to be dramatically increased.
- **Sewage disposal**
Anglian Water has confirmed that they can accommodate the Phase 1 homes within their existing framework. We have received a letter from Anglian Water which quite clearly states that development beyond Phase 1 cannot be accommodated until they make a major upgrade to their sewage arrangements, which they are “considering” to do “in the next 2-3 years”. It is essential that this Phase 2 is not permitted to proceed until this upgrade is in place. Our village is still subject to raw sewage discharges because the existing sewage infrastructure is overloaded. Note also that clause 23(b) of the Planning Conditions requires written confirmation from AWSL that the sewage arrangements will be entirely adequate.
- **Storm water disposal**
The Parish Council fully endorses the concerns raised by Longstanton residents for Dry Homes in the letter from Ned Grace to David Rush dated 28th February.
- **Children's play area**
Though the plans incorporate LAPs, there is no provision for a LEAP play area for larger children. There needs to be a substantial such area in the Phase 2/3 Public Open Space.
- **Pedestrian crossings**
The extra traffic this development will generate will require additional pedestrian crossings on affected roads, i.e. Over Road, High Street.
- **Longstanton Bypass**
Clause 17 of the SCDC Planning Permission Conditions document S/0682/95/O makes clear that the interim bypass must be completed before 100 homes are built on the total Home Farms site. However, 91 homes have already been approved for Phase 1 and the assumption has to be that these will be built before the Phase 2 homes.

It is ridiculous to assume that when only 9 homes have been completed the initial Bypass will be constructed. Unless SCDC asserts itself, we will end up in the kind of situation that has happened with several other developers recently, in which the terms of these agreements are ignored by developers. The only way in which the D&CC Committee can ensure that this clause is adhered to is to make it a condition that the Phase 1 Bypass must be completed before Phase 2 development commences.”

28. **Swavesey Parish Council** “raises the following objections and concerns to this application, which are in line with objections and concerns raised over previous applications for development at Home Farm:

- Local sewage system – additional pressure from increased development will be put onto the local sewage system, which is currently believed to be at capacity.
- Flood assessment report should be carried out to assess the future flood risk to the surrounding area resulting from the proposed development. In the light of recent flood events around Swavesey, concern over future flood risk is high.

- Further development in this area will lead to an increase in traffic levels along Ramper Road, Swavesey. This road is currently deteriorating rapidly and cannot cope with further increased traffic use and is becoming increasingly dangerous for use by cyclists and horse riders. Improvements to Ramper Road are urgently required if this housing development is to be approved.”
29. **Willingham Parish Council** “unanimously resolved to recommend refusal unless a bypass for Willingham is constructed in advance of the development.
30. **Bar Hill Parish Council** recommends approval.
31. **Environment Agency** has no objections from the Land Drainage/Flood Defence point of view. It states that the submitted plans and associated documentation satisfactorily demonstrates to the Agency that the development proposals are in line with the agreed drainage strategy. The agreed strategy involves certain channel modifications to the local watercourses to allow additional capacity within the receiving system and the construction of a balancing pond downstream. Details are the subject of current applications (see Paragraph 15 above).
32. **Middle Level Commissioners** comment: “The Commissioners, on the Board’s behalf, have recently concluded negotiations with the applicant’s consultant and the Environment Agency to ensure that the Home Farm development does not detrimentally affect the Board’s area. As a result, planning application S/1379/04/F, has recently been submitted by Persimmon Homes (East Midlands) Ltd for a balancing pond and associated drainworks. Provided that these works are constructed before the site is developed, and as agreed and shown on the drawings, we have no objection to the amended plan.”
33. **Anglian Water** has no objections to raise in principle but requests that a condition requiring the submission of details of foul and surface water drainage be imposed.
- Anglian Water also states that the current infrastructure can accommodate Phase 1 development but capacity will not exist for the remaining properties until improvements in the infrastructure have been completed. Anglian Water is currently working on a scheme.
34. **Local Highways Authority** comments in general:
- ”I am unable to fully assess the proposal unless/until the layout(s) are fully dimensioned to give carriageway, footway, footpath, cycle and verge widths together with junction, centre line and turning head radii. In addition, all junction and pedestrian visibility splays must be given. It would also be very helpful if all roads could be assigned numbers for ease of reference.
- The off-site footway adjacent to Over Road to be provided to link with that associated with the Phase 1 junction should be clearly identified on the layout plan(s).
- Where is the pedestrian/cycle permeability to Phase 3? I note that links are shown to the open space but how are direct links to Phase 3 going to be achieved?”
35. More specific comments are raised by the Local Highways Authority aimed at achieving a less engineered approach, reducing the distance for vehicles having to reverse in front of Plots 19 and 27 (Wimpey) and ensuring visibility is not compromised by tree planting. The LHA has been involved in a meeting with the

applicants to discuss highways issues but has not commented on the amended drawings, which do incorporate full dimensions.

36. **Highways Agency** has no comments.
37. **The Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service** asks that adequate provision is made for fire hydrants by way of Section 106 agreement or condition.
38. **Transco** confirms that it has plant in the vicinity which may be affected by the proposal. It also states that gas pipelines owned by other gas transporters, and privately owned, may also be present in this area.
39. **Network Rail** states that it has no comment.
40. **Cambridge Water Company** has no objections and is able to make water available to the whole of the proposed development by reinforcing the local mains network. The Developers have been made aware of the likely costs.
41. **County Council's Definitive Map Officer (DMO)** has discussed with the applicants improvements of Public Footpath No. 3 necessitated by the Development specifically in regard to surfacing in the central open space to the north, replacement bridge where the path joins the open space and a link between the open space westwards to the new public bridleway/leisure walk.
42. The DMO is disappointed that the applicant has decided not to create a public link from Phase 2's recreation area alongside the drain to Phase 1 (northeast site boundary). This may be a "lost way". It would make good use of an existing natural feature and would pre-empt the public's acquisition of a right of way through prescription.
43. It is also regretful that a public footpath link from the access to Phase 2 along Over Road to link with Public Footpath No. 2 Longstanton has not been proposed. This would have fulfilled the duties under the Countryside & Rights of Way Act 2000 and the environmental policies of the Structure Plan to improve the rights of way network by providing a safe link between existing rights of way facilitating better access to both community facilities and the countryside.
44. **Chief Environmental Health Officer** has no objections.
45. **Police Architectural Liaison Officer** is concerned that several parking courts are still too large, in some cases parking is remote from the dwellings served, the number of pedestrian/cycle routes on the south east boundary is at five, too great with adjoining parking being vulnerable and there being cases of adjoining parking courts. These are all issues which can create an environment in which crime, particularly against vehicles, can grow.
46. In 'Home Zone' areas and elsewhere, such as on the boundary of the development, there are many cases where dwelling elevations do not benefit from clearly identifiable private/defensible space, thereby raising the risk of damage as in the form of graffiti or disputes between occupiers and others immediately outside their dwellings."
47. In earlier comments he recommended that parking courts should be small, serving a maximum of six dwellings, with spaces close to and within natural supervision of the dwellings they serve.

48. **Council's Lands Drainage Manager** comments that:

"Under Council's Land Drainage Byelaws the following applies:

1. No excavating, hedging, fencing, buildings or other obstructions will be allowed within 5 metres of Council's Award Drain.
2. Maintenance contribution will be required from developer to cover ease of enhanced maintenance work to Award Drain."

49. **Sustrans** recommends that a cycling/walking link be added to the north west towards Over and to enable local children to get to Swavesey Village College. Concern is also expressed that the links between Phases 1 and 2 appear to be poor – staggered junctions are not suitable for modern design and will create visibility problems.

50. **Ramblers Association** comments in respect of Public Footpath 3:

- (a) surface should not be unduly disturbed;
- (b) materials are not stored/dumped on it;
- (c) vehicles visiting the site should not impede the safe passage of pedestrians; and
- (d) any footpath signs are not obscured or removed during building works.

51. **English Nature** comments:

- (a) **Bats**
Section 1.1.4 of the Habitat Assessment Report refers to a bat survey being undertaken on trees along the Longstanton Drain and that these trees should be made safe and retained. If these trees are destined to be lost then the trees should be surveyed for bats in line with the statement in the landscape strategy.
- (b) **Water Voles**
We support the provision of a pre-construction water vole survey described in Section 1.1.8 of the Habitat Assessment Report.
- (c) **Badgers**
We support the provision of a pre-construction badger survey described in Section 1.1.9 of the Habitat Assessment Report.
- (d) **Birds**
Section 6.1.3 states "all hedges in the site are potential nesting habitat". We would wish to learn if any are being lost and if so how will they be removed without impinging on nesting birds. We request that a planning condition is used to prevent scrub and tree removal during the bird nesting season.
- (e) **Landscape Management Strategy**
We would wish to see the Landscape Management Strategy focus on how the scheme would create biodiversity gains and contribute to the targets in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Biodiversity Action Plan."

52. **The Council's Ecology Officer** comments:

"The design brief does not mention nature conservation. The Sustainability

Statement has little over five lines on biodiversity. Whilst I generally agree with the broad statement, the gardens will attract wildlife, in terms of sustainability the question should be “how is this development sustaining the present biodiversity?” The answer to this would then be ‘very poorly’ as there is not even an intention to provide bird or bat boxes. If every garden in ten was designed for wildlife a significant contribution would be made.

At present wildlife is being forced to adapt to gardens from an arable environment rather than being actively encouraged within the development.

Measures could include:

- erection of high quality species specific bird and bat boxes (i.e. for sparrows, robin and starlings);
- fence lifting to allow small mammals such as hedgehogs through the development in future;
- insect hibernation boxes adjacent to play areas;
- hedgehog boxes adjacent to boundary hedging.

Perhaps a show home could be planted as a wildlife garden to encourage biodiversity conservation.”

53. **The Council’s Strategic Development Officer** has commented in detail upon the applicant’s Sustainability Statement. These comments relate to climate change, energy efficiency, the need to refer to Building Research Establishment’s “A Sustainability Checklist for Developments”, the importance of renewables in new developments, possibility of car-sharing schemes and car clubs, creation of home zones (incorporated in amended scheme), sustainable urban drainage systems, locally sourced labour, verifiably sustainable materials and the on-site recording and monitoring of waste.
54. **The Council’s Landscape Design Officer** is concerned about practical space for planting and long-term retention, lack of mention of service locations, reduction in tree planting along Over Road, pressure on the hedge along Over Road and lack of details of fence/tree protection. Specific comments are made on particular drawings and inconsistencies between particular drawings.
55. **The Council’s General Works Manager** is reluctant to provide the collection service given the restricted access as originally proposed. Specifically:
1. “Will all the numbered lanes and roads be constructed:-
 - (a) to take 6 x 4 heavy goods vehicles with a minimum gross weight of 26 tonnes;
 - (b) using materials that will withstand tyre scrub; and
 - (c) so that the hammerheads will facilitate turning and reversing without the need to encroach on verges or footways bearing in mind not all residents will have off-street parking.
 2. Could you please confirm:-

- (a) every dwelling will be provided with suitable and approved storage facilities for a minimum of 2 wheeled bins and a 55 litre kerbside box;
- (b) that the construction of the dwellings facilitates waste collection from the front boundary of each property;
- (c) the purpose of the 'refuse collection points' as shown by blue stars; and
- (d) that every property can be driven passed or up to by a 26 tonnes GVW RCV. It would appear that this is not the case, some are served by a footpath only (from Over Road) and others by a lesser carriageway (between lane 2 and road 2. Also lane 1 from road 1 does not appear to be accessible). Areas that cannot be easily reached by vehicle will require a location for residents to take their containers for emptying without encroaching on other residents' land or amenity."

56. **The Council's Cultural Services Manager** has commented on issues relating to the discharge of conditions on the outline planning permission (Landscape Management Strategy, Neighbourhood equipped area for play (NEAP) on the recreation ground extension and locally equipped area for play (LEAP) on the central open space). These are not for consideration at this meeting.

57. Of relevance to this reserved matters application are her comments on the LAPs, as follows:

- (a) "LAPs 1 and 2 do not seem to provide the minimum NPFA space of 100 sq. m. plus 5m buffer zone. Please can these be extended? I am still not convinced that LAP 1 will properly serve the public as it will be very much linked to property 5 of that block.
- (b) The LAPs illustrated are too similar and should offer greater variety and a range of designs. They should incorporate a variety of grass and paved surfaces and include design features to stimulate play. There is currently very little paving shown. The boundaries of these areas should be marked by low level planting and not fencing. Fencing should only be used where absolutely essential for children's safety i.e. when LAP is adjacent to roads and planting is not sufficient to stop children running onto the road. This may be the case for the road side of LAP 4 and LAP 6, depending on the design.
- (c) Each LAP should have a bin and a bench capable of seating more than one person. Single seats are not appropriate.
- (d) The proposed earth mounds may be difficult to maintain. These should not be a feature of every LAP as currently illustrated – possibly in 1 LAP only. The footprint trails and wooden model animals are good in principle but other ideas are also needed to offer greater variety. Natural features may also be used e.g. a fallen tree.
- (e) These areas may well be used by adults as well as children. Appropriate signage will include reference to 'no dogs' and 'children playing'. Signs saying 'no adults unless accompanying children' are not appropriate.
- (f) A final point is that 2 of the LAPs appear to have electric sub stations next to them. (They are pretty close to houses also). In my experience these can be

quite noisy and will certainly detract from the attractiveness of these areas of POS. I expect the home owners close by will be badly affected also. Please can these be well surrounded by planting to help provide a noise buffer.”

58. **County Principal Archaeologist** comments:

”The site is located in an area of high archaeological potential to the west of the historic village of Longstanton. The site has been subject to an archaeological evaluation (Birmingham Archaeology, 2003) which revealed significant archaeological remains relating to the late Saxon and medieval settlement of the area. A programme of archaeological investigation has been commissioned by the applicant, in consultation with this office, intended to preserve these important archaeological remains by record and present the results of the investigation in an appropriate publication. The fieldwork is currently being undertaken by Birmingham Archaeology and is nearing completion.

We would consider it appropriate to secure the post excavation analysis and publication of these results by means of a suitable negative condition. However, once the fieldwork is complete to the satisfaction of this office, we will have no further objection to the commencement of development on this site.

I note that the area of public open space to the north of the Phase 2 housing area is included in the accompanying plan. No archaeological work has been undertaken in this area. Should any landscaping involve significant below ground disturbance this would need a separate scheme of archaeological investigation, which could be secured through the inclusion of a suitable negative condition in any planning consent.”

Representations

59. **The Longstanton Residents for Dry Homes** (LRDH) objects on the basis that the number of homes is not consistent with the capacity of the surface or foul drainage or with the outline consent. It would lead to an inevitable increase in the total number of houses.

60. LRDH comments further:

”Based on this (outline planning permission) and the approved Phase 1 plans, the densities would be as follows:

- Phase I: 3.1 Ha, approved for 91 homes (29.4 dph)
- Phase II: 6.4 Ha, applied for 200 homes (31.2 dph)
- Phase III: 11.5Ha, residual is 209 homes (18.2 dph)

Phase III would, therefore, be significantly below the densities for either Phase I or Phase II, making it financially unattractive. The result would be an inevitable push for an increase in housing density (probably for 350 homes rather than 209), citing current government targets rather than correctly referring to the targets in effect when the plan was agreed by SCDC and the village. LRDH would find this totally unacceptable and would expect SCDC opposition to be as fierce as was indicated recently with the proposed Cambourne extensions.

61. Given a 500-home limit to Home Farm, it is sensible to provide equal density for both Phases II and III (meaning 22.9 dph). This leads to 147 dwellings for Phase II and 262 dwellings for Phase III. We would, therefore, like to see no more than 147

homes approved for Phase II. Any approval beyond that can only be seen as an abandonment of the original outline consent. In that case, we would welcome Phases II and III to be reapplied for in totality rather than choosing to change only those parts of the outline plan that suit the developers.

62. We note Cofton's statement that any reduction in the size below 200 would be "contrary to Government Advice in PPG3." They further state that since the site has already been chosen, the PPG3 requirements that densities be sympathetic to the existing village are moot. They further include unconcealed threats to increase densities significantly by referring to precedents in which developers have appealed and ended up with more houses than they had at the beginning.
63. We find this approach insulting and an affront to the authority of the Council and the sensibilities of the affected village. In each precedent to which Ms Adcock refers, there was no initial agreed housing limit. S/0682/95/O, on the other hand, specifically limits both housing and residential area to 500 homes and 21 Ha respectively. There is no ambiguity in the plan, and it is a plan to which Cofton have subscribed by taking on Phase II. New legislative requirements can surely only apply to new applications, not ones to which outline consent has already been given."
64. Finally, LRDH considers that no approval should be issued which would create a sewage overload beyond Anglian Water's stated capacity. The necessary infrastructure must be in place.
65. **The Occupiers of four properties** in Longstanton object to the scheme on the following grounds:
 - It is stated that foul and surface water drainage will be channelled to existing outlets, but both these systems are already overloaded; existing brooks do not have the capacity to cope with further surface rainwater discharge;
 - Existing foul and surface water problems will be exacerbated by this development. Anglian Water knows full well that the existing foul drainage system in Longstanton is unable to cope yet still gives approval to the development;
 - There is no mention of continued use of the haul road for construction traffic, which would otherwise cause great problems along High Street and Over Road;
 - There should be no bridleway on Few Lane. Its surface is not suitable. Public footpath status should be retained;
 - The ditches and watercourses around the central open space would be a danger to children;
 - Open spaces should be managed long term by a Residents Association Committee;
 - Density of development is inconsistent with the outline planning permission (see Longstanton Parish Council's objections above);
 - To develop the site of the former farm buildings would be an asset to the village but the remainder is ill-conceived and fragmented; it will have no positive benefit to the village; and

- No provision is made for the storage of caravans, boats, trailers and horseboxes on site (draft Section 106 Agreement).

Planning Comments – Key Issues

66. The principle of erecting 500 dwellings on the Home Farm site has already been established by the grant of the outline permission. The permission allows for the phased development of the site, and includes conditions relating to the phasing of the residential development, business park, open spaces and the timing/thresholds for the provision of the necessary infrastructure and roads.
67. This reserved matters application provides details of the siting, design, means of access and landscaping to Phase 2 of the residential element of the development approved in 2000 (S/0682/95/O) only, and these are the matters to be considered.
68. It is also important for the Committee to reach a decision today to inform the Public Inquiry of the Council's case in respect of the appeal against non-determination of the duplicate application (see Paragraph 12 above).
69. The key issues are:
- (a) density and numbers;
 - (b) design and layout; and
 - (c) drainage.

Density

70. The density of development on the site is guided by:
- (a) the outline planning permission, condition 16;
 - (b) the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 **Policies SE4, HG5** and **'Longstanton 1'**;
 - (c) the adopted Development Brief for Home Farm;
 - (d) the approved Structure Plan **Policy P5/3**; and
 - (e) **PPG3**, Housing.
71. Condition 16 of the outline permission states that "Not more than 500 dwellings shall be constructed on the site unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority". This equates to approximately 24 dwellings to the hectare. The reason for condition 16 is "To ensure an appropriate balance is achieved between scale of development and the provision of essential services, infrastructure and the Longstanton Bypass". In his January 2002 report, the Local Plan Inspector recommended that Longstanton be downgraded from a Rural Growth Village to a Group Village in view of its relative poor level of sustainability. The District Council incorporated this change in its adopted Local Plan (**Policy SE4**).
72. Increasing the density to an average of 30 dwellings to the hectare throughout the site would result in a further 130 dwellings, whereas development in group villages is normally restricted to a maximum of 8 dwellings, although, exceptionally, a maximum of 15 dwellings may be approved if this would make the best use of a Brownfield site. The application was based on providing approximately 500 dwelling. To increase the density throughout at 30d/h would be clearly contrary to Policies SE4 and Longstanton 1 of the Local Plan.

73. Reserved Matters on Phase 1 have been approved at 29.3d/h. Phase 1 and proposed Phase 2 would leave a residue of some 209 (224 if **Policy SE4** is taken into account) dwellings on 11.5 hectares in Phase 3 at a density of 18.2 d/h (19.5 d/h). This, in my opinion, is unrealistic having regard to the Development Brief which, although envisages greater areas of lower density in the form of 'village lanes' and 'hamlets' in Phase 3, does incorporate higher density areas of 'village streets'.
74. Having regard to the outline planning permission Condition 16 and the adopted Development Brief's illustrative Master Plan, it is not, in my view, appropriate for the density of the whole of Phase 2 to exceed the approved density of Phase 1.
75. Clearly the approved Structure Plan **Policy P5/3** and **PPG3** advice would support the proposed density in the application were it not for the circumstances which led to the imposition of condition 16 on the outline planning permission.
76. The applicants have been consistently advised that, if the number of dwellings on the whole site is likely to exceed 500 (plus any margin allowed for by **Policy SE4** of the Local Plan), a new planning application should be submitted.
77. In my view, this reserved matter application should not be supported without a master plan for the whole of the site under the existing planning permission. The Master Plan should set out prospective densities in relation to land to be used for residential development. This would enable the Local Planning Authority to ensure the proper development of the whole of the site under the extant planning permission.
78. Alternatively, if a new planning application and master plan were to be submitted, the costs and benefits of any additional dwellings in terms of transport, education, open space and affordable housing obligations, together with impact upon infrastructure capacities, could be properly assessed and shared over the bulk of the remaining development. Such an application would also need to be considered in the context of Development Plan Policies (see above) or those appertaining at the time of determination of the application.

Design and Layout

79. The adopted Development Brief sets out a series of design principles to ensure the new development is appropriate in terms of scale and style. The illustrative Master Plan shows how these principles could be put into practice. This indicates that Phase 2 would contain an element of each townscape zone (greenways, village lanes, village streets, and hamlets) with these more informal, lower density areas located to the west, on the periphery of the site.
80. An assessment of the design and layout proposals of the amended scheme has been carried out by an experienced Design Architect. I quote below the general comments:
81. "The site itself is split into two zones separated by the main spine road. To the South and East is located the George Wimpey East Anglia Ltd development and to the North and West is the Kingsoak Homes Ltd development. The spine road forms the only access into the site and separates the two developers' proposals. The road pattern around the site is generally acceptable providing a number of styles and grades of roads and accesses. A number of footpaths are provided around and across the site which provide good permeability. Positions of buildings are generally well considered to provide overlooking of public open spaces and footpaths and vista

stops at important junctions, however, there does appear to be a lack of focal point buildings around the site (these are detailed in the assessment).

82. **General Comments**

- Pavement widths and road widths around the scheme should be varied in order to provide an informal arrangement and variation in streetscene;
- The implementation of semi-mature landscaping features should be considered in order to provide an established sense of place to focal areas within the site;
- The scheme would generally benefit from some further variation in street scenes by the introduction of some frontages tight to the back edge of the pavement and some further gables positioned on to the street;
- The detailing of front garden areas needs to be carefully considered along the tree lined spine road, the use of front walls and/or railings should be considered along with brick garden walls of varying heights around the scheme. It is important to recognise that the use of front boundary garden treatments of this type can act as a good device to break down the scale of the buildings behind whilst also providing defensible space to the dwellings themselves. The use of walling in particular allows pinch points to be created within streetscapes when positioned hard along the back edge of pavement or road edge.”

83. The assessment incorporates detailed comments and suggestions which are aimed to improve the quality of the scheme and to highlight weaknesses within it. There are also detailed comments on, and suggested improvements to, house types, particularly those in the Kingsoak Homes Ltd development. One house type is considered to be completely inappropriate. In two cases, building proportions need to be adjusted and one house type should be used in groupings of four. The remainder are considered to be generally acceptable subject to suggested elevational improvements.

84. Wimpey house types have been considered to be acceptable.

85. The above assessment, coupled with comments and concerns of the Council's Landscape Design Officer, does in my opinion, justify a reason for refusal in itself, having regard to the design philosophy of the Development Brief and the objectives of Policies P1/3 of the Structure Plan and HG10 of the Local Plan. Nevertheless, a copy of these relevant comments have been sent to the applicants, who “are willing to continue to discuss the proposals.”

Drainage

86. Conditions attached to the outline permission state that no development shall commence until a phased scheme of foul and surface water drainage has been approved by the Local Planning Authority and constructed. Discussions between the applicants and the relevant parties (Environment Agency, Council's Drainage Manager, Middle Level Commissioners and the Longstanton Residents for Dry Homes Group) have concluded in the agreement of surface water drainage strategy. This strategy does not impact upon the layout of this reserved matters application but is to be taken forward by virtue of the applications referred to in Paragraph 15 above.

87. Although the capacity does not yet exist in the foul water drainage system to cater for development in excess of some 100 dwellings, condition 23 of the outline planning

permission precludes further development commencing until the necessary improvements to the infrastructure have been completed.

88. All necessary conditions are already imposed on the outline planning permission. No further drainage-related conditions are necessary or appropriate at this reserved matters stage. Therefore, there is no reason to withhold approval of reserved matters on this ground alone.

Other Matters

89. A 'LEAP' is to be provided in the central open space. The design and layout of this is the subject of separate and continuing discussions under a condition of the outline planning permission.
90. The question of additional pedestrian crossings would need to be pursued separately from this reserved matters application. Any need would have to be balanced with the longer term reduction in vehicular traffic through the village when the development-related bypass is constructed.
91. Conditions of the outline planning permission already set out the timescales for the phased construction of the bypass. No further conditions are either necessary or relevant to this reserved matter application.
92. Any improvements to Ramper Road, between Longstanton and Swavesey are outside the scope of the consideration of this application.
93. The outline planning permission does not provide for a Willingham bypass. This application cannot be withheld for that reason.
94. Further consideration should be given to footway and footpath links, having regard to comments from the Local Highways Authority, the County Council's DMO and Sustrans. There is, however, to be a bridleway through the perimeter landscaping area.
95. Further improvements are necessary to implement the applicant's sustainability statement.
96. The applicants will be asked to respond to the Council's General Works Manager's comments, although the application is accompanied by a refuse collection layout.
97. Although the number of LAPs provide satisfactory coverage, their design appears to warrant further attention.
98. Condition 11 of the outline planning permission requires the haul road to be available for construction traffic.
99. I am not aware of any proposal to upgrade Public Footpath no. 3 on Fews Lane to a bridleway.
100. Defensible boundaries would be provided to the LEAP on the central open space.
101. A scheme of management of open spaces is required by virtue of Condition 8 of the outline planning permission.
102. The Section 106 Agreement makes no provision for the storage of caravans or other ancillary vehicles.

103. Finally, I have expressed reservations to the applicants regarding the mix of houses, particularly aiming to increase the proportion of one and two bedroom houses. However, given the lack of specific targets in the Local Plan and a favourable comparison with the approved mix in Phase 1 (16.5% 2-bedroom, 27.5% 3-bedroom, 55% 4-bedroom and 1% 5-bedroom), I do not consider that the application could be refused for that reason.

Recommendation

104. Having regard to all considerations, I conclude that this reserved matters application should be refused for the following reasons:
1. The proposed density at 31.25 dwellings per hectare, which exceeds the approved density of Phase 1 (29.3 d/h), would be contrary to the development principles of the Adopted Development Brief for Home Farm, would fail, in the absence of an appropriate master plan, to coherently implement the phased provision of 500 dwellings over the whole Home Farm site as required by the Outline Planning Permission, reference S/0682/95/0 dated October 2000 and would not reflect the character of the existing built environment; consequently the proposal would be contrary to Policies P1/3 of the Approved Structure Plan 2003 and HG5, HG10 and Longstanton 1 of the approved South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.
 2. The design and layout of the proposed development fails to achieve a sufficiently high standard of design and a sense of place as required by Policies P1/3 of the Structure Plan 2003 and HG10 of the Local Plan 2004 and by the adopted Longstanton Development Brief 1998.
105. That the Council's case at the forthcoming Public Inquiry against the non-determination of the duplicate reserved matters application, reference S/0246/04/RM, be based upon the above-mentioned objectives.

Background Papers:

Reserved Matters Applications File Refs S/0696/04/RM and S/0246/04/RM
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
Development Brief for Home Farm, Longstanton 1998

Contact Officer: David Rush – Development Control Quality Manager
Telephone: (01954) 3153

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	6 th October 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

S/1766/04/F - Meldreth
Change of Use of Land to Garden Land and Construction of Tennis Court at 36 North End for Mrs K Betts.

Recommendation: Refusal

Site and Proposal

1. The 0.05 hectare application site is located off North End, outside of the village framework and outside of the designated Conservation Area for Meldreth. The application site is located within the grounds of a Listed Building. The grounds, situated next to a moat are very rural in their setting and open to attached paddock land. There is paddock to the west of the dwelling house and there is a garden wall that runs south west from the rear of the house, separating the two uses of the land on this site.

The full planning application received 20th August 2004 is for the change of use of garden land and the construction of a tennis court with chain link fencing surrounds.

Planning History

2. None relevant to this application

Planning Policy

3. **Policy EN28** Development within the curtilage or setting of a Listed Building of the Local Plan requires proposals to be sympathetic to its surroundings.
4. Structure Plan 2003 **Policy P1/2** seeks environmental restriction on development in the countryside and designated areas.
5. Structure Plan 2003 **Policy P7/6** seeks to protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the historic built environment

Consultation

6. **Meldreth Parish Council** recommends approval stating that it has "*no objections to this proposal and considers that there would be no demonstrable harm to the community*"
7. **Conservation Manager** states the following:

"Having visited the site it is evident that the structure will only be visible from within the grounds. However the proposed 2.25m fencing and surface treatment will have a significant impact on the setting of the Listed Building group. In particular the erection of the fencing will:

- a) *screen the garden wall, which will form part of the Listed building group (curtilage structure)*
- b) *create an encroachment into the countryside outside the village framework.*
- c) *disrupt the visual relationship of the walled garden to the enclosing pastoral/paddock area by extending the domestic structures into the agricultural landscape*
- d) *introduce alien material into the pastoral landscape (i.e. the green tarmac and 2.25m green fencing)*
- e) *the excavation to create the court would potentially damage archaeological remains (although this might be mitigated by a watching brief)*

Therefore, I am of the opinion that the proposed development would detract from the setting of the Listed Building group and its important visual relationship with the paddock/pastoral area. The result would be to damage the 'well being' of the listed building and be consequently contrary to Policy EN28 of the Local Plan.

While I have considered potential methods of mitigating the impact of the structure (such as reducing the height of the central fence section and adopting less strident colours and screen planting) I am not satisfied that these could temper the impact of the structure on the listed group. I consequently suggest that the application should be refused."

Representations

8. None received

Planning Comments – Key Issues

9. The Key Issue for this application is the effect the development will have on the surrounding Listed Buildings.
10. **Listed Buildings** – The development is proposed to be located on the outside of the garden wall that runs southwest from the rear of the dwelling house. The land at present is not used as garden land and is separate from the existing garden space. The wall divides the land uses significantly. To the west of the wall is paddock land, predominately surrounded by young and mature trees and a rear view of 34 North End. The setting is predominately rural and the introduction of the proposed materials would be detrimental to the setting of this group of buildings and its surrounding countryside. In my view the tennis court with its associated fencing and activity would introduce an urbanising and harsh feature in this pastoral landscape which would be completely out of keeping with its surroundings. It would represent an extension of development into this area of unspoilt countryside, which would have a harmful impact on the character of the surrounding listed buildings. Whilst it is appreciated that it may be possible to mitigate the appearance of the development to some degree, in my view it would not be possible to satisfactorily assimilate a development of this scale and type within this sensitive setting.

Recommendation

11. Refuse

The construction of the tennis court and the surrounding fencing will intrude in the countryside and detract from the character of the surrounding listed buildings; consequently the proposal will be contrary to Policy EN28 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 and Policy P1/2 and P7/6 of the Cambridge and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003, which aim to protect the character and setting of Listed Buildings and the rural character of the countryside.

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

- Planning File reference S/1766/04/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 6th October 2004
AUTHOR/S: Director of Development Services

**S/1770/04/F - Milton
Youth Building at Recreation Ground, The Sycamores
for Milton Parish Council**

Recommendation: Approval

Site and Proposal

1. The Sycamores Recreation Ground is located on the western edge of the village, with the residential area of The Sycamores to the north and east, Tesco's to the southeast, the A10 to the west and Cambridge Road to the south. In the northeast part of the ground there is a vehicular access from The Sycamores. This leads to a gravel car park beyond which is a brick built sports pavilion serving the Milton Cricket and Football Clubs. To the northwest of this building is a temporary portacabin structure accommodating a youth club. This is metal clad, single storey with a flat roof and is somewhat 'tired' in appearance. The ground is well screened from The Sycamores by a mature hawthorn hedge to the road frontage and landscaped banks screen it from the surrounding roads.
2. This full planning application, received on the 15th October 2004 proposes to replace the existing portacabin with a permanent building on the same siting. This will measure 14.5 metres by 9.3 metres with a pitched, gabled roof constructed with pvc coated box profile steel sheets with a grey finish. The bricks will match the existing sports facility. All windows and doors are to be fitted with metal roller shutters for security.

Planning History

3. Planning application ref: **S/0587/00/F** gave permission for a portable building for youth activities, limited to a time period of three years. This permission was renewed under planning application ref: **S/0859/03/F** for a further temporary period until 30th June 2006, with a condition that the building be removed at the end of this period.

Planning Policy

4. **Policy SE10 'Protected Village Amenity Areas'** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 ("Local plan") identifies areas of undeveloped land that are important to the character, amenity and/or functioning of the village as a whole. Development of such areas will only be permitted where it would not be harmful to the distinctive qualities and functioning lying behind their inclusion. (The Recreation Ground is defined as such.)
5. **Policy CS13 'Community Safety'** of the Local Plan states that for development that might provide opportunities for crime, the Council will give appropriate consideration to design and layout to minimise such opportunities and the circumstances where the fear of crime would be increased.

6. **Policy RT1 ‘Recreation and Tourism Development’** of the Local Plan sets out considerations to be made in determining applications for recreation facilities, including the need for such facilities and the benefits they might accrue.
7. **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

8. **Milton Parish Council** recommended approval
9. **Chief Environmental Health Officer** – no significant Environmental Health impacts.
10. **Police Architectural Liaison Officer** – comments will be reported verbally.

Representations

11. Residents of 47 The Sycamores object to the proposals on grounds that youths frequently gather outside of the building and cause disturbance, including to traffic due to youths running in the road and through intimidating behaviour. The car park has been used by people from other areas of Cambridge to park and play loud music. When residents approach and ask the youths to stop they have been met with verbal abuse. The youth supervisor is unable to police the numbers using the club. Before changes to the car park were introduced, they reported frequent incidents of noise and criminal behaviour to the police. These have lessened but continue to occur sporadically, particularly as the Community Police Officer has been reallocated. They tolerate disturbance and excess car parking when the cricket and football teams use the area but are very concerned about the potential use of the site, particularly in the evenings.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

12. The key issue to consider in respect of this application are the opportunities for crime and whether the fear of crime would increase as a result of these proposals.

Community Safety: Crime

13. Policy CS13 requires consideration to be given to design and layout of proposals, including footpaths, public open spaces, landscaping, lighting and natural surveillance in order to minimise opportunities and the fear of crime.
14. The building itself has been designed so that when not in use it is as secure as possible. Shutters to protect windows and doors are proposed. The building will replace the existing portacabin and in providing a purpose built building, it is likely that there will be an increased ‘ownership’ of the facility by local users that will, in turn, reduce the likelihood of related crime. It does not introduce a new use to the site.
15. The layout of the site and landscaping provides few opportunities for surveillance from surrounding residential properties due to the hedge and landscaping to the boundaries. The vehicular access to the site is not gated, so cars can access the car park at all times. The comments received from local residents indicate that problems relate to youths outside the building. The presence of the youth club on the site does

not necessarily mean that it is the cause of these congregations of youths. If the building were not there it is probable that youths would still congregate and would be totally unsupervised, outside and potentially are more likely to cause problems. Youths using the building are more likely to walk, cycle or be dropped off at the site than they are to drive there themselves. The site is a public area with unlimited public access. It is difficult to argue that the reported problems are the result of the existing facility.

Recommendation

16. In light of the above considerations and subject to no objections or concerns being raised by the Police Architectural Liaison Officer, approval is recommended, subject to the following conditions:
1. Standard Condition A – Time limited permission (Reason A);
 2. Sc5a – Details of materials for external walls. (Rc5aii);
- + any conditions required by the Police Architectural Liaison Officer.

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:** SE10 'Protected Village Amenity Areas', CS13 'Community Safety' and RT1 'Recreation and Tourism 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:
 - Community safety (crime).
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/1770/04/F

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

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	6 th October 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

**S/1032/04/F - Papworth Everard
Formation of Car Park, Papworth Hospital for Papworth Hospital NHS Trust.**

Recommendation: Approval

Site and Proposal

1. The application site is a vacant area of landscaped ground area 0.12ha. It is situated adjacent to an existing hospital car park to the south of the hospital complex. The site is bounded on three sides by mature trees and shrubbery. There is a single Holly tree within the site approximately 6 metres in height. A line of saplings has been planted in the verge between the existing car park and the application site. There is vehicular access from the existing car park.
2. The application, registered 18 May 2004, proposes an extension to the car park to form a further 35 spaces. The line of saplings is to be moved approximately 5m to afford more parking space within the site. An amended plan received 15th September 2004 indicates that the Holly is to be replanted within a landscape strip, or a similar replacement specimen planted. The car park is to be provided with additional lighting on 6m high standards and low level bollard lights.

Planning History

3. Planning permission for the existing car park was granted in 1998 (S/1560/98/F).

Planning Policy

4. South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 – **Policy EN5** (Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows): the District Council will require trees, hedges and woodland and other natural features to be retained wherever possible in proposals for new development.

Consultation

5. **Papworth Everard Parish Council** – recommends refusal of the application. The Council does not object to the principle of the car park being built, but is concerned about the likely loss of the Holly tree, which it believes not to be correctly plotted on the layout plan. It also is concerned that not all of the saplings will be retained if the car park is constructed as shown. Comments on the amended scheme will be reported orally
6. **Trees and Landscape Officer** – Provided that the car park is constructed using a ‘no dig’ method, and trees protected during construction, the Trees and Landscape Officer has no objection to the proposal. He does not consider the Holly tree to be a good specimen and is not opposed to its removal.
7. **English Heritage** - no objection.
8. **Local Highway Authority** – no objection.

Representations

9. None received.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

10. The main issue concerns the landscaping of the car park. The site is enclosed by mature trees and hedgerows which will be retained. However, the site is exposed on the eastern boundary with the existing car park. The agent has confirmed that because the saplings are to be transplanted, none will be lost. Also, the Holly will be transplanted or replaced, notwithstanding its poor quality as indicated by the Trees and Landscape Officer. I am satisfied that the concerns of the Parish Council are unfounded in this case and that, subject to suitable conditions, the development is acceptable.

Recommendation

11. Approval
 1. Standard Condition A – Time limited permission (Reason A);
 2. The car park shall be constructed using a ‘no dig’ method in accordance with the Arboricultural Advisory Service document APN1. (Reason - To avoid root disturbance);
 3. Landscaping shall be carried out in accordance with the scheme shown upon layout drawing no. 04523 (0-) 01.dwg rev P2 or otherwise to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority (Reason – In the interests of the appearance of h site.)
 4. SC52 – Implementation of landscaping (Rc52);
 5. SC56 – Protection of trees during construction (RC56).

Reasons for Approval

1. The approved development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004: Policy EN5** (Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows);
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:
 - Highway safety
 - Visual impact on the locality
 - Retention of existing natural features
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 application S/1032/04/F: South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.

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

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	6 th October 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

S/0771/04/F - Sawston**Change of Use of Agricultural Buildings to Hostel Accommodation for Agricultural Workers and Ancillary Office Accommodation Together with Erection of Covered External Area and Use of Existing Bungalow as Warden Accommodation at Dernford Farm, Stapleford****Recommendation: Approval**

Members of Committee will visit the site on Monday 4th October 2004.

Site and Proposal

1. The application site is a 0.8 hectare parcel of land sited between the villages of Stapleford and Sawston and on the west side of the A1301. The site comprises a range of timber and render agricultural buildings together with a brick bungalow. Beyond the western boundary of the site is a detached farmhouse. The site is accessed via an approximately 450 metre long unmade track.
2. The full application, submitted on 14th April 2004 and amended on 26th May, 23rd June and 5th July 2004, proposes to convert four agricultural buildings in order to provide hostel accommodation for up to 50 agricultural workers and ancillary offices.
3. A supporting statement submitted with the application states that the farm workers are employed by Watson Agricultural Ltd, a Cambridge based company supplying temporary and seasonal staff to local farmers and other agricultural businesses across the region. The company recruits, trains, supervises and provides accommodation for these workers, a service that the farms themselves would find uneconomical due to the seasonal nature of the work. There is a growing shortage of people willing to do this kind of work and at least 95% of staff are foreign students and backpackers looking for temporary work. The need for accommodation for these essential workers is not satisfactorily met by current methods. At present, workers are accommodated in shared houses rented by the Company predominantly in Cambridge but this has drawbacks of high rents together with a need to make many car journeys in and out of Cambridge every day to get to the farms.
4. The accommodation will be inhabited on a seasonal basis in evenings and weekends. Workers will be driven to sites in a fleet of fifteen 12 and 6 seater vehicles owned by the applicant. Dernford Farm is ideally situated with easy access to the M11, A11 and A14 – the proposal would therefore not add to congestion in surrounding towns. Public transport and cycles will be used for personal trips outside working hours. It is claimed that Dernford Farm is within walking distance of basic local amenities. Sustainability is a key aspect of the scheme with emphasis on providing enough amenities to achieve a self-contained and self-sufficient site (eg – kitchen and social areas). The accommodation of workers in one place enables the use of larger and fewer vehicles. Farmworkers will not be permitted use of private vehicles.

There would be a full time warden on site accommodated in the bungalow on the north side of the farm buildings together with two additional staff working in the office.

5. Proposed materials draw upon the existing vernacular of the farm buildings. Proposed rooflights sit within the pitch of the roof or form part of the system and profile of the corrugated roofing. The layout of the buildings would allow for the communal area to be furthest from neighbouring properties.
6. Figures comparing anticipated traffic movements with the level of movements associated with the previous use of the buildings have been submitted as has a plan showing the location of farms that the hostel would serve.

Planning History

7. **S/1020/85/F** – Application to change use of part of farm building [building A of the current application] to office refused on the grounds of intensification and consolidation of a commercial activity in the countryside and Green Belt. The application was allowed at appeal subject to a condition restricting the use to a connection with agricultural research/field trials.
8. **S/0344/91/F** – Consent granted for alterations to and use of barn as office and w. c – this application relates to Building A of the current application. A condition of the consent restricts the use of the office to connection with agricultural research/field trials.
9. **S/0812/96/F** – Application to change the use of agricultural barn to B1(b) use approved – this relates to Building A of the current application.
10. **S/0568/99/F** – Consent granted for change of use and extensions to the agricultural buildings to extend existing crop protection trials base.
11. All the above applications were submitted by Cyanamid, a company carrying out trials of agricultural chemicals.
12. **S/1669/02/F** – Application for extraction of sand and gravel in connection with construction of an agricultural reservoir on land to north-west of the site submitted to the County Council. The application has been approved at the County Council's Committee subject to resolving archaeological matters and to the signing of a Section 106 Agreement. The plans show the construction of a temporary access in a position to the south-east of the access serving the application site.

Planning Policy

13. The site lies within the Green Belt and countryside. **Policy P1/2** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 states that development will be restricted in the countryside unless proposals can be demonstrated to be essential in a particular rural location.
14. **Policy P1/3** of the Structure Plan states that a high standard of design and sustainability will be required for all new development which minimises the need to travel and reduces car dependency. In addition development is expected to provide a sense of place which responds to the local character of the built environment.

15. **Policy GB2** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 states that planning permission will not be granted for inappropriate development in the Green Belt unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated. Development is defined as 'inappropriate' unless it comprises (in part):

- Buildings for agriculture or forestry;
- The re-use of buildings provided that (a) the development does not result in a materially greater impact on the openness and purpose of the Green Belt; (b) strict control is exercised over any proposed extensions and associated uses of surrounding land; (c) the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction and capable of conversion without major or complete reconstruction; and (d) the form, bulk and general design of the buildings are in keeping with their surroundings.

Consultation

16. **Sawston Parish Council** objects to the application stating:

"This is residential building within the Green Belt which goes against the Local Plan. This is at the narrowest strip of Green Belt around Cambridge. There will be immense traffic problems with access and egress onto the busy A1301 at a very dangerous junction. The access/egress crosses a cycle-way used by pupils at Sawston Village College and others. There is a footpath which crosses the proposed site and will be covered by the patio of the building. This will cause light pollution through the roof panels onto flat open countryside and the whole proposed development will cause disturbance to the two adjacent properties. The Parish Council would like to request a site visit to this property".

17. **Stapleford Parish Council** objects to the application stating:

"Inadequate accommodation for 41 people, 10 double bunked rooms being applied for. Significant noise nuisance to neighbours both early morning traffic leaving site and number of people living on site. This is an unacceptable change of use. A hostel close to houses is an unacceptable use of these premises. This number of people would impact on neighbours to an unacceptable degree. The increase of traffic together with the lorries to and from the gravel extraction would impact on the lives of the neighbours to a large extent".

18. **Great Shelford Parish Council** objects to the application:

"This proposal is contrary to policies for development and employment within the green belt in that these seek to reduce the need to travel by locating labour close to sources of employment and permit the conversion of agricultural buildings where they would provide local employment. This proposal does neither; it involves transporting workers considerable distances to their work and does not provide local employment. The workers themselves would be remote from local services and it would seem a far more appropriate location could be found nearer to services and to their work. In addition the proposal will cause considerable disturbance to the residents of Dernford House and Bridge End Cottage".

19. **The Local Highways Authority** comments that the upper daily traffic figure of 71 given for the existing use is generous and that daily traffic movements are likely to be no greater than 22-25. If the transport for all workers was definitely secured by minibus then it would be difficult for an objection from the highway point of view to be

sustained because the trips would be only some 12 per day. If the minimum number of cars were used, the trips would increase to some 30 per day. This in addition to the traffic already associated with the leased buildings would result in an intensification of use of the access and, on this basis, it is recommended that the proposal be refused.

20. **The Chief Environmental Health Officer** expresses concern about potential noise from the social area of the accommodation and the early morning movements of vehicles. Cars and vans involved with the early morning transport of workers should be parked immediately adjacent to the new 2 metre high brick wall and vehicles should be started, loaded with passengers and driven directly off site from this location. This will help to reduce vehicle noise disturbance to the adjacent house. Also, a condition should be applied to any planning consent requiring the building to be acoustically insulated in accordance with a scheme to be agreed in writing beforehand.
21. **The County Archaeologist** states that the site lies in an area of archaeological potential and it is considered likely that archaeological deposits may survive on the site. It is recommended that the site be subject to a programme of archaeological investigation which can be secured by way of condition.
22. **The Environment Agency** states that the application does not consider sufficiently issues of surface water drainage and pollution control and appropriate conditions should therefore be applied to any planning consent.
23. **The County Footpaths Officer** raises no objections to the development. Public Footpath No. 2 Sawston runs through the yard and adjacent to the proposed site. It is stressed that the footpath must remain open and unobstructed at all times from building materials and vehicles, that the surface of the footpath must not be altered without the consent of the County Council and that lawful authority is required for vehicles to drive over the footpath.
24. The comments of the **Building Inspector** in respect of the potential for converting the buildings and their suitability for use as accommodation are awaited and will be reported verbally at the Committee meeting.

Representations

25. Letters of objection have been received from 7 local residents, Dernford House, River Cottage, Dernford Mill House, Bridge End Cottage, Little America Farm Bungalow, Barns Farm and Stapleford Grange. The main points raised are:
 - The public footpath is incorrectly shown on the submitted plans. It in fact runs immediately in front of the proposed accommodation;
 - Security implications for nearby residents due to isolated nature of local houses, poor lighting and absence of local police presence;
 - The proposal will devalue property in the area;
 - The proposal would increase traffic from Dernford Farm Lane onto the A1301. This road junction is very hazardous. The recent approval of construction of a gravel pit with large numbers of heavy lorries using the junction will increase the risk of accidents at a point where a cycle/footpath used by schoolchildren from Sawston Village College crosses the road;

- There is no need to accommodate agricultural workers in this location. It would be more appropriate to house them in temporary accommodation on the farms where they are needed;
 - The applicant company is registered under general business services and not agricultural services. This is therefore not agricultural development;
 - The development will place unacceptable pressure on local water and sewage facilities and threaten the local ecology;
 - Activities in the early hours of the morning when people are driven to work and throughout the evening when there will be little to occupy the workers due to lack of local facilities and amenities would result in serious noise disturbance to the immediate neighbour;
 - The problem of noise disturbance will be compounded by the fact that workers will not be permitted their own transport and will therefore be restricted to the immediate area every evening and weekend;
 - The lane is narrow and potholed and unsuited to the increase in traffic likely to be generated by the proposed use;
 - This proposed change of use will alter the character of this Green Belt area;
 - The buildings are not suitable for conversion particularly for human habitation. A report from a structural engineer on the existing condition of the buildings should be required;
 - Could the buildings be occupied by non-agricultural workers?;
 - The site should be better related to social and other facilities.
26. 3 letters of support have been received from the NFU, Trumpington Farm Company and Dalham Estates. The main points raised are:
- The accommodation is necessary for seasonal agricultural workers in the area;
 - The re-use and adaptation of existing rural buildings has an important role in meeting the needs of rural areas;
 - The project fits in very well with the current needs of modern agriculture. Farming in this area is highly mechanised but people are still needed to harvest the crops.
- With local employment levels at 95%-98%, there is a labour crisis in the countryside to perform short term and seasonal tasks on the farm;
- The proposed location is ideal – a rural location to provide a base for rurally located jobs. It is also a good use of buildings which would otherwise be redundant;
 - Trumpington Farm Company has used the services of the applicant (Watson Agricultural Ltd) for 24 years. For farmers employing overseas labour, it is

essential to have a supply of seasonal labour without the administrative problems associated with employing the labour directly;

- Transport to and from farms is an ever increasing cost;
- A properly managed and run hostel would greatly benefit the workers and make the movement of staff around the various farms more efficient;
- Watsons is a well established company and has been trading for 24 years supplying good reliable staff.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

27. The key issues to consider in the determination of this application are:
- The principle of the use of the buildings for the purposes proposed;
 - The impact of the development upon the character of the countryside and upon the openness of the Green Belt;
 - Neighbour impact;
 - Highway safety;
 - Effect on the public footpath;
28. The re-use of redundant agricultural buildings is considered within Policy GB2 of the Local Plan to be appropriate development in the Green Belt providing the buildings are capable of being converted without major reconstruction and providing development would not materially affect the openness of the Green Belt. Although the proposal involves the conversion of the existing buildings, doubts have been raised about their suitability for conversion within letters of objection. As such, this Authority's Building Inspector has been asked to clarify whether they are capable of being converted and, in particular, whether they can be used as accommodation without requiring reconstruction. It should be noted, however, that the buildings do have consent to be used for office and research uses in association with the testing of agrochemicals and this use was carried out on the site between the 1980's and 2002.
29. The proposed change of use, although providing residential accommodation unassociated with the needs of Dernford Farm itself, does seek to serve the needs of farms in the Cambridge Region. A list of in excess of 70 farms served by the applicant's business together with a map showing the location of these farms has been submitted as part of the application. This shows that the site is centrally located and well related to the businesses it serves. In bringing all employees together on one site thereby enabling the use of fewer larger vehicles, I consider the hostel to be a more sustainable option, in terms of minimising the need for vehicular movements, than the situation that presently exists (ie – employees are scattered about town in rented houses). I consider the accommodation of agricultural workers to be an acceptable use in a rural area although should Members be minded to grant consent for the scheme, I would suggest that a condition be applied restricting the use of the barns to agricultural workers only.
30. With regards to the impact of the development upon the character of the countryside and the openness of the Green Belt, the proposal does seek to create a number of

new openings in all the buildings, particularly in the north elevations of Buildings A. Whilst the appearance of the buildings would be altered, I consider the contemporary design approach to be acceptable and in keeping with the current treatment of the buildings. The physical additions to the buildings (the verandah to Building A and the covered courtyard between Buildings B and C) would not be prominent within the surrounding area.

31. Concerns have been raised in respect of noise and disturbance to adjoining residents, particularly to the occupants of the immediately adjacent dwelling, Dernford Farmhouse. The Environmental Health Officer has been consulted on this point and has raised no objections in principle subject to the erection of a wall between buildings B and D (this is shown on the plans) and subject to early morning vehicle movements being restricted to an area on the opposite side of the wall to the adjoining property.
32. With regards to the highway safety implications of the development, the Local Highways Authority has objected to the application on the basis of the scale of the use. These objections appear to be based, however, on the assumption that the use of existing leased buildings would continue – this is not the case. As the submitted traffic figures would not be in addition to those already associated with the site, the Local Highways Authority has been asked to reconsider the application. In addition to this, in order to minimise the number of vehicle movements and to minimise the highway safety implications of the development, the applicants are willing to enter into a Section 106 Agreement stipulating that occupants of the hostel would not be able to own their own motorised transport.
33. Concerns have been raised in respect of the security implications of the development and upon the impact of the development upon house values. However, these are not material planning issues.

Recommendations

34. Subject to the Local Highways Authority raising no objections to the application, to the Building Inspector confirming that the buildings are capable of being converted and to the signing of a Section 106 Agreement to prevent occupiers of the hostel owning their own motorised transport, delegated powers are sought to approve the application, as amended by plans and details submitted on 26th May, 23rd June and 5th July 2004:
 1. Standard Condition A – Time limited permission (Reason A);
 2. Sc5a – Details of materials for external walls and roofs (Rc5aii);
 2. Sc51 – Landscaping (Rc51);
 4. Sc52 – Implementation of landscaping (Rc52);
 5. Sc60 – Details of boundary treatment (Rc60);
 6. Before the use, hereby permitted, commences the refectory/social space (Building C) shall be acoustically insulated in accordance with a scheme that shall previously have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. (Reason – To minimise noise disturbance to neighbouring properties);

7. Before the use, hereby permitted, commences, a wall shall be constructed between Buildings B and D (in the position denoted on the attached plan) in accordance with a scheme that shall previously have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. (Reason – To minimise noise disturbance to neighbouring properties);
8. Vehicles associated with the early morning transport of workers shall not be parked other than immediately adjacent to the eastern edge of the wall shown between Buildings B and D (shown hatched on the attached plan) and vehicles shall be started, loaded with passengers and driven directly off site from this location (Reason – To minimise vehicle noise disturbance to the adjacent dwelling);
9. Prior to the commencement of any development, a scheme for the provision and implementation of foul water drainage shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The works/scheme shall be constructed and completed in accordance with the approved plans/specification at such time(s) as may be specified in the approved scheme. (Reason – To prevent the increased risk of pollution to the water environment);
10. Prior to the commencement of any development, a scheme for the provision and implementation of surface water drainage shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The works/scheme shall be constructed and completed in accordance with the approved plans/specification at such time(s) as may be specified in the approved scheme. (Reason – To ensure a satisfactory method of surface water drainage);
11. The hostel accommodation, hereby permitted, shall not be used other than for the accommodation of agricultural workers only and for no other purpose (Reason – To ensure that the use is appropriate to a rural area and in keeping with the aims of Policy P1/2 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003).
12. Archaeology condition

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 **P1/2** (Environmental Restrictions on Development)
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004: GB2** (Development in the Green Belt)
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;
 - Highway safety;
 - Visual impact on the locality and upon the openness of the Green Belt;
 - Suitability of the buildings for conversion
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. The public footpath must remain open and unobstructed at all times from building materials and parked vehicles (it is an offence both at common law and under s137 of the Highways Act 1980 to obstruct a public footpath);
2. The surface of the footpath must not be altered without the consent of the County Council Countryside Services Team (it is an offence under s1 of the Criminal Damage Act 1971 to damage the surface of a public footpath);
3. No vehicles can drive over the footpath unless they have lawful authority (this comprises an offence under s34 of the Road Traffic Act 1988).
4. The applicant's attention is drawn to the comments of the Environment Agency set out in the attached letter dated 28th April 2004.

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; File Ref: S/0771/04/F.

Contact Officer: Lorraine Casey – Senior Planning Assistant
Telephone: (01954) 713251

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	6 th October 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

S/1512/04/F - Sawston
**Erection of Chalet Bungalow and Garage Following Demolition of Existing Bungalow
at 8 Whitefield Way for Mr & Mrs Kersey**

Recommendation: Refusal

Site and Proposal

1. The application site extends to approximately 0.1 hectares (0.25 acres) and is occupied by a brick bungalow with a shallow metal clad roof and its garden. The land falls to the south. Nos. 1-8 Whitefield Way are all single storey although No.4 has a steeper pitched slate roof. The site's side and rear boundaries are marked by close-boarded fences. No.7 to the south west has a blank side elevation.
2. This full application, registered on the 20th July 2004, proposed the erection of a 4-bedroom, 7.2m high chalet bungalow with dormer windows following the demolition of the existing bungalow and the erection of a 5.4m high double garage. The density equates to approximately 10 dwellings to the hectare.

Planning History

3. Permission for extensions, including the addition of a first floor, to the existing bungalow was granted in April 2004 (**S/0247/04/F**). The resulting dwelling would have 2.5 metre high eaves, a 7.2 metre high ridge and catslide dormers on the front and back.
4. Planning permission was granted in 2002 for the change of use of part of the site to garden (**S/1512/04/F**).

Planning Policy

5. The existing dwelling and its original curtilage are within the village framework. The extended garden area is within the countryside and the Green Belt.
6. 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.

7. 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.
8. Structure Plan 2003 **Policy P1/2** states that development in the countryside will be resisted unless it can be demonstrated to be essential in a particular rural location.
9. Structure Plan 2003 **Policy P9/2a** states that new development within the Green Belt will be limited to uses appropriate to a rural area
10. Local Plan 2004 **Policy SE8** states that residential development outside village frameworks will not be permitted.
11. Local Plan 2004 **Policy GB2** defines development which is not inappropriate in the Green Belt and states that planning permission will not be granted for inappropriate development in the Green Belt unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated.

Consultation

12. **Sawston Parish Council** recommends approval.
13. **Chief Environmental Health Officer** recommends conditions and informatives to be attached to any approval to protect adjoining residents from noise during construction.

Representations

14. The owners of 108 New Road comment that the proposed dwelling does not appear to be in keeping with the surrounding buildings in the vicinity of the development as neighbouring properties appear to be bungalows. They also state that, as the site occupies high ground, the impact of the proposal would be greater and the approved plan to modify and extend the existing dwelling would seem to be more appropriate for the area.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

15. The key issues in relation to this application are:
 - Whether the proposal constitutes ‘inappropriate development in the Green Belt’ and the impact of the proposal on the openness and rural appearance of the Green Belt;
 - The design of the dwelling and garage; and
 - The affect on the amenity of the occupiers of No.7.
16. I have no objection in principle to the erection of a dwelling with accommodation in the roofspace on this site and an extension to the existing dwelling, including first floor accommodation, has already been approved. However, it is important that the development is wholly within the village framework. Whilst the extended garden approved under planning reference S/1606/02/F has been incorporated into the residential curtilage, that part of the site is still defined as countryside and Green Belt in the Local Plan 2004 and its predominantly undeveloped appearance still makes a contribution to the openness of the Green Belt. Part of the proposed new dwelling and the whole of the garage are proposed to be located on this land.

17. Such development constitutes 'inappropriate development in the Green Belt' and would detract from the openness of the Green Belt. Inappropriate development will not be permitted unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated. I do not consider that there are any very special circumstances in this instance to outweigh the presumption against inappropriate development. I have sent a letter to the agent setting out this view.
18. The proposal is considered to be acceptable in all other respects. Whilst the design of the dwelling would be different to other dwellings within Whitefield Way, it would be acceptable if the whole of the dwelling was within the village framework. I am also satisfied that the proposal would not have a serious impact on the amenity of neighbours. Specifically, it would not result in undue overlooking or overshadowing of No.7 nor would it be unduly overbearing when viewed from No.7.

Recommendation

19. Refusal

Whereas the existing bungalow to be replaced is wholly located within the village framework, part of the proposed new dwelling and the whole of the garage are located in the countryside and the Green Belt as defined in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004. That part of the dwelling within the Green Belt and a garage of the height proposed constitutes 'inappropriate development in the Green Belt' and would detract from the openness of the Green Belt. Inappropriate development will not be permitted unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated and, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the very special circumstances required to justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt have not been demonstrated.

The proposal is therefore contrary to: Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 Policy P1/2 which states that development in the countryside will be resisted unless it can be demonstrated to be essential in a particular rural location; Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 Policy P9/2a which states that new development within the Green Belt will be limited to uses appropriate to a rural area; South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 Policy SE8 which states that residential development outside village frameworks will not be permitted; and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 Policy GB2 which defines development which is not inappropriate and states that planning permission will not be granted for inappropriate development in the Green Belt unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated.

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/1512/04/F, S/0247/04/F & S/1606/02/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	6 th October 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

**S/1521/04/F - Sawston
Dormer Window at 47 New Road for Mr Jarvis**

Recommendation: Refusal

Site and Proposal

1. The property is a 2 storey semi-detached house in a pair with No 45. It has a single storey building at the rear which is identical to other properties along this side of the road. New Road is characterised by 2 storey semi-detached dwellings and a few of these properties have 2 storey side extensions. Beyond this row of properties is a footpath leading to the rear boundaries of dwellings in New Road and Martindale Way. Nos 35 and 41 New Road have dormer windows projecting to the rear and they can be seen from Westmoor Avenue and the footpath between New Road and Martindale Way.
2. This full application, registered on 21st July 2004, proposes to erect a dormer window to a bedroom in the rear elevation.

Planning History

3. S/1526/88/F - Permission for 2 storey extension
S/1096/85/F – Permission for single storey extension

It is considered that other planning applications for dormer windows within New Road are relevant to the consideration of this application;
S/0248/93/F – Permission for 2 storey side extensions with dormer window at No 41 New Road;
S/1480/85 – Permission for loft conversion with dormer window at No 35 New Road

Planning Policy

4. **Policy P1/3** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 requires a high standard of design and sustainability for all new development, that responds to the local character of the built environment and details aspects of design to be considered.
5. **Policy HG12** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 partly states that planning permission for extension and alteration to dwellings will not be permitted where the design would not be in keeping with local characteristics and there would be an unacceptable visual impact upon the street scene.

Consultation

6. **Sawston Parish Council** recommends approval.

Representations

7. None received

Planning Comments – Key Issues

8. The key issue in relation to this application is whether the dormer window would have an unacceptable visual impact upon the street scene.
9. I consider that the proposal would not result in undue overlooking or overshadowing of neighbouring properties, Nos. 45 and 49. The proposed dormer window is more than 40 metre from the rear boundary of Nos. 13 and 15 Martindale Way. The new bedroom window would not seriously harm the amenities of occupiers of these two properties.
10. However, I consider the mass and bulk of the dormer measuring 2.8m wide and 1.6m high projecting to the rear would be prominent and visible when viewed from Westmoor Avenue and the footway between New Road and Martindale Way. Although there are two dormers of in similar size at Nos 35 and 41 New Road, the planning consents were granted at 1985 and 1993 and they were considered against the development plan at that time. It is considered that the addition of the dormer window would have cumulative impact of the existing dwellings in the locality. It will lead to significant changes to the character of this part of the village having regard to the issues of scale, design and the impact upon surrounding properties and street scene. It is considered that the proposed dormer window will unduly affect the street scene and would be out of keeping with, and would dominate and detract from, the character and original design of the existing dwelling.

Recommendation

11. Refusal

The proposed dormer window projecting to the rear of the existing house will be visible from Westmoor Avenue and a public footway between New Road and Martindale Way. The dormer window forms a prominent feature that would be out of keeping with the character of the area. The consequent harm to the street scene would contravene Policies P1/3 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 and HG12 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 which require new development to be sensitive to the character of their surroundings.

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

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure 2003

Planning file Refs: S/1096/85/F, S/1480/85/F, S/1526/88/F, S/0248/93/F and S/1521/04/F

Contact Officer: Emily Ip – Planning Assistant
Telephone: (01954) 713250

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	6 th October 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

**S/1555/04/F - Sawston
Extensions and Boundary Wall and Gate at 11 Park Road for Mr & Mrs Dunkley**

Recommendation: Approval

Site and Proposal

1. No 11 Park Road is a 1.5 storey dwelling with accommodation in the roof space and 3 dormer windows projecting to Park Road. The property has an attached pitched roof garage at the side set back from the front elevation of the dwelling. It is situated on a cul-de-sac on the northern side of the road within Sawston village framework. To the east of the site is No 13, a two storey house with a blank gable wall facing the garden of No 11. To the north is No 9, a two storey house with a single garage at the side adjacent to the common boundary.
2. Park Road is characterised by a mixture of two storey and single storey dwellings. The other 5 properties in this cul-de-sac (Nos 1, 3, 5, 7 and 9) are 2 storey houses.
3. This full application, registered on the 26th July 2004, proposes to :
 - Extend the existing garage projecting to the front by 2.95m and at the rear by 0.5m;
 - Add a first floor extension above the garage providing 2 bedrooms (one of them is an en-suite bedroom) with dormer windows in the front and at the rear;
 - Erect a conservatory at the rear measuring 2.6m x 8.5m; and
 - Erect boundary wall and gate (1.8m high wall at the side boundary fronting Park Road and 0.9m high wall in the front and at the side)

The amended plan date stamped 16th September 2004 shows the revised location of the 1.8m high boundary wall set back from the footway.

Planning History

4. S/0757/04/F – Extensions – Refused 2nd June 2004 on grounds of dominating and detracting from the character and design of the existing building contrary to Policy P1/3 of the Structure Plan and HG12 of the Local Plan.

Planning Policy

5. **Policy P1/3** 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 for all new development.

6. **Policy HG12** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 states that planning permission for extension and alteration to dwellings will not be permitted where the proposal would not be in keeping with local characteristics, would seriously harm the amenities of neighbours through undue loss of light or privacy, being unduly overbearing in terms of its mass, or would affect surrounding properties by virtue of its design, layout, location or materials, would result in an unacceptable loss of parking space or amenity area, have an unacceptable visual impact on the street scene, or would have inappropriate boundary treatment.

Consultation

7. **Sawston Parish Council** recommends refusal and states 'overdevelopment of the site'.

Representations

8. None received.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

9. The key issue in relation to this application is whether the proposed extensions contribute to over-development of the site.
10. This application is a revised scheme subsequent to the refusal of the previous application (ref. S/0757/04/F) and discussion with the officer and the applicants on site. This scheme significantly reduces the eaves height of the addition over the garage on the front elevation compared with the refused design. In that respect it is in character with the existing.
11. The existing ridge height and eaves height of the dwelling are 7m and 2.2m respectively and the height of the existing garage is 5m to the ridge. There are 1m high fences along the rear and side boundaries. Having considered that No 9 (to the north of the site) has a garage at the side adjacent to the garage at No 11, and No 13 (to the east of the site) only has a blank gable wall facing the rear of the application site, I do not consider that the proposal will have an adverse impact upon residential amenity interests. The proposed new dormer window at the rear will not cause extra overlooking of the private garden area of No 13 given that there are already first floor bedroom windows at Nos 11, 9 and 15 facing the garden of that property.
12. I consider that the scale and form of the proposed extension, by keeping a low eaves height in the front elevation of the resultant garage at 2.2-2.3m and the ridge height at 7m, would be in keeping with the character and original design of the existing dwelling. The eaves height of the extension at the rear elevation is 4m. That elevation will not be visible from the road and therefore it will not affect the street scene. Other properties in this cul-de-sac are all 2-storey houses and there are examples of boundary walls in the locality (No 43 London Road and No 1 Park Road). The proposal is considered to have an acceptable visual impact in the street scene. The property is within village framework and I do not consider that the proposed extension above the garage and the conservatory would cause over-development of the site.

Recommendation

13. Approval as amended by drawing number SF03150.1B date stamped 16th September 2004.

Conditions of Consent

1. Standard Condition A – Time limited permission (Reason A);
2. Standard Condition 19 – Matching materials (Reason 19)

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
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:**
HG12 (Extensions and alterations to dwellings within frameworks)
2. The proposal conditionally approved is not considered to significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations which have been raised during the consultation exercise: visual impact in 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:

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
Planning file refs: S/0757/04/F, S/1555/04/F

Contact Officer: Emily Ip – Planning Assistant
Telephone: (01954) 713250

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	6 th October 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

**S/1606/04/F – Sawston
2 Dwellings and Garage on Land Adjacent 2 Granta Road for Hogger Homes Ltd**

Recommendation: Approval

Site and Proposal

1. The site extends to approximately 0.06 hectares (0.14 acres) and was previously the grassed side garden to No.2 Granta Road which, like all the other dwellings in this part of Granta Road, is a semi-detached chalet dwelling with flat roof dormers on the front and rear and a flat roof garage to the side. There is an existing 1.5m-2m high hedge along the sites's road frontages. The site is bounded by Granta Road to the northeast, No.2 Granta Road to the southeast, open land/trees to the southwest and Meadowfield Road to the northwest.
2. This full application, received on the 3rd August 2004 and amended by plan date stamped the 20th September 2004, proposes the erection of a pair of 8.8 metres high semi-detached 3-bedroom chalet dwellings on the site. The dwellings are similar in design to the existing dwellings in this part of Granta Road although the dwelling on plot 1 has a pitched roof attached garage with study above and the dwelling on plot 2 would have a pitched roof detached garage to the rear accessed from Meadowfield Road. The proposed density equates to 33 dwellings per hectare.
3. The floor level of the dwellings would be 300mm above the highest recorded flood level applicable to this site. Furthermore, this application purports to include the measures proposed at the time of the recently approved application for 2 dwellings on the site which demonstrated that there would be no loss of flood plain by ensuring that the area beneath the dwellings and garages is left open, air bricks allow any water to flow into this area and then drain out after the end of the flood and any small loss of flood plain is counteracted by lowering the ground level beneath the dwellings. The plan date stamped the 20th September 2004 is the same as the original plans save that air bricks are shown.

Planning History

4. Planning permission was granted for 2 dwellings and garage on the site in April 2004 (**S/1745/03/F**). The application was considered at the March 2004 meeting of this Committee.
5. An outline application for 2 dwellings on the site was refused in February 2002 (**S/2072/01/O**) for the following reason: "The site is in the recorded floodplain of the River Cam and it's tributaries, at a level approximately 600mm below the highest recorded flood level. The proposed development of the site for housing would subject the dwellings to the potential of flooding and reduce the area of floodwater storage, increasing the risk of flooding elsewhere.

As such it would be contrary to Policy SP8/6 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 1995 and Policy CS8 of the Deposit South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 1999.”

Planning Policy

6. The site is within the village framework of Sawston, which is defined as a Rural Growth Settlement in Local Plan 2004.
7. Whilst the front part of the site is outside the Environment Agency’s Zone 2 Flood Risk Area, the rear part of the site is within it. These Zones replace the Indicative Flood Plain maps previously used.
8. 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.
9. 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.
10. Local Plan 2004 **Policy CS5** states that planning permission will not be granted for development where the site is liable to flooding, or where development is likely to: (1) increase the risk of flooding elsewhere by materially impeding the flow or storage of flood water; (2) increase flood risk in areas downstream due to additional surface water runoff; or (3) increase the number of people or properties at risk unless it is demonstrated that these effects can be overcome by appropriate alleviation and mitigation measures and secured by planning conditions or planning obligation providing the necessary improvements would not damage interests of nature conservation.
11. Structure Plan **Policy P1/2** states that no new development will be permitted within or which is likely to adversely affect functional flood plains or other areas where adequate flood protection cannot be given and/or there is significant risk of increasing flood risk elsewhere. Structure Plan **Policy P6/3** states that, if development is permitted in areas where flood protection is required, flood defence measures and design features must give sufficient protection to ensure that an unacceptable risk is not incurred, both locally and elsewhere.

Consultation

12. **Sawston Parish Council** recommends refusal stating “This site is in the floodplain of the River Cam and its tributaries and therefore more buildings would create problems for them and existing buildings nearby. The proposed access and egress from the site are at a dangerous road junction which would cause more traffic problems.”
13. **Chief Environmental Health Officer** recommends conditions relating to the times during the construction period when power operated machinery shall not be used and driven pile foundations are attached to any approval.

At the time of application S/1745/03/F, he also specifically confirmed that he had no objections to the proposal in terms of groundwater pollution.

14. The comments of the **Environment Agency** are awaited.

Representations

15. The occupiers of 18 and 22 Meadowfield Road reiterate concerns expressed at the time of application S/1745/03/F, namely parking problems, loss of view to open space, loss of feeling of space, increase in height is not in keeping with the rest of the surrounding properties and the site is within the floodplain.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

16. The main issues in relation to the application are:

- Flood Risk:
- The design and appearance of the dwellings; and
- Impact on the amenity of neighbours.

17. The principle of erecting two dwellings and garage on the site has already been established by the granting of planning permission under reference S/1745/03/F. The current proposal also purports to include all of the measures proposed at the time of application S/1745/03/F which lead to the Environment Agency raising no objections to the proposal subject to conditions. Subject to the receipt of confirmation from the Environment Agency that it does not object to this proposal, I consider that the scheme is acceptable in terms of flood risk. The recommendation includes the informative that Members specifically requested be attached to the previous permission which stated that, in coming to a decision to approve the application, the Local Planning Authority had regard to the Environment Agency's comments that the scheme satisfactorily addresses and mitigates against the risk of flooding to the site and neighbouring properties.

18. This application proposes revisions to the design of the approved dwellings including changes to the fenestration and a room over the garage to the side of the dwelling on plot 1. In my opinion, the revisions to the fenestration would better assimilate the dwelling into the street scene. These changes include relocating the entrance to the side of the dwelling on Plot 2 (surrounding dwellings have their entrances in the side elevations) and linking the flat roof dormer windows (the dormer windows of each pair of existing semis are linked). That said, I consider that further amendments to the scheme are required in that the dwellings should be no higher than the approved scheme (i.e. 8.5m rather than 8.8m to ridge), they should be no nearer to the adjacent angled section of footpath at the junction of Granta Road and Meadowfield Road than shown on the approved plans (approximately 1.8m) and the garage with room above element to the side of the dwelling on plot 1 should be more subservient. The agent has indicated that his client is willing to amend the scheme to address these concerns and the recommendation is therefore subject to the receipt of amended plans. It is likely that he will ensure that the garage with room above element is more subservient by 'cutting off the top' and thereby reducing its height (ie. having a flat roof element in the middle obscured from view by ridge tiles). As the side of this element would not be readily visible in the street scene due to the position of No.2 Granta Road, I consider that this would be acceptable.

19. I consider that the proposal would not unduly affect the amenity of neighbours and would be acceptable in terms of parking and highway matters.

Recommendation

20. Subject to no objections being raised to the scheme by the Environment Agency and the receipt of amended plans to address the concerns set out in paragraph 17 above, Approval subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard condition A – (Reason A);
2. The external materials of construction for the building works hereby permitted shall be identical to those used for No.2 Granta Road unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority – RC To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development;
3. The ground floor level of the dwellings hereby permitted shall be 21.55 ODN metres – RC To provide a reasonable freeboard against flooding;
4. Prior to the commencement of any development, a scheme for the provision and implementation of surface water drainage shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works/scheme shall be constructed and completed in accordance with the approved plans/specification at such time(s) as may be specified in the approved scheme – RC To ensure a satisfactory method of surface water drainage;
5. There shall be no raising of ground levels within the site, save for the hereby permitted dwellings and garage – RC To prevent the risk of flooding to other land/properties, due to impedance of flood flow and reduction in flood storage capacity;
6. The air bricks, shown on drawing no. EDG/04/84/2b, shall remain clear from obstruction at all times – RC To facilitate flood risk conveyance;
7. Standard condition 21 (Part 1, Classes A and E) ‘Removal of permitted development rights’ – RC To ensure that extensions and outbuildings which would not otherwise require planning permission do not lead to an increased risk of flooding to other land/properties, due to impedance of flood flow and reduction in flood storage capacity;
8. During the construction period ... Standard condition 26 ‘Times when power operated machinery shall not be operated’ (0800, 0800, 1800, 1300) – RC26;
9. Standard condition 60 (all) ‘Boundary treatments’ – RC To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development and to protect the amenity of the occupiers of No.2 Granta Road and the hereby permitted dwellings

Reasons for Approval

1. The approved development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:
 - a) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003: **P1/2 (Environmental Restrictions on Development); P1/3 (Sustainable Design in Built Development); and P6/3 (Flood Defence).**

b) South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004: SE2 (Development in Rural Growth Settlements); and CS5 (Flood Protection),

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: **parking problems, loss of view to open space, loss of feeling of space, increase in height in relation to surrounding properties, the site is within the floodplain and the proposed access and egress from the site are at a dangerous road junction which would cause more traffic problems.**
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

In coming to a decision to approve this application, the Local Planning Authority had regard to the Environment Agency's comments that the scheme satisfactorily addresses and mitigates against the risk of flooding to the site and neighbouring properties.

Should driven pile foundations be proposed, before development commences, a statement of the method for construction of these foundations shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the District Council's Environmental Health Officer so that noise and vibrations can be controlled.

During construction, there shall be no bonfires or burning of waste on site except with the prior permission of the District Council's 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:

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
Planning file Ref: S/1606/04/F, S/1745/03/F and S/2072/01/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 6th October 2004
Control Committee

AUTHOR/S: Director of Development Services

**S/1705/04/F - Sawston
Extensions at 27 Hillside for Mr & Mrs Norrie**

Recommendation: Refusal

Site and Proposal

1. The property is a 2 storey detached house situated on the east site of Hillside with a detached double garage at the side and single storey extensions at the rear. In the front of the existing garage are 2 parking spaces. To the north/north-west of the site is No 25, a 2 storey house with a patio area adjacent to the 1.8m high fences and hedges. To the south-east are Nos 29 and 31, 3 storey semi-detached dwellings set back from the road and No 27 with bedroom windows in the front elevation on the first and second floors.
2. This full application, registered on 13th August 2004, proposes to replace the existing garage by a 2 storey side extension for living room and 2 bedrooms measuring 5.75m x 7.5m. It will be the same height as the existing house under a matching pitched roof. The proposal also includes a single storey rear extension beyond the existing rear extension by 9.5m for utility and an en-suite bedroom. The rear extension lies along the common boundary with No 25; it will be 2.4m high to the eaves and 3.5m high to the ridge, on the north boundary.

Planning History

3. S/0775/03/F - Permission for extensions, including 2 storey side extension, set back from the front building line of the house by 0.5m and set lower than the house by 0.4m, and a single storey rear extension measuring 5.35m in length.

S/1253/90/F – Permission for single storey rear extension

SC/0104/71/D – Permission for extending existing garage

SC/0313/65/D – Permission for erection of garage

Planning Policy

4. **Policy P1/3** 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 for all new development.
5. **Policy HG12** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 states that planning permission for extension and alteration to dwellings will not be permitted where the proposal would not be in keeping with local characteristics, would seriously harm the amenities of neighbours through undue loss of light or privacy, being unduly overbearing in terms of its mass, or would affect surrounding properties by virtue of

its design, layout, location or materials, would result in an unacceptable loss of parking space or amenity area, have an unacceptable visual impact on the street scene, or would have inappropriate boundary treatment.

Consultation

6. **Sawston Parish Council** recommends approval.

Representations

7. None received

Planning Comments – Key Issues

8. The key issues in relation to this application are:
 - The affect on the amenity of the occupiers of No 25, and
 - Visual impacts upon the street scene
9. I have no objection in principle to the extensions at the side and the rear on this site. Extensions to the existing dwelling, including a 2 storey side extension and a single storey rear extension, have already been approved under planning reference S/0775/03/F. However, it is important that the development will not unduly affect the residential amenity interests and street scene.
10. I am satisfied that the proposal would not have a serious impact on the amenity of neighbours of No 29 given the setback of No 29 from the proposed side extension. Adjacent the common boundary between Nos 27 and 29 is a driveway, leading to the rear of No 29. Specifically, it would not result in undue overlooking or overshadowing of No 29 nor would it be unduly overbearing when viewed from No 29.
11. Although no representations have been received from the occupants of No 25, I consider there to be a concern of overbearing impact when viewed from the patio area of that property as a result of the proposed single storey rear extension. The proposed rear extension beyond the existing rear structure will result in a mono-pitched roof building of 10.6m long along the boundary with No 25. There will a 3.5m high and 10.6m long brick wall adjacent to the patio area/sitting out area at No 25. Given the height and length of the resultant building, I consider this would be unduly overbearing when viewed from the private garden area at No 29 and directly affect the residential amenity interests of that property.
12. Turning to the street scene, the two storey side extension will be in line with the front elevation of the dwelling and the same height as the house. I consider the extension should be set back a minimum of 0.5m from the dwelling itself. The height should be designed to have a lower ridge height than the existing dwelling in order to have an acceptable visual impact upon the street scene. Properties along this side of the road have side extensions and they are set back from the front elevation of the properties and set lower than the original ridge height. It is considered that the proposed two storey side extension will unduly affect the street scene.

Recommendation

13. Refusal

1. The proposed rear extension, by virtue of its height, length and position on the northern boundary, would appear dominant and overbearing in the outlook from the patio area of the neighbouring property to the north, No 25 Hillside. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy HG12 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan which states that extensions will be refused if they result in serious harm to the amenities of neighbours by being unduly overbearing in terms of their mass.
2. Notwithstanding the above reason for refusal the proposed side extension, by reason of its height and siting flush with the front elevation of the house, would appear dominant and be out of keeping with the design and character of the nearby properties with consequent adverse impact on the street scene. As such, it would be contrary to Policy P1/3 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 and Policy HG12 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 that require new development to be of good design and to relate well to its surrounding.

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: SC0313/65/D, SC/0104/71/D, S/1253/90/F, S/0775/03/F and S/1705/04/F

Contact Officer: Emily Ip – Planning Assistant
Telephone: (01954) 713250

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	6 th October 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

**S/1453/04/F and S/1452/04/LB - Swavesey
Conversion Of Barns Into Offices and Erection of Offices and Children's Day Nursery,
Mill Farm, Middlewatch for Nationwide Ltd**

Recommendation: Refusal

Departure Application

Site and Proposal

1. The application site is located on the east side of Middlewatch within a countryside gap of some 100 metres between dwellings to the north and south. Opposite is residential development.
2. The site includes two grade II Listed Barns early 18th Century with attached single storey outbuildings. The barns, both three bays, are timber framed and weatherboarded with corrugated iron roofs. They form a group with the Listed Farmhouse (Mill Farm), which is in separate ownership to the south of the site. To the east within the site are a number of large modern agricultural buildings.
3. The planning and listed building applications, registered on 12th July 2004, propose the change of use and refurbishment of the historic barns to B1 offices, including a new mezzanine floor in the Listed barns, the erection of four business units comprising ground floor accommodation of 504 sq metres at the eastern end of the site and, at the widest and southern most part of the site, a 75 place full children's day care nursery in a single storey building of some 403 sq metres footprint. The application quotes a total office floorspace of 1,258 sq metres.
4. A new 5 metre wide carriageway road with 1 metre wide footway is proposed along the north boundary of the site. This will give access to 65 car parking spaces.

Planning History

5. Planning application (S/0787/03/F) for the conversion of barns into offices, rebuilding of a barn for office and erection of a children's day nursery has not been determined.

Planning Policy

6. The site is located in the countryside outside the Swavesey Village Framework.
7. Structure Plan 2003 **Policy P1/2** restricts development in the countryside unless the proposal can be demonstrated to be essential in a particular rural location.
8. Structure Plan **Policy P2/6** encourages sensitive small-scale employment development in rural areas where it contributes to one or more of several objectives, including enabling farm or rural diversification and the re-use of existing buildings.

9. South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 (Local Plan) **Policy EM10** encourages the change of use and conversion of rural buildings outside village frameworks to employment use subject to a number of criteria.
10. Structure Plan **Policy P7/6** and Local Plan Policies **EN26, EN27 and EN28** require the historic built environment to be protected and enhanced and set out criteria against which applications for the change of use of Listed Buildings and for development within the curtilage of Listed Buildings should be assessed.
11. Local Plan **Policy TP1** promotes more sustainable transport choices by amongst other measures, restricting car parking to maximum levels set out in appendix 7/1.
12. Government's Planning Policy Statement 7 (2004), "Sustainable development in rural areas", supports the re-use of appropriately located and suitably constructed existing buildings in the countryside where this would meet sustainable development objectives. Re-use for economic development is preferred. Para 19 states: "The Government is also supportive of the replacement of suitably located, existing buildings of permanent design and construction in the countryside for economic development purposes. The replacement of buildings should be favoured where this would result in a more acceptable and sustainable development than might be achieved through conversion, for example, where the replacement building would bring about an environmental improvement in terms of the impact of the development on its surroundings and the landscape."

Consultation

13. **Swavesey Parish Council** recommends refusal on parking grounds. It comments:
14. "**Parking.** For the proposed office space and in particular the children's day nursery, insufficient parking spaces have been provided. For the children's day nursery only 3 drop-off spaces are shown, this is less than in the previous application (S/0787/03/F). Parents may be forced to park along Middlewatch when dropping-off and collecting children, which is likely to cause serious problems along Middlewatch. Mill Farm is close to the junction with Whitton Close, close to two bus stops and along the busy main road through Swavesey. There are also less parking spaces in total for all the office space proposed, than for the previous application. The Parish Council is extremely concerned that staff and visitors to the development will end up parking along Middlewatch and not within the development site."
15. **Local Highway Authority** has no objections, but requires an amended layout plan to address recommended conditions including demonstrating that a 4.5 m x 90.0 m visibility splay can be achieved to the south.
16. **Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service** does not require additional water supplies for fire fighting.
17. **Environment Agency** recommends the imposition of conditions requiring surface water drainage and pollution control schemes to be submitted, agreed and implemented.
18. **Middle Level Commissioners** opposes the application until such time as an appropriate flood risk assessment has been submitted and approved.

19. **Chief Environmental Health Officer** has no objections subject to the imposition of a condition requiring submission, approval and implementation of details of the location and type of any power driven plant or equipment.
20. **Conservation Manager** has no objections in principle to the conversion of the listed barns but the following is suggested:
21. “Barn A – The proposals make good use of the existing openings but the additional openings in this barn and the single storey range need to be rationalised. Where shutters exist they should be retained. The large glazed opening should be recessed to provide a shadow line.
22. Barn B – There is a discrepancy between the survey drawings and the proposals, which implies that the roof and the eaves are to be heightened. Previous discussions were to retain the existing building and insert a mezzanine floor without disturbing the existing timber frame elements; if this is not possible then this building should be single storey. The method of lighting this space needs to be addressed, the number of rooflights is not acceptable, it is important that this prominent elevation retains its agricultural appearance.
23. The openings on the front elevation do not respect the existing openings and would result in a significant loss of historic fabric, I suggest that this part of the scheme is looked at in detail to find a more acceptable approach.
24. The single storey meeting room should have less glazing and more weatherboarding for the same reasons.
25. Barn C – The addition of a pitched roof will be an enhancement and the use of the existing openings appears to be acceptable but again the glazing of the large opening needs to be set back and existing timber shutters retained.”
26. In respect of the new build, the **Conservation Manager** objects. The scheme would neither preserve nor enhance the appearance or setting of the Listed Buildings. Detailed comments are:
27. “Access – There is concern over the close proximity of the proposed access to the listed buildings and the effect this will have on their setting and their shallow footings. The access should be narrower and sited further to the north. Of particular concern are the hard landscaping and the visibility splay and the impact on the setting of the Listed Buildings.
28. Layout – The scale of new build and the amount of parking is overdevelopment of the site and bears no relationship to the existing barn complex. The proposal reads as a completely separate development with a large area of car parking between the two, it should be re-designed as an extension to the farmyard perhaps with the parking to the rear of the site.
29. Design – The design needs to be looked at in detail, in particular the scale and massing and the span of the buildings. The scale should emulate the existing barns in order to avoid the large spans and over complicated roof forms, which are out of character with the listed buildings. The fenestration detailing is poor and needs to be simplified.”
30. **Ecology Officer** requires, by condition, an ecological assessment to be undertaken to ensure any species of biodiversity interest are protected and enhanced. There is

evidence of a barn owl and possibly evidence of great crested newts and bats being on site.

31. No comments have been received from the **Wildlife Trust, Anglian Water** or the **Early Years Directorate, OFSTED**.

Representations

32. One resident of 94 Middlewatch objects to the application on the following grounds:
- a) Increase volume of commuter traffic; Middlewatch cannot cope;
 - b) The access will be close to two bus stops and frequently parked cars; it would be better sited south of Mill Farm House opposite Whitton Close junction with a mini roundabout;
 - c) Screening of the barns, roadway and car parking is necessary;
 - d) Children's day nursery will generate up to 150 vehicle movements per day on top of staff and delivery vehicles; cars will park on Middlewatch, compounding bad traffic problems; and there is insufficient parking space on site for this use.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

33. Whilst planning policies encourage the re-use of rural buildings and, subject to a number of criteria, of historic buildings, construction of new buildings in the countryside are severely restricted by reference to Structure Plan Policy P1/2.
34. Hence the application is a Departure from the Development Plan given that the proposed uses of the new buildings are not required for agriculture or countryside activities.
35. However, Officers have, in informal discussions with the applicant, encouraged the principle of replacing the modern agricultural buildings with single storey "courtyard" office buildings and the erection of a single storey nursery building on the grounds of enhancement of the setting of Mill Farm, apart from other Listed Buildings, and evidence dated 20th October 2003 submitted under application ref. S/0787/03/F of need for a children's day nursery in Swavesey.
36. Notwithstanding that support in principle, the applications do not satisfactorily address:
- a) Details of design and elevational treatment of the Listed Barns (which might also reduce floorspace);
 - b) Access in relation to the public highway, the Listed Barns and inadequate space for landscaping on the north boundary; or
 - c) The scale, layout and design of new build.
37. I consider that the first is capable of resolution.
38. The second appears to be only capable of resolution so far as achieving a safe access to Middlewatch is concerned, subject to submission of an accurate dimension drawing. The width and position of that access road in relation to the setting of the Listed Barns and need for landscaping is dictated by the limitations of the site and the scale of development proposed. There is no alternative position of this access within the extent of the application site.

39. The scale of the new build and parking at the rear of the site is of concern not only in relation to the setting of the Listed Buildings but also in assimilating the development within the countryside. Whilst it is intended to plant native hedges to the perimeter boundaries and to provide a 4.5 m wide native planting belt along the east boundary, there is very little open space or planting provided within the site. Moreover new buildings will be very close to the north and south site boundaries.
40. Maximum car parking of 53 spaces is required for 1,258 sq metres of office floorspace. It is not clear, however, what provision is required for the nursery, given the absence of information on staff numbers. However, given the proposed capacity of the nursery I consider that the proposed provision of 3 wide drop-off spaces is inadequate. Parents are likely to park on Middlewatch, although the Local Highway Authority has not objected on this ground.

Recommendation

41. That the applications be refused for the following reasons
1. The scale and position of the proposed new build, together with the necessary car parking and position and width of the parking and access road, would represent an overdevelopment of the site which would adversely affect the setting of Listed Buildings and create a harsh built edge with scope for little landscaping on the boundaries to the countryside; consequently the proposal would be contrary to Policies P7/6 of the Structure Plan 2003 and EN28 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.
 2. Alterations proposed to the Listed barns including the extent of glazing and the loss of timber frame elements and historic fabric in Building B would adversely affect the character and appearance of these buildings, consequently the proposal would be contrary to Policies P7/6 of the Structure Plan 2003 and EN26 and EN27 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.

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

Structure Plan 2003
South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
Planning Applications, ref S/1453/04/F and S/0787/03/F

Contact Officer: David Rush – Development Control Quality Manager
Telephone: (01954) 713153

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation Control
Committee

6th October 2004

AUTHOR/S: Director of Development Services

**S/1419/04/F - Teversham
Erection of Eleven Flats Following Demolition of
Two Houses and Conversion of Existing House into 2 Flats,
at 750 - 754 Newmarket Road, Cambridge
for Messrs A & H Reed**

Recommendation: Delegated Approval

Site and Proposal

1. The site has an area of 0.195 hectares and is located on the south side of Newmarket Road, which is A-classified. The site is adjoined on two sides by the Marshall airport to the east and north and residential properties to the west. It comprises of three semi-detached dwellings and their associated garden areas. These date from the post-war period and are part of a run of identical houses fronting Newmarket Road. Planning permission has recently been granted for re-development of the adjacent Marshall land, including demolition of no.756 and the training centre to allow the erection of a new office building (ref: S/1896/2003/F).
2. This full planning application, received on the 7th July 2004 proposes the demolition of nos. 752 and 754, which is a pair of semi-detached houses. No. 750 will be retained and converted into a pair of flats. The split will be vertical to ensure that living accommodation is not adjacent to neighbouring bedrooms. A small single storey rear extension is required to enable this. The site will then be re-developed to provide a three-storey block of flats with eleven 2-bedroom units. The net increase in dwellings will therefore be ten dwellings, however thirteen units in total are proposed, at a density of 67 dwellings per hectare. The applicant has agreed to five dwellings being secured for affordable housing. The site will be accessed at a single point off Newmarket Road, leading to a car park and turning area. The flats are to be sited at 90° to the road, with a landscaped amenity area between the flats and boundary with no. 748, including semi-mature tree planting to screen the development from houses beyond and to prevent overlooking of rear gardens.
3. The application was amended on the 13th September 2004 and detailed corrected elevations for the block of flats. On the 20th September 2004 a plan detailing a variation to the car parking layout, so that two spaces in the former front garden of no. 750 are re-sited. On 23rd September 2004 amended plans showing the vertical split of no. 750 with a small single storey rear extension and a location plan with the red line area extended to include no. 750 (formerly shown as outlined in blue) were submitted.

Planning History

4. A previous application (Ref: **S/0281/04/F**) for a very similar scheme was refused earlier this year. Although the principle of re-development was not objected to, the application was refused on the basis that the block of flats would result in

overlooking, loss of privacy, and would be overbearing and dominating in the outlook from the rear of no. 750.

Planning Policy

5. **Policy SE4 'Group and Infill Villages'** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 ("Local Plan") defines Teversham as a Group Village in which residential re-development of up to eight dwellings will be permitted within the framework providing the development meets with the criteria of this and other policies included within the Local Plan. Development of up to fifteen dwellings may exceptionally be permitted where best use of a brownfield site is possible. A mix of dwelling sizes, type and affordability should be provided.
6. **Policy HG7** of the Local Plan sets out the Council's approach to securing affordable housing provision within new developments. Teversham has a population of less than 3000 and therefore up to a fifty percent provision is required if there is a known housing need.
7. **Policy HG10** of the Local Plan requires developments to include a mix of housing types and sizes, with the design and layout being informed by the wider area.
8. **Policy HG12** of the Local Plan identifies requirements for extensions to houses, such as not harming the amenities of neighbours.
9. Other policies of the Local Plan that are of relevance to this application include:
 - **TP1** 'Planning More Sustainable Travel'
 - **CS3** 'Foul And Surface Water Drainage'
 - **CS4** 'Ground Water Protection'
 - **CS10** 'Education'
 - **CS13** 'Community Safety'
 - **EN5** 'The Landscaping Of New Development'
10. **Policy P1/1 'Approach to Development'** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 ("Structure Plan") affords high priority to developments involving the use of previously developed land, within existing settlements where travel distances by car can be minimised.
11. **Policy P1/3 'Sustainable Design in Built Development'** of the Structure Plan states that a high standard of design and sustainability should be adopted for all new forms of development.
12. **Policy P5/3 'Density'** of the Structure Plan requires previously developed land to be re-used efficiently. A guideline of 40 dwellings per hectare is identified for sites close to a good range of services, facilities and public transport. Densities of less than 30 dwellings per hectare will not be acceptable. The highest density possible that is compatible with local character should be applied.
13. **Policy P5/4 'Meeting Locally Identified Housing Needs'** sets out the requirement for Local Authorities to make provision to meet locally assessed housing need.

Consultations

14. **Teversham Parish Council** recommended refusal as it is concerned that there is inadequate car parking, insufficient landscaping and no details of its future

maintenance, no site for waste disposal bins, lack of social housing provision, and the wooden cladding proposed is likely to deteriorate quickly and become unsightly.

15. **Chief Environmental Health Officer** – suggested conditions to limit noise disturbance during development.
16. **Environment Agency** – applicant must demonstrate that sufficient capacity is available in existing systems.
17. **Trees and Landscape Officer** – Walnut and other trees that are to be retained should be protected during development, no objection to the proposed planting and additional boundary trees, full landscaping conditions required if approved.
18. **Housing Development Officer** – The latest housing needs survey from January 2003 shows a high level of need at the lower end of the unit size range and for one-bedroom flats. A 50% requirement is justified.
19. **Defence Estates** – No safeguarding objections.
20. **Local Highways Authority** – The layout is satisfactory, conditions are recommended.
21. **County Archaeology** – The site lies in an area of some archaeological potential, it is possible significant deposits remain on site. A programme of investigation is recommended in order to confirm the presence or absence, date, character and significance of any deposits through a negative condition.

Representations

22. Four letters of objection have been received from Bidwells (on behalf of Marshall), and occupiers of nos. 738, 746 and 748 Newmarket Road. The concerns raised included:
 - Siting of the building too close to the boundary with the Marshall site.
 - Impact on future residential occupants from commercial activities at Marshall.
 - Frontage re-development, with car parking at the rear would be less obtrusive.
 - Impact on existing residents from overlooking and loss of privacy.
 - Additional cars accessing Newmarket Road adding to congestion, and likely increase in car parking on verges for easier access onto the road resulting in blocked views.
 - Removal of trees would increase overlooking.
 - Measures to encourage use of public transport should be in place before further development is allowed.
 - Potential noise disturbance to the neighbouring house from the conversion into two flats of no. 750.
 - Unsuitable location for affordable accommodation due to a lack of infrastructure.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

23. The key issues to consider in respect of this application are the impact on the amenities of neighbouring dwellings, the impact of the Marshall site on the amenities of the dwellings proposed, provision of affordable housing, landscaping proposals and highways matters. Other issues of drainage, bin storage, materials and archaeology could be addressed with suitable conditions.

Amenities of neighbouring dwellings

24. The scheme that has now been submitted, together with subsequent amendments, have addressed the previous reason for refusal by re-siting the closest set of windows to the north (facing Newmarket Road), converting no. 750 into flats and adding semi-mature tree planting along the boundary with no. 748. The combination of these measures will reduce the impact of overlooking by removing the windows closest to the most private sections of the rear gardens, with a separation distance of at least 17 metres. The additional trees will obscure views of the gardens and landscaping conditions should be worded to include maintenance and replacement of trees beyond the usual five-year period through a management scheme. The conversion of no. 750 overcomes concerns regarding loss of privacy to its garden area, as in the revised scheme the garden is incorporated into the general amenity area of the site overall. The flats have been laid out to allow living rooms to adjoin the neighbouring living rooms, and similarly for the bedrooms.

Impact of the Marshall site on the amenities of future occupants

25. The proposed flats will not be unduly impacted by the development of the Marshall site. A training building and a small office currently occupies the area close to the flats. These are likely to be replaced with phase two of an office development at the rear of the training building and will result in an access road and car parking being close to the site. A landscaped strip adjacent to the boundary with the site will sufficiently separate the two developments. If this development does not take place the proposed flats would be a minimum of seven metres away from the sidewall of the training building, with a treed boundary separating the two buildings. This is sufficient to ensure that future residential amenities are not significantly harmed.

Affordable housing

26. A fifty percent affordable housing contribution has been agreed to by the applicants and is to be secured through a Section 106 if this application is approved. The agent has verbally confirmed that several Registered Social Landlords (RSLs) have been approached, with regard to this development. The Housing Development team requires confirmation of which RSL is on board, whether funding through the Housing Corporation has been secured, tenure type, and details of whether the layout and type of units provided meet scheme development standards set by the Housing Corporation before a S.106 agreement can be entered into.

Landscaping

27. Some details of landscaping to the boundary with no. 746 have been provided. Existing trees are to be retained and the Landscaping Officer is satisfied that conditions can be placed to ensure a suitable scheme is achieved. This could include groups of trees in the eastern part of the site to provide screening to houses beyond.

Highways

28. It is accepted that Newmarket Road is a very busy main road. However the Local Highways Authority has not raised concerns and is satisfied that conditions will ensure highway safety is not jeopardised.

Recommendation

29. In light of the above considerations and consultation responses I am satisfied that the scheme put forward accords with policy and therefore request that delegated powers of approval be given subject to the finalisation of affordable housing requirements, a S.106 Agreement securing the affordable housing provision and the conditions listed

below. If the affordable housing issues cannot be resolved within one calendar month from the Committee being held, the application should be refused on grounds of failure to provide an affordable housing contribution.

(Delegated) Approval as amended by letters and plans dated 13/9/04, 20/9/04 and 22/9/04

1. Standard Condition A – Time limited permission (Reason A).
2. This permission does not include the details of materials listed on the approved drawing 03:947/03B. (Reason: Insufficient information has been provided for the Local Planning Authority to properly assess the impact of the finished appearance of the development.
3. Sc5:
 - a – Details of materials for external walls and roofs (Rc5aii)
 - b – Surface water drainage (Rc5b)
 - c – Foul water drainage (RC5c)
 - d – Refuse bin storage (Rc5d)
 - f – Materials for hard surfaced areas (Rc5f)
 - h – Underground works for the provision of infrastructure
 - add – Cycle parking facilities (Reason: To encourage travel by methods other than by car, as required by policy TP1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, 2004).
3. Sc12 – Height limit, worded ‘11.5 metres’ (Rc12b).
4. Sc51 – Landscaping (Rc51).
5. Sc52 – Implementation of landscaping (Rc52).
6. Sc57 – Landscaping (protection of existing trees) (Rc57).
7. Sc60 – Details of boundary treatment, worded ‘all site boundaries’ (Rc60).
8. A landscape management plan, including long-term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape and amenity areas shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the occupation of the dwellings on the site. The landscape management plan shall be carried out as approved. (RC To provide long term management of the landscaped areas.)
9. Sc26 – “During the period of construction” Power operated machinery, worded ‘before 8 am on weekdays and 8 am on Saturdays nor after 6pm on weekdays and 1pm on Saturdays (nor at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays) (Rc26);
10. B9 – Access road, worded ‘width of 5.5 metres’ (delete ‘for the distance of...’).
11. B10 – Access road
12. C3 – Parking, turning, loading and unloading:
 - a – turning
 - b – parking
13. D5 – Visibility, worded ‘2.0 metres x 2.0 metres’
14. A common turning area shall be provided within the site to enable vehicles to enter and leave the site in forward gear. Such area shall be provided prior to the occupation of any of the flats and thereafter shall be maintained. (RC10-14 RC10 Safety)
15. Sc66 – Archaeology worded ‘application site’ (Rc66).
16. The block of flats, hereby permitted, shall not be occupied until the remaining house at no. 750 has been converted into two flats and the amenity land has been laid out in accordance with the approved details. (Reason: To ensure that the house does not continue to be occupied as a single dwelling, as it would suffer a loss of residential amenity through overlooking and loss of privacy of its private garden area).

Informatives

1. Should driven pile foundations be proposed, then 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 and demolition there shall be no bonfires or burning of waste except with the prior permission of the Environmental Health Officer in accordance with best practice and existing waste management legislation.

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:
P1/1 'Approach to Development', P1/3 'Sustainable Design in Built Development', P5/3 – Density and P5/4 'Meeting Locally Identified Housing Needs'.
South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:
SE4 'Group and Infill Villages', HG7 'Affordable Housing on Sites Within Village Frameworks', HG10 'Housing Mix and Design', HG12 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings Within Frameworks', TP1 'Planning More Sustainable Travel', CS3 'Foul And Surface Water Drainage', CS4 'Ground Water Protection', CS10 'Education', CS13 'Community Safety', and EN5 'The Landscaping Of New 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 Amenities
 - Provision of Affordable Housing
 - Landscaping
 - Highways Matters
 - Drainage
 - Bin Storage
 - Materials
 - Archaeology
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 files Ref: S/1896/2003/F, S/0281/04/F, and S/1419/04/F

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

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation
Control Committee

6th October 2004

AUTHOR/S: Director of Development Services

S/1858/04/F - Teversham
Erection of two-storey side extension, 5 Dolphin Close, for Mr G Wright

Recommendation: Approval

Site and Proposal

1. No 5 Dolphin Close is a two-storey, semi detached property, located within the Cherry Hinton residential estate. The application property has an asymmetrical roof, which, to the rear of the property measures just 2.6 metres in height.
2. To the front of the dwelling is a modest area and driveway, whilst to the rear is a relatively small, but reasonably private grassed garden. A single storey covered parking area is located to the side of the dwelling. The carport like structure extends up to the boundary of the site shared with the adjacent property No 3 and has a shallow lean-to roof.
3. The side boundary of the site tapers slightly with the rear boundary being approximately 1.7metres wider than the front.
4. The application, received on 3rd September 2004, proposes a two storey side extension set back from the front building of the property by 2.05 metres. The structure measures 2.7 metres in width and towards the front of the site will, like the existing carport, extend up to the side boundary of the site. The eaves height of the extension is the same as that of the main dwelling. Given the reduced span, the ridge height of the extension will however be 1.2 metres lower. The extension has no flank elevation windows while to the rear it is proposed that a single velux window be inserted within the roof slope.
5. Sufficient space to park one car will be provided to the front of the extension.

Planning History

6. S/0859/04/F – Erection of two storey side and rear extension – Refused on grounds of adverse impact upon the amenities of No 3 Dolphin Close and Nos. 12 and 14 Antelope Way, contrary to Policy HG122 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.

Planning Policy

7. **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.

8. **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.

Consultation

9. **Teversham Parish Council – Refuse for following reasons:**
- Loss of visual separation between properties
 - Setting of precedent with resultant terracing that maybe caused
 - Overdevelopment
 - Impact on adjacent property No 3 Dolphin Close and properties to rear, Nos 12 and 14 Antelope Way by reason of undue loss of light and appearing overbearing
 - Inadequate parking

Representations

10. At the time of writing this report no representations had been received. As the consultation period does not expire until 30th September 2004, any comments that are received will be reported verbally to Members.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

11. The key issues to consider in this application are the impact of the two-storey side extension on the residential amenities of the surrounding properties and the impact of the extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Residential Amenity

12. Given the siting and design of the proposed two-storey side extension, the proposed structure will have no adverse affect on the attached property, No 7 Dolphin Close.
13. Whilst the proposed structure will extended along the common boundary shared with No 3 Dolphin Close, the extension does not protrude beyond the rear building line of the adjacent property. The roof design of the extension mirrors that of the existing dwelling and measures just 2.6 metres in height at its rear most point. This roof structure is considered sympathetic and whilst sited closer to No 3, the lowered ridge height will ensure that the overshadowing and overbearing affect of the dwelling will not be considerably increased.
14. No 3 does have two ground floor and one first floor window sited within the flank elevation of the property. Whilst sited to the north of the application site, these openings all serve non-habitable rooms and are already overshadowed by the application property.
15. The proposed extension has no windows inserted in the flank elevation, which would raise concerns of overlooking. A condition ensuring that no windows are subsequently added within this elevation would be recommended.
16. Nos 12 and 14 Antelope Way are similarly designed properties located to the rear of, the site, (to the east). Like the application property, the rear elevations of these properties slope down to single storey level. The rear gardens of Nos 12 and 14 Antelope Way are similarly short, measuring just 8 metres in length. Antelope Way is also built at a slightly lower ground level.

17. Whilst the proposed extension will reduce some of the visual separation provided between Nos 3 and 5 Dolphin Close, this two-storey addition is lower than the existing dwelling and measures just 2.8 metres in width. The rear elevation of Nos 12 and 14 Antelope Way are sited some 16 metres away from the proposed extension and for this reason it is considered that the additional building mass that will be added by this proposal will not significantly impinge on the residential amenity of these properties.
18. The two rear facing windows proposed are a roof light that serves a bathroom and a kitchen window at ground floor level. Neither of these openings will increase the overlooking potential of the property. There are existing roof lights sited within the roof slope of the dwelling that serve a bedroom.
19. The previous application, reference S/0859/04/F proposed a similar two storey side extension. However to the rear, rather than reducing to a single storey level, the proposed extension formed a two-storey, gable end structure, that extended 1.5 metres beyond the rear building line of the dwelling and measured 5.95 metres in width and 8.2 metres in height. This application was refused due to the overbearing, overlooking and overshadowing affect of the extension in relation to No 3 Dolphin Close and Nos 12 and 14 Antelope Way. This amended application which does not extend beyond the rear elevation of the dwelling and is considerably lower, suitably addresses these reasons for refusal.

Street scene

20. The visual separation provided between detached properties is considered an important feature within the street scene. Whilst the proposed structure will extend right up to the boundary of the site, the extension is set 2 metres back from the front elevation of the dwelling. The ridge height of the structure is also 1.2 metres lower than that of the dwelling. These design features help to reduce the bulk of the extension when viewed from within the street and create a visual break within the front elevation of the dwelling.
21. The design and spacing between properties within the Close is varied and in the form proposed it is considered that the extension will not adversely affect the character and appearance of the area. Whilst the potential terracing of detached properties should be resisted, a suitable gap will be maintained between Nos 3 and 5.
22. The Parish Council is concerned that, in allowing this application, a damaging precedent would be set. Any subsequent applications will however be considered on their own merits. While the principle of this form of development will be set, any application which does not maintain important open spaces or would adversely affect the amenities of adjacent properties should be resisted.
23. With regard to the overdevelopment of the site, the application property already has a covered car port located to the side of the dwelling. Whilst the built up appearance of the site will be increased, sufficient undeveloped space will be retained to the front and rear of the property.
24. No details of additional car parking spaces have been submitted as part of this application. Sufficient space will however be provided to park one vehicle on the driveway. Whilst there is the potential to provide further spaces to the front of the property, this would require the front garden to be hard surfaced. Having regard to the Councils maximum car parking standards this is not considered necessary within this accessible region of the district.

Recommendation

25. Approve

1. Standard Condition A – Time limited permission (Reason SCA);
2. No first floor windows, doors or openings of any kind shall be inserted in the north facing flank elevation of the extension hereby permitted, unless expressly authorised by planning permission granted by the Local Planning Authority in that behalf

Reason – To safeguard the privacy of occupiers of the adjoining properties in accordance with the requirements of Policy HG12 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.

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: 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 overlooking, overshadowing and overbearing issues
 - Visual impact on the locality
 - Precedent
 - Off street car parking provision
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 2004-09-20 Planning files S/0859/04/F and S/1858/04/F

Contact Officer: Paul Belton – Planning Assistant
Telephone: (01954) 713253

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	6 th October 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

**S/2301/02/Circular 14/90 - Stow-Cum-Quy, Fen Ditton and Horningsea
Burwell to Horningsea 132 kv Dual Circuit Overhead Line, Land in the Parishes of
Stow-Cum-Quy, Fen Ditton and Horningsea – 24 Seven Utility Services Ltd now EDF
Energy**

Recommendation: No objections

Site and Proposal

1. The above application, originally received in November 2002 was reported to the 5th March 2003 Committee – Agenda attached as an Appendix.
2. The recommendation: “Until such time as detailed plans of mitigation have been prepared and agreed, I would advise Members to object to the proposal because of its detrimental visual impact on the stretch of open fenland landscape, which is designated Green Belt and Area of Best Landscape in the County Structure Plan and 1993 Approved Local Plan” was agreed.
3. In addition to this Council's objection, East Cambridgeshire District Council, together with Cambridgeshire County Council, both objected because of the detrimental impact on the open landscape.

Up-Date 1

4. Following the above objections Cambridge Landscape Architects were instructed to prepare proposals for mitigation for consultation with Council Officers and Landowners. The Environmental Statement (ES) submitted with the application had identified the significant variation in adverse visual impact according to distance from the line and the characteristics of the area. Although the E.S. had predicted that the adverse effects would be most significant within a distance of 500m from the line where there would be oblique views of the line and/or the towers would break the horizon, no schemes of mitigation had been submitted.
5. Cambridge Landscape Architects looked at a range of planting configurations to suit local conditions and to achieve variety and visual connection with existing features. This led to the conclusion that new planting areas would be most effective if established as linear features on field boundaries roughly parallel to and between 300m to 1000m from the line.
6. This strategy was illustrated and discussed with officers of all 3 authorities in March and May 2003 and generally endorsed, but confirmation was sought that, not only was the strategy feasible in terms of land ownership, but that its planting and future maintenance could be safeguarded.
7. Following the appointment of a firm of surveyors to act for EDF Energy, the scheme was discussed with all landowners, tenants and neighbours. Several of the original

planting sites were omitted because of constraints (machinery access, ditch clearance etc) whilst others have been added.

8. All the sites are subject to the final agreement of owners and the preparation of detailed plans and schedules identifying the dimensions of the site, the number of plants and their sizes. In the majority of cases the formal agreement both to planting and subsequent maintenance would be achieved under a permanent easement in the form of a Deed of Grant. Many of the landowners and tenants are the same as those over which the line is actually going; however, there are some landowners accepting planting sites who are not affected by the tower line.
9. The current schedules identify approximately 12,000 metres of field boundaries to be planted either with randomly positioned individual trees or with groups, hedges, hedgerows or plantations. (NB The overall length of the line from Burwell to Horningsea is approximately 10km for which 12km of field boundaries will be planted. 2.55km of the line will be within the South Cambridgeshire District.)

Up-Date - 2

10. Cambridgeshire County Council, at its meeting of the Development Control Committee on 13th September 2004, agreed to withdraw its previous objections subject to the Secretary of State imposing a condition requiring the implementation of the Mitigation Planting Proposals.

Up-Date - 3

11. In the second week of September two public exhibitions (12.00 noon – 8.00pm) were held in Burwell and Horningsea. These were manned by representatives from EDF Energy and Cambridge Landscape Architects. Written comments were made by some of those who visited the exhibitions and a breakdown of same will be made verbally.

Up- Date - 4

12. On 21st September both parties made a presentation to Members. It was explained that an underground alternative would not be feasible along the line of the present overhead line because of soil conditions, a high water table, existing waterways and lodes. There would be greater harm to the landscape and archaeology. Repairs would also take significantly longer than repairs to an overhead supply. If underground the route would have to be closer to the villages and more likely go along the present road system ie the B1102, Quy to Burwell.
13. The only other alternative would be a new overhead line from Burwell, cutting to the south-east of Swaffham Prior and Bulbeck and both Great and Little Wilbraham. Such a route would be substantially longer, affecting a greater number of the public, and be more visible crossing, as it would have to, the A14. A greater length would also be within the Green Belt. This route would be totally unacceptable.
14. The Landscape Mitigation Plans were fully explained by Cambridge Landscape Architects and it was confirmed that a Deed of Grant would be entered into by all parties. This would require, amongst other things, that all agreed planting would be fully maintained by the applicants for a period of five years and, for the next fifteen years, the landowner would be responsible. A pro-rata payment to the landowners from the applicants would go towards routine maintenance for such a period.

Planning Comments

15. The importance of the future development of the Cambridge sub-region is recognised in both regional planning documents and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan. The latter sets out a strategy to make provision for considerable levels of growth in and around the city (Policy P9/1) and also identifies the need for infrastructure provision, including utilities (Policy P9/8) as a key element in implementing the strategy.
16. Policies of the current South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, 2004 (HG1 and HG2) refer to some of this growth, but policies of the imminent Local Development Framework will refer to Northstowe, Cambridge East, Cambridge South etc.
17. It is vital that the electricity supply is augmented for existing residents and businesses and to enable the planned growth of the Cambridge sub-region to take place.
18. What is the alternative? Irrespective of the actual cost in economic terms, the cables cannot be put underground on the proposed route, - there are too many physical problems and the damage to the landscape, archaeology, wildlife, ecology etc. would be huge. If put underground, the line would probably have to follow the B1102, or somewhere close. I would anticipate that there would be far greater objection to this solution.
19. Likewise overhead to the south-east of the Swaffham and Wilbrahams is out of the question. With the "clock ticking" on the present supply system, this application is the only real solution.

Recommendation

20. That the District Council's objection is withdrawn subject to the Secretary of State imposing a condition requiring the implementation of the Visual Impact Mitigation Planting Proposals dated August 2004 or any variation to that scheme which may be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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

County Structure Plan 2003
South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
Application File ref S/2031/02/Circular 14/90

Contact Officer: Jem Belcham – Area Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713252

This page is intentionally left blank

6. **S/2301/02/CIRCULAR 14/90 - STOW-CUM-QUY, FEN DITTON AND HORNINGSEA BURWELL TO HORNINGSEA 132 KV DUAL CIRCUIT OVERHEAD LINE, LAND IN THE PARISHES OF STOW-CUM-QUY, FEN DITTON AND HORNINGSEA FOR 24 SEVEN UTILITY SERVICES LTD**

INTRODUCTION

24seven (formerly Eastern Electricity) is the company responsible for the operation and maintenance of the electricity distribution networks serving East Anglia. The network is owned by EPN Distribution Limited and 24seven has a contract with them governing its operation. EPN is a "Public Electricity Supplier" and the statutory requirements governing the supply of electricity are set out in the Electricity Act 1989.

24seven, on behalf of EPN, is applying to the Secretary of State for the Department of Trade and Industry (SoS) under section 37 of the 1989 Act for consent to construct a 132,000volt dual circuit overhead tower line from Burwell to Horningsea. Consent constitutes "deemed planning permission" and may be given subject to conditions. The procedure requires formal consultation with Cambridgeshire County Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council and South Cambridgeshire County Council so that the views of the local authorities can be taken into account by the SoS prior to a decision being reached on the application. The local authorities may object to the proposed development and give grounds for doing so and/or request that a Public Inquiry be held before the SoS gives his direction.

The application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES). The ES addresses the following issues: Description of need and options; Project description; Planning Policy framework; Landscape and Recreation; Ecology; Archaeology; Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings; Agriculture; Highways; and Health and Safety. The principal permanent effect has been identified as concerning the visual impact of the proposed power line in respect of its impact on the character of the local landscape and views from within and across it.

SITE AND PROPOSAL

Running approximately North/South, and to the west of Burwell is a 400kv line which forms part of the National Grid.

Off this from the existing sub-station at Burwell, a 132kv overhead power line on lattice towers crosses the open countryside to the north of Reach and to the north-west of Swaffham Prior, Swaffham Bulbeck, Lode and Stow-Cum-Quy. At Snout Corner, to the south-east of Horningsea the line divides, running south to the sub-station at Fulbourn and west across the Cambridge sewage works, the Science Park and the remainder of the Northern fringe (NB this latter section has recently been placed underground.)

The Circular 14/90 application, received on 28th November, proposes the erection of a 2.55km/1.6mile (within South Cambridgeshire) 132kv overhead electricity line on steel pylons, the average height of which will be 30.0m as is the existing line. The proposed route will run to the north-west and parallel to the existing, at a distance of between 50m and 110m.

POLICY

The route in South Cambridgeshire lies entirely within the Green Belt and Area of Best Landscape (1995 Structure Plan and 1993 Local Plan only)

The following policies are relevant:

Cambridgeshire Structure Plan (1995)

Policy SP10/1 Protection of Grades 1, 2 or 3a agricultural land from irreversible development

Policy SP12/1 Restriction of development in the countryside
Policy SP12/2 Development in Areas of Best Landscape

Policy SP12/5 Nature conservation zones
Policy SP12/6 Development and landscape character
Policy SP12/7 Retention and creation of wildlife habitats
Policy SP18/3 Green Belt

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (1993)

Policy CS5 Development by statutory undertakers
Policy C1 Development in Areas of Best Landscape
Policy C3 Protection of long distance views
Policy C13 Protection of wildlife habitats
Policy C16 Archaeology

Local Plan No 2: Proposed Modifications 2002

Policy GB2 Development within the Green Belt
Policy CS10 Development by utility companies
Policy EN1 Landscape Character Areas
Policy EN10 Nature Conservation: identified sites
Policy EN15 Nature conservation: unidentified sites
Policy EN19 Requirement for archaeological evaluation

APPLICANT'S JUSTIFICATION OF NEED

The proposal is a consequence of recent increases in demand for electricity and the anticipated growth in demand which will arise from future development in the Cambridge area. The electricity supply for the City of Cambridge and its surrounding area is obtained from the National grid Company's (NGC) site at Burwell. Supplies from Burwell are distributed to Cambridge by a double circuit tower line operating at 132,000volts. This supplies two grid sub-stations at Histon and Fulbourn from where distribution at lower voltage takes place.

Over the last six years load growth on the Cambridge network has increased significantly above the average for the EPN network – about 3% compared with 1% across the EPN network as a whole. The capacity limit from NGC at Burwell has now been reached. The envisaged continued development in the region has major implications for the electricity supply infrastructure for Cambridgeshire.

To meet the continuing load growth it is necessary to increase the capacity at Burwell, to increase the number of circuits between Burwell and Cambridge and to provide additional capacity at the grid sub-stations. The tower line circuits from Burwell to Histon and Fulbourn grids are operating at their maximum capacity and it is therefore necessary to increase the number. Failure to do so could lead to widespread losses of supply for extended periods. Faults are more likely to produce a cascading affect as the remaining equipment is overloaded and either trips or fails. Equipment failures at this voltage can take months to resolve. A failure to maintain security of supply contravenes EPN's licence obligations so to "do nothing" is not an option.

As well as the proposed strategy, an alternative was considered: connecting the Burwell Super Grid Substation to Fulbourn Grid with two circuits following a similar route to the existing 33kv overhead circuit, a distance of about 15 km. However, the proposed strategy is considered preferable as it involves the minimum amount of new construction and maximises the use of existing assets. To achieve the proposed strategy a number of options were evaluated. The existing towers already carry the maximum structural loads acceptable for their design and safety requirements so it is not feasible to increase the electrical load capacity of the line by replacing the conductors or by adding additional circuits. Whilst it would be possible to increase the load capacity of the two circuits by replacing the existing

towers with the design used for higher voltages, this would not provide the necessary four circuits. There is no design approved for use in the UK, which is capable of taking four circuits. If there were it would be about 30.0m wide and visually 'heavier' than two rows of pylons.

The options considered to be technically feasible were:

- i) Two separate circuits of 'H-Type' wood pole construction would require a swathe of land approximately 40 metres wide. The span achievable with this design is approximately half that of steel towers, greatly increasing the difficulties in both locating pole positions and the amount of agricultural land affected. The size of conductor for wooden pole construction is limited and would impose a significant constraint on the capacity available for future network development. Cost: approximately twice that of a double circuit steel tower line.
- ii) Two underground cable circuits. Cost: at least five times that of a double circuit steel tower line. This ratio is based on the same route as the proposed overhead line but to avoid significant interference with archaeological, ecological, drainage and agricultural interests, a route substantially following the highway would be needed, thus increasing the length of excavation and reinstatement and therefore the cost. There are no network benefits from installing cable. Data indicates that, per kilometre, a greater number of faults occur on 132 kv cables than on 132 kv overhead lines. Repair times and costs are also significantly greater for cables.

Another option, but not seriously considered for obvious reasons, is to run a parallel line from the National Grid near St Neots, the line passing close to Papworth Everard, Elsworth, Knapwell, Dry Drayton, Girton and Histon. The other difficulty with such a route is its length as the amount of power reduces over distance.

CONSULTATIONS

Fen Ditton Parish Council objects as 'it would have a detrimental environmental effect on Quy Fen, which is a Conservation Area'. (NB Quy Fen is a Site of Special Scientific Interest, an S.S.S.I. not a Conservation Area.)

Horningsea Parish Council recommends refusal stating:

"A 4 circuit structure (as used in Europe) would be preferable in this case. Duplication is cheaper and easier but very environmentally unfriendly. Figure 7 omits to show Quy Fen as an area open to public access and this is surely significant. We need a visit from 24/7 utilities to our next Parish Council meeting".

Following a Parish Council meeting at which representatives of 24/7 came to give a presentation of the scheme, Horningsea Parish Council still maintains its objection, stating:

1. We remain very concerned about the environmental impact of a second series of pylons and cables/wires. The route passes through or adjacent to important areas of countryside including Quy Fen which is an SSSI and public space used by the parishioners of Horningsea, Fen Ditton and Quy for recreational purposes. Horningsea was also the site of an important Roman settlement, and although the proposed route does not pass over the Site of Archaeological Importance there are remnants of the Roman settlement in many of the fields in Horningsea Parish. You will be aware that the National Trust has a plan to purchase much of the land over which the cables will pass, as they regard this as a unique area of our natural heritage. It will be impossible to disguise the cables or reduce the environmental impact.
2. We found it difficult to accept the argument that the cost of putting cables underground was prohibitively expensive. The suggested cost of £10m appears to be minimal in the context of the reasons for the requirement to double to amount of power. If the new developments by the University at Madingly Road, Addenbrookes and the "new development" (at Oakington or wherever) require such additional power, the cost of contributing to the underground cabling

should be included in the planning permission. We also consider that when planning permission is granted for such large-scale developments, some consideration should be given to use of alternative sources of energy, which may in the long run be more sustainable in any event.

3. We do not accept the suggestion that there is no alternative route for the cables, as it seems that if a southern route were taken to link into Fulbourn, the existing cables would be sufficient for the northern parts of the city, including the new developments.
4. Despite the assurances given by members of '24seven', members of the public remain very concerned about the health impact of living close to or under the cables. A particular concern was raised about the health of livestock and horses, which graze in the fields under the route.

For these reasons we would ask the relevant authorities to reject the application."

Stow-Cum-Quy Parish Council makes no recommendation, but has the following comments:

- i) Could the new line not be erected closer to the existing?
- ii) Regarding Health and safety. All the information relates to a single 132kv overhead line. Is there information on EMI's produced from parallel/double lines? Results from research to possible health risk suggest a statistical increased risk to children in homes with an averaged magnetic field over 0.4 micro teslas – this applies to fewer than half per cent of children in the UK – how many is that?"

The Environment Agency states that the line will cross at least three 'statutory Main Rivers' for which consent will be required, consent is required for works within 9.0m of the top of a river bank and that there should be no raising of ground levels as the site is within a flood risk area.

See also the attached appendix for County Consultations.

REPRESENTATIONS

A letter has been received from agents acting for the Bottisham United Charities, which supports the objections made by various Parish Councils to the environmental impact that a second row of pylons would have on the fen landscape. The latter also refers to difficulties farmers would have in cultivating their fields.

PLANNING COMMENTS

There will be very little impact of the line on the countryside when viewed from public roads. The closest point will be from the Fen Ditton/Horningsea Road, immediately after the point where it crosses the A14 towards Horningsea. Here, Snout Corner is 750m away and, because the line runs away to the north-east, at an angle of approximately 30° to the road, it will be over 1km distant at the other end of the village.

The fundamental impact from the additional row of pylons (10 in total in South Cambridgeshire) will be to the fen landscape as seen from the numerous public rights of way, footpaths and bridleways, which criss-cross this landscape. Low Fen Drove Way, The Drove Way and Harcamlow Way all pass under the line with the last two being linked to each other by three other paths within 400m of the route of the new line.

In the accompanying Environmental Impact Assessment, reference to the mitigation effects to the proposal are given as:

- "6.83 The mitigation of the adverse effects of constructing overhead lines is generally achieved at the stage of broad scale route planning. There is also scope at a more detailed level to plan the route to avoid damaging features of the landscape. The route selection and detailed alignment

has minimised the adverse effects.

- 6.84.1 There is considerable scope for the reinforcement of hedgerows and the planting of trees near the overhead line. This could be done in a way which is consistent with the visual characteristics of the fens as outlined in the Cambridgeshire Landscape Guidelines such as by the planting isolated trees and clumps or by the planting of substantial belts. The aim would be to enrich the visual characteristics of the area and to assimilate rather than to screen the line.
- 6.85 The strategy would have most beneficial effect in the area to the north of Swaffham Bulbeck Lode. The fact that the visual effects outlined above have a dispersed nature as opposed to concerning a limited number of specific viewpoints means that tree planting will mitigate the effects wherever it occurs within the area and within 2km of the line. It is recommended that this approach should be explored at a more detailed level in consultation with landowners and officers of the local authorities.”

What concerns me here is the last paragraph, 6.85. The applicants recognise that the visual effects of the second row of pylons will have a damaging effect on the landscape and that this will be over a large area – reference is made to an area within 2km of the line, the solution would appear to be “explore at a more detailed level in consultation with landowners” the reinforcement of hedgerows and the planting of trees.

This is (hopefully) finding a solution to a problem after permission has been ‘granted’, and dependant upon other parties agreeing.

Measures of mitigation, ie landscaping, should be submitted at the time of the proposal, not afterwards. What guarantee is there that the planting will be implemented and, more importantly, maintained? The proposal will have a negative impact on views from within and into this relatively flat landscape.

Equally, the visual amenities of the Green Belt should not be injured by proposals for development within it (para 3.15 Planning Policy Guidance 2, ‘Green Belts’). Visual harm will occur.

Part of the proposed route immediately adjoins Stow-cum-Quy Fen SSSI and five of the tower locations are within 200 metres of it. The ES requires monitoring of the construction of these towers to ensure no physical disturbance to the SSSI.

The adverse visual impact has to be balanced against the need for the proposal to support the continuing and future development of the Cambridge Sub-region.

RECOMMENDATION

Until such time as detailed plans of mitigation have been prepared and agreed, I would advise Members to object to the proposal because of its detrimental visual impact on the stretch of open fenland landscape, which is designated Green Belt and area of best landscape in the county structure plan and 1993 approved local plan.

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation Control
Committee

6th October 2004

AUTHOR/S: Director of Development Services

**S/1612/04/RM - Waterbeach
Two Houses (Amended Design) at 48 Denny End Road
for Mr. P. Munro**

Recommendation: Approval

Site and Proposal

1. The 0.08 hectare site comprises the plot of a former bungalow, which has been demolished to make way for a pair of semi-detached houses, now nearing completion. The site fronts Denny End Road, opposite Winfold Road and is neighboured by houses on either side. To the east is no. 46, a detached house; with a gable to the road, set back in its plot with a flat-roofed projecting double garage. It has three first floor side windows that face the site. Two are secondary windows situated at high level that serve bedrooms at the front and rear; the third, centrally located window, is to the stairs. At ground floor two lounge windows also face the site. To the west of the site is no. 50, a small, detached house, also set back behind no. 48 with a blank gable. It has been extended to the side.
2. This reserved matters application, received on the 3rd August 2004 proposes amendments to the design previously approved (and now under construction) to allow the creation of second floor accommodation in the loft space of each of the dwellings. The stairs to this accommodation will be lit by small, high-level velux windows and each of the bedrooms by two larger velux windows, all in the rear elevation. Planning permission is required for these amendments, as the dwellings have not been substantially completed or occupied. All other matters have been considered in previous planning applications.
3. The application was amended on the 25th August 2004 and 13th September 2004. The amendments included details of the additional openings and a plan of the second floor.

Planning History

4. Planning permission was initially refused in 2002 (**S/1887/02/F**) for a single house on the site with a garage. It was considered that the dwelling proposed was unduly prominent, out of scale with adjacent dwellings, would result in loss of light to no. 46, and would have an overbearing appearance when viewed from no. 46.
5. Outline planning permission (Ref: **S/1088/03/O**) has been granted for the pair of semi-detached dwellings that are now under construction. The permission included details of siting and access. A reserved matters application was subsequently approved for the design and external appearance of the two houses under application **S/2611/03/RM**.

Planning Policy

6. **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.
7. **Policy SE2 ‘Rural Growth Settlements’** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 defines Waterbeach as a Rural Growth Settlement in which residential development will be permitted on unallocated land providing the development meets with the criteria of this and other policies included within the Local Plan. In particular, criteria (c) of this policy states that developments should be sensitive to the amenities of neighbours.

Consultations

8. **Waterbeach Parish Council** recommended refusal on grounds of lack of privacy to neighbours. In response to consultation on the revised plans it added that it is unhappy that the side doors have been added at such a late stage and that these will infringe on the privacy of neighbours; over-development of the site, in light of refusal of a five-bedroom detached house on the site, they consider two four-bedroom dwellings should not be permitted.
9. **Waterbeach Internal Drainage Board** has no comment.

Representations

10. The occupier of no. 46 Denny End Road has written objecting to the proposals on grounds of loss of privacy, overlooking, increased level of bedroom accommodation with inadequate living accommodation, increase in car parking requirement resulting from the increased number of bedrooms, overlooking from side door, the building appears out of scale with the adjacent dwellings and prominent in the area, overbearing and oppressive, retrospective nature of the application. The writer adds that restrictions on future alterations such as additional windows and extensions should be imposed.
11. The residents of no. 50 Denny End Road also object on grounds of loss of light, excessive, overbearing and out of character with the area, loss of privacy to garden and close proximity of side door to their lounge.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

12. The key issues to consider in respect of this application are the impact of the amendments to the approved design, which included adding a second floor, side doors and first floor side windows. All other matters have been considered previously when permission was granted in 2003. The likely impacts of these amendments are considered in paragraphs 16-21 below.

Residential amenities

13. The introduction of additional openings in the side elevations of these dwellings will not significantly harm the neighbouring residential amenities. The side doors serving the kitchens at ground floor will not result in overlooking or loss of privacy, as these are secondary openings. The door on the west elevation faces the blank side elevation of no. 50, while the door in the east elevation faces a 1.8 metre high close-board fence that largely blocks views across to no. 46. The first floor side windows

are to serve the stairs. Stair windows generally do not result in significant loss of privacy, however as no. 46 does have windows facing the site obscure glazing would be appropriate.

14. Two rear facing velux windows will serve each of the proposed second floor bedrooms. The third, smaller velux windows will light the stairs up to these rooms in each of the units. In light of neighbour's concerns regarding overlooking and loss of privacy the Case Officer has visited the site and has observed the views from the velux windows. Views from the roof windows in these dwellings do not allow additional overlooking or loss of privacy. It was only possible to view the very end part of the rear garden to no.50, which is also screened by a tree in the garden of that property. The main view from the second floor was of the roof itself.
15. No. 46 has a secondary, high-level, first floor window that serves the rear bedroom. If leaning out of the velux window, it was possible to view this window from above. The angle between the two windows was such that it is unlikely that views into the bedroom could be achieved. No additional overlooking of the private garden area was possible either, therefore, it was concluded that no significant harm to the neighbouring residential amenities would result.

Street scene

16. The dwelling has been approved previously at a total height of 9 metres above ground level. Case Officers have checked on site and are satisfied that this has not been exceeded.

Car parking

17. The additional bedroom does not increase the car parking requirement, as the maximum standard is two car parking spaces for dwellings of 3 or more bedrooms. The site layout provides for this level of car parking.

Permitted development rights

18. Due to the relative sensitive relationship with the neighbouring dwellings and in light of the neighbours concerns, removal of permitted development rights for additional side openings is recommended.

Recommendation

19. It is recommended that the reserved matter of design and external appearance be approved, as amended by drawings 3095/1 date stamped 3rd September 2004 and 3095/2 date stamped 25th August 2004, and in accordance with outline planning permission dated 4th August 2003, reference S/1088/03/O, subject to the following conditions:
 1. SC22 – No further windows, worded 'no windows at first and second floor level in the east and west elevations of the development' (RC22).
 2. SC23 – Obscured glazing, worded 'The first floor windows in the east and west elevations' (RC23).
 3. SC52 – Implementation of landscaping (RC52)
 4. SC60 – Boundary treatment, worded 'front boundary' (RC60)

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).
2. The reserved matter 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
 - Car parking
 - Street scene
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 reserved matter.

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/1612/04/RM, S/2611/03/RM, S/1088/03/O and S/1887/02/F.

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

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	6th October 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

**S/1217/04/F - Waterbeach
Redevelopment of Existing Caravan Park to Comprise
34 Touring Pitches, New Toilet/Shower/Laundry Block, Reception Building and
Internal Road.
Extension of Season to 11 Months from 6th February to 5th January,
'Travellers Rest' Caravan Park, Chittering
for C. Crickmore**

Recommendation: Delegated Approval

Site and Proposal

1. The above application was Deferred at the 4th August Committee (Item No. 5) in order that further time could be given for the preparation of revised plans for the site access, together with the widening of School Lane, and also for the drafting of safeguarding conditions to cover the length of time a caravan(s) could stay on site. A copy of the August Report is attached as Appendix 1.

Update - Highways etc

2. i) **Access.** The applicant has employed a Highway Engineer who has worked closely with the local Highway Authority. A revised plan has been submitted, approved by the latter, which proposes:-
 - widening the existing access from School Lane from 4.4 metres to 6.8 metres, together with the provision of 1.5 metres wide footway on its western side;
 - its junction with School Lane would be provided with a 10.5 metre kerb radii and 4.5 metre x 45.0 metre visibility splay to the west i.e. towards the A10. The opposite side of the bell-mouth would have a smaller radii and 2.4 metres x 70.0 metres visibility splay.
3. ii) **School Lane.** At present School Lane, from the caravan park entrance to the A10, varies in width between 4.0 metres - 5.5 metres. Further east it is less than 4.0 metres wide. The revised plan widens School Lane to 6.8 metres from the inner-most point of the kerb radii with the A10, to just beyond the caravan park entrance. Thereafter, it reduces with a 1:25 taper, 40.0 metres long, to its present width.
4. iii) **Public House Access.** As recommended by the Local Highway Authority, it is proposed to close the present access to the public house car park onto the A10. Members agreed this closure in August. Access will now be achieved via the new caravan park access.
5. iv) **Guest Bedrooms.** Members will also recall at the August meeting, granting Delegated powers of approval for 8 guest bedrooms sited to the rear of the

public house. This was subject to the current access being closed and revised access plans being submitted. The same plans have been submitted for this scheme, but has resulted in a small change to the layout of the bedroom block. A new beer garden, to replace that to be built on, is also planned.

6. v) **Signage.** It is also proposed to install standard/corporate highway signs in the verge opposite the School Lane junction, one for the 'Travellers Rest', the other the usual brown and white logo sign of a caravan and a tent.
7. vi) **Caravan Park Layout.** This stays fundamentally the same but the widening of the access roadway has meant that the proposed Reception/Office building, now 12.0 metres x 7.0 metres, is to be re-sited on the opposite side of the road and the number of pitches reduced to 34.

Update - Conditions

8. The current consent for the site permits the use of the land and a '40 pitch camping and caravanning site' between the 1st April and 30th September in any one year.

The applicants wish to continue this use, but to bring it up to meet modern standards and expectations, and also to extend the season to 11 months i.e. from 6th February in one year to 5th January in the following.

Please refer to Appendix 2 - the letter from Humberts Leisure dated 6th May 2004.

9. Local concern centres on the fact that the site, if granted for the extended season, will become a permanent residential site. That is not the applicant's intention and is not relevant to this application. If matters were to change in the future then a decision will be taken at that time, taking into account the use(s) and relevant policies of the Development Plan. An application cannot be determined on what may, or may not, happen in the future.
10. Government advice and Case Law have both endorsed that the imposition of a condition requiring that the site should not be used outside the permitted time and that all touring caravans are removed is a valid condition.
11. The storage of caravans is a separate use for which consent would be required. Again, it is not part of this application.
12. It is suggested that a condition be imposed to the effect that a touring caravan can only stay for a specific number of days. This is more controversial due to severe problems of enforcement; the monitoring of pitch letting records being required.
13. As can be seen from the Agent's letter of 12th August, attached as Appendix 3, more sites are allowing a caravan owner to leave the caravan on site when not in use, so that they can return the following week, later in the month or whenever. Whilst I accept that this may have some effect on the visual quality of the area, there are obvious gains to the residents of Chittering, and users of the A10, in that traffic movements are reduced substantially. There are no such conditions on the present use of the land and 'what is to stop a caravan owner, if such a condition were to be imposed, leaving the caravan park with his caravan, turning round, re-entering the park, and booking onto another pitch?'

14. In light of the current, unrestricted consent on the land, and Case Law, I would recommend conditions restricting the use of the caravan park to touring caravans only, and only to be occupied by persons on holiday and only with a main place of residence elsewhere and that all caravans are removed on or before 5th January, not to return until the 6th February at the earliest.
15. Again, from Case Law, it is clear that a 'static caravan' is one that is 'plugged in', i.e. permanent connections for electricity, water and foul drainage. This is a separate use for which planning permission would be required. A touring caravan will probably have a temporary connection to an electrical hook-up point only. Water would be collected from a water point and waste water/foul waste disposed of at a disposal point within the central shower block.

Planning Comments - Key Issues

16. Although the land has the benefit of a consent for 40 pitches, there are no restrictive conditions other than that it can only operate for 6 months of the year. It is clear that the holiday industry has changed dramatically in the 30 years since consent was granted, as have people's life-styles and spare time. Expectations are also far higher.
17. The proposed layout, now for 34 pitches and facilities, is what the public expects today. As explained above, it is extremely difficult, if not impracticable and unenforceable, to impose conditions restricting length of stay etc. However, those suggested above are felt to be reasonable.
18. Since the August Committee the **Environment Agency** has asked for the submission of a Flood Risk Assessment. The applicant has an engineer investigating this issue and a verbal report will be made in this respect.

Recommendation

19. Delegated approval, subject to the satisfactory resolution of the Flood Risk Assessment, and as amended by Drawing No. 2004-11-2 Rev A and 2004-11-3, by M. S. Ford Associates, together with letter dated 10/9/04 and Drawing No. 01/B franked 15/9/04, and to the following conditions:
 1. Standard Condition 'A' - Time limited permission (Reason 'A')
 2. The site shall not be used other than for holiday purposes only, with any touring caravan, camper van or tent occupied by holidaymakers whose main place of residence is elsewhere. (Rc - To ensure that the site is used in connection with the tourism industry only and is not occupied by persons other than holiday makers and not for residential purposes.)
 3. No touring caravans, camper vans or tents shall remain on site during the period 6th January and 5th February in any one year. (Rc - To ensure that the site is used in connection with the tourism industry only and is not occupied by persons other than holiday makers and not for residential purposes.)
 4. No pitches or any other part of the site shall be occupied at any time by a static caravan. (Rc - To ensure that the site is not used for temporary, seasonal and/or permanent residential purposes.)
 5. SC51 - Landscaping Scheme. (Rc51)

6. SC 52 - Implementation of Landscaping. (Rc52)
7. SC60 - Boundary Treatment 'all'. (Rc60)
8. SC5f - Hardsurfing and 'individual pitches, parking and patio areas'. All such areas shall be constructed with their finished surface level at the same level as existing ground levels. (RC5f) 'and to protect its rural qualities'.)
9. SC5a - Materials 'walls and roofs' (Rc5a ii)
10. No development shall be commenced until detailed elevations of the Reception/Office building have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority; the development shall be completed in accordance with such plans. (Rc - To ensure the details of the development are satisfactory.)
11. SC66 - Archaeological investigation. (Rc66)
12. The existing access into the present car park from the A10/Ely Road shall be permanently and effectively closed prior to the commencement of the use hereby approved. (Rc - Para.) (Rc10 - safety.)
13. All highway improvements to School Lane shown on Drawing Number 2004-11-2 Rev A (M. S. Ford Associates), together with the widened access into the touring caravan site shall be completed prior to any development hereby approved commencing. (Rc - Para.) (Rc10 - safety.)
14. + any additional conditions requested by the Environment Agency.

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:**
P7/6 (Historic Built Environment)
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:**
EN15 and RT11
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:
 - too large a facility for such a small community and would put a strain on local services;
 - if 11 months, the site would become a permanent residential one;
 - noise and disturbance to neighbours;
 - poor access; increase in traffic on A10;
 - layout too dense.

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/1217/04/F

Contact Officer: Jem Belcham - Area Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713252

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation
Control Committee

4th August 2004

AUTHOR/S: Director of Development Services

S/1217/04/F - Waterbeach

**Redevelopment of Existing Caravan Park to Comprise 39 Touring Pitches,
New Toilet/Shower/Laundry Block, Reception Building and Internal
Road. Extension to Season to 11 Months from 6th February to 5th January.
“Travellers Rest” Caravan Park, Chittering for C. Crickmore**

Recommendation – Delegated Approval

Site and Proposal

1. Grass field of 0.9ha area to the north of the “Travellers Rest” public house/restaurant on the eastern side of Ely Road/A10, on the corner of School Lane. To the north is a house, to the rear of which is a small commercial brewery, to the east farmland and the garden of a house in School Lane.
2. Entrance to the site onto School Lane is between a childrens play area and the rear of the public house/restaurant. Opposite are houses on School Lane.
3. The full application, received 10th June, proposes the construction of a loop road within the site, off which would be 38/39 caravan pitches, a toilet, shower, laundry block and a Reception building. Water points, fire points and bin storage areas would be provided through the site.

Policy

4. Policy P1/2 of the Structure Plan seeks to restrict development “in the countryside unless the proposals can be demonstrated to be essential in a particular rural location”.
5. Policy P4/1 of the Structure Plan supports improved tourism facilities which, inter alia, increases employment facilities and improves the landscape.
6. Policy RT1 of the Local Plan highlights the fact that the Authority will resist proposals for recreation and tourist facilities if materials, structures and buildings are intrusive, there will be a loss of archaeological interests and there is inadequate landscaping.

History

7. In March 1974 (application ref C/73/1446) consent was granted to use the field for a touring caravan and camping site (40 pitches), plus toilets and shower block.
8. Condition 2 restricted use of the site for the summer months only – 1st April to 30th September in any one year. The reason for the condition was “to safeguard the interests of other users of land in the vicinity”.
9. In May 1986, (application ref. S/0294/86) consent to extend the above to cover the winter months was refused for the reason:-

“The use of this land for touring caravans during the winter months in an area where adequate facilities already exist would be visually detrimental to the open and rural appearance and character of the area”.

Consultations

10. **Waterbeach** Parish Council recommends approval and asks that no caravan should stay on site for more than 21 days and that there be no caravans on site during the “closed season”.
11. Following a recent meeting with a representative of the Local Highway Authority and the Area Officer, the Parish Council may comment further with regard to highway issues.
12. Any comments from **Landbeach** Parish Council will be reported verbally.
13. **Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service** is of the opinion that additional water supplies for fire fighting are not required.
14. **The Chief Environmental Health Officer** asks that a limitation on machinery hours during the period of construction be imposed on any approval.
15. The comments of the **Local Highway Authority** will be reported verbally but improvements to the access and widening of School Lane are expected.
16. The **Waterbeach Level Internal Drainage Board** does not object to the scheme in principle if adequate soakaways are provided. If other method(s) of surface water drainage are proposed the Board must be re-consulted.
17. The comments of the **Environment Agency** will be reported verbally.
18. The **County Archaeologist** recommends a site investigation be required by condition (see further comments below).

Representations - Applicant

19. A letter of 6th May from Humberts Leisure, agent for the applicant, is attached as an Appendix and outlines their client’s proposals and, more importantly, the change in the “holiday caravan industry” in the last 40 years.

Representations – Neighbours

20. Thirteen letters of objection have been received from residents, - points raised being:-
 - i) the scheme will double the size of the village which has no facilities – shop, Post Office, etc. What facilities will be provided by the Council if consent is granted?
 - ii) with such an increase, children will have to go to school which will put pressure on the school and school transport.
 - iii) Chittering is not a “highly desirable” tourist area. Not being popular the site will become permanent.

- iv) a six month summer season is adequate, there is no evidence of need to extend it to eleven months. If required over the Xmas/New Year period, then a special licence could be given for that period.
- v) if an eleven month period is agreed, the site will become a permanent mobile home park.
- vi) there should be a condition limiting the number of people on site to 50 at any one time.
- vii) conditions should be attached to any consent stating touring caravans only, one caravan/one family per pitch, 21 day stay maximum and no return within 14 days.
- viii) the extended period will increase noise and disturbance to neighbours.
- ix) if the extended period is agreed, then perhaps a temporary consent should be granted in order to judge its impact.
- x) no objections to a renewal of current licence for 40, - or even a slight increase, but keep to a 4 month period.
- xi) layout too dense.
- xii) scheme should be re-designed to have the road on the periphery of the site which would have some of the vans further away from adjacent residential boundaries. Extra screening is needed for privacy and, adjacent to the Brewery, the fence should be increased to 2.6m.
- xiii) there is noise from the adjacent Brewery, more at certain times of the year. The premises also has a reed bed for drainage which could be a danger.
- xiv) with a ditch along School Lane being filled in, the road occasionally floods.
- xv) the proposed shower block should be where it is at present and the Reception Block is new.
- xvi) the policy for Chittering is "no further development". If these buildings are allowed, plus the 8 bed guest rooms, their combined floor area amounts to two bungalows. New buildings are not allowed in the village.
- xvii) School Lane is single track and heavily trafficked already with school transport, and residential and agricultural traffic.
- xviii) extending the period from six months to eleven months will represent a huge increase in the amount of traffic.
- ixx) since consent was granted in 1974 there have been increases in the volume of traffic on the Ely Road/A10, - especially commuter traffic and lorries connected with the Waste Management Park.
- xx) the School Lane/Ely Road junction should be improved to cater for this extra traffic.
- xxi) the access is next to the children's play area.

- xxii) the bin lorry, when parked on School Lane collecting from the public house, can be a hazard.
- xxiii) the site could be developed for travellers. A local farmer took a field off the market after travellers showed an interest in buying it.

Planning Comments

21. The main issues to be considered in respect of this proposal are:

- Scale of development
- Extension to season
- Layout of site and proposed buildings
- Traffic and access
- Archaeology
- Conditions
- Other uses

i) Scale of Development

- 22. The site has planning consent for caravans/camping for a total of 40 pitches. Such could be implemented tomorrow with no further consents from the Council. The submitted layout plan proposes 38 caravan pitches
- 23. This application is for the actual “engineering and buildings works” ie roadway and hard-standings, together with the two buildings. As can be seen from the Agents letter, see Appendix, the standards expected by caravan site users has changed since consent was granted in the mid 1970’s. Then, users were happy to park on the grass with basic amenities, but today their requirements are much different. Although most caravans have limited bathroom/toilet facilities, there is still the need for a proper shower/laundry block. Likewise there has to be somewhere to “book in”, ie hence the need for a Reception building.
- 24. The shower block will be 4.1m high, the Reception building 3.8m. Buildings would be stained boarding with a slate or pantiled roofs and the site would be extensively landscaped.
- 25. In order to maintain the character of the site it is essential that all roads and hard-standings are constructed of sympathetic materials and at existing ground levels. The applicant has suggested the roadway to be tar-spray with a pea-shingle finish (similar to the new SCDC office car park), with timber edging, - not concrete kerbs. Individual hard-standings would again be a low key, natural materials.

ii) Extension to Season

- 26. Again, I would refer Members to the attached Appendix for the changes since consent was first granted.
- 27. It is not clear from the original file in 1973 whether the then applicant requested a six month period or whether it was imposed by the previous Authority. Either way the reason for the condition, “to safeguard the interests of other users of land in the vicinity”, does little to explain why it was for six months only.
- 28. In 1986 consent to allow “all year” caravan/camping on site was refused consent for two reasons, adequate facilities in the area and detrimental to the character of the area.

29. The large caravan/camping site at Landbeach Marina (now the Cambridge Research Park) has long been closed so the question of adequate need is no longer an issue. With proper screening/landscaping, there should be no loss of amenity to the area. There will, no doubt, be occasions during the six months of the summer, when there are not 39 or 38 caravans on site and this will certainly be the case in the extra five months requested.
30. If the site is satisfactory for the summer months and does not cause problems, what reason is there for not extending that period? I can appreciate the residents concerns about the site developing into a permanent mobile home park but that is not the proposal before the Authority.

iii) Layout of Site/Buildings

31. A simple, loop, road is the obvious way of laying out the site and a central toilet block is convenient to all. If, as suggested by a neighbour, the roadway is put adjacent the outside edge of the field, he would in my opinion, suffer more noise and disturbance from the road than from the caravan parked on the nearest plot.
32. The two buildings, as described earlier, are in scale with the site. The shower/toilet block includes both Male/Female toilets/washrooms, together with three showers each. There is also a disabled toilet and shower room. In addition, there are laundry and waste disposal facilities and a boiler room. The Reception Room is a front desk, office and toilet.

iv) Traffic and Access

33. These two issues are of great concern to the community and are also likely to be subject to further comment from Waterbeach Parish Council.
34. However it must be stressed that the site already has consent for 40 caravan/camping pitches so, in theory, there will be no increase in traffic. Following a meeting on site with the applicant, the Parish Council, the Area Planning Officer and a representative of the Local Highway Authority, I understand that the latter is likely to ask that the existing access off School Lane be widened and provided with proper kerb radii, and that School Lane be widened up to its junction with Ely Road. The access to the car park from Ely Road should be closed.

A verbal report will be made in respect of these matters.

35. With the site already having consent for camping/caravans, and with the closure of the public house/restaurant access to Ely Road which will have benefits for all, it is unlikely that the County Council could insist on the applicant funding improvements to the School Lane junction, ie a proper "ghost island".

v) Archaeology

36. In his request for a safeguarding condition, the County Archaeologist states:

"The proposed development site is situated alongside the A10, a major Roman routeway, in an area which has previously produced a number of Roman burials and contains extensive evidence for Roman settlement. Sites in the vicinity include the earthworks of a Roman farmstead/settlement on Chittering Hill, some 150m to the north, which is protected as a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SM 13605), a series of cropmarks indicating further settlement and associated field systems to the west and

a series of artefact scatters of Roman and Saxon date. In addition, the presence of a ring ditch (possibly the plough-levelled remains of a burial mound) suggests a much earlier element to the settlement and exploitation of the landscape in this area.”

37. Policy P7/6 of the Structure Plan and EN15 of the Local Plan stress the importance of early investigation of development sites prior to any approved works commencing.

vi **Conditions**

38. In addition to the standard conditions concerning materials for the buildings, hard landscaping, soft landscaping and drainage, it is essential to ensure that the site is only used for touring caravans and that the site is clear of all vans for one month of the year. Whilst a “21 day only” condition sounds a simple solution to the problem, officers are investigating this matter and checking Case Law. Also, it must be remembered that the existing consent has no such conditions.

A verbal up-date will be made in this respect.

vii **Other Uses**

39. When the applicant first purchased the property and moved onto the site, the community was fearful that the site was to be used for other forms of caravans/mobile homes. That is not the applicant’s intention but I can appreciate the local concern. The application, as with any other, has to be determined on the scheme submitted, not on what may, or may not, happen in the future.

Recommendation

40. That delegated approval be granted subject to revised plans showing the full access improvements being submitted and agreed and that suitable conditions be agreed, as summarised above.

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/1217/04/F

Contact Officer: Jem Belcham, Area Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713252

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	6 th October 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

**S/0856/04/F - Willingham
Stationing of four mobile homes on land off Schole Road for Mr D Bibby.**

Recommendation: Refuse

Site and Proposal

1. The application relates to land off Schole Road which at present accommodates the applicant and his immediate family. There are three mobile homes, a detached shower and toilet block and a garage, together with a range of stables and sheds. There are a number of lorries and vans at the rear of the site. The site is screened by conifer hedgerows along its frontage and western boundary.
2. Schole Road is a private unmetalled track located beyond the framework boundary for Willingham. There are bridleway rights running along its length. It has a poor surface, no lighting and no footway provision. There is a mixture of sporadic housing, farm buildings and agricultural land adjoining the track.
3. The application, dated 16th April 2004, seeks permission for the stationing of four mobile homes on the site in addition to the two that have the benefit of planning permission at present. These are for occupation by the applicant's three children, their partners and their children.
4. In supporting statements, the applicant states that he has been bereaved by the death of his wife and one son. He has lived at the site for 14 years and he wishes to keep the remainder of his family around him to help him cope. He does not wish to move from the site. He states that his is a travelling family that travels to make a living. His family has grown up on the site and they now have families of their own, which require more space. His children and grandchildren are registered with the local doctor and his eldest grandchild attends the local primary school. They need education and stability. The elder son works with him in a landscaping/gardening business, and his partner is a home carer in the surrounding villages. The younger son works for a local roofing company that operates all over the region. His partner looks after their two children. Mr Bibby's daughter and her partner have three children, and are travelling at present.
5. He states that there would be no increase in traffic on Schole Road, as the members of his family live on the site now, when they are not away. In any case, Mr Bibby is active in maintaining the road. The land site would have additional landscaping and fencing, and is already screened by trees. There are already hardstanding areas and the site is provided with services.

Planning History

6. Planning permission for the retention of a mobile home and a caravan on the site was granted on appeal in 1994 (S/0263/94/F and S/0264/94/F). A condition was attached

by the Inspector to limit the occupation to Mr and Mrs Bibby and their immediate family, and to no other persons.

7. Enforcement action was taken against the unauthorised stationing of 12 caravans/mobile homes on the site and adjacent land in 1990. An appeal was considered at public inquiry in 1991, when the enforcement action was upheld, with modifications. The site was owned by Mrs Bibby, although the mobile units were occupied by other families as well. The Inspector took the view that the occupying families were gypsies within the meaning of the Caravan Sites Act 1968.

Planning Policy

8. The site lies in the rural area beyond the village framework boundary.
9. Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003: **P1/1** (Approach to Development)- development should be located where travel distances by car can be minimised, walking and cycling encouraged and where good transport accessibility exists or can be provided. **P1/2** (Environmental Restrictions on Development)- development will be restricted in the countryside unless the proposals can be demonstrated to be essential in a particular rural location.
10. South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 – **Policy SE2** (Rural Growth Settlements)- residential development will be permitted on unallocated land within the village framework, subject to development criteria being met. **G19** (Sub-division of Mobile Homes)- any planning permission for a mobile home will be subject to a condition that the mobile home shall not be subdivided into more than one unit. **HG23** (Gypsies and Travelling Show People)- proposals for caravans for gypsies and travelling show people on a site consisting of a single or more pitches will only be considered when a need for a site is shown to be essential to enable the applicants to continue to exercise a travelling lifestyle for the purpose of making and seeking their livelihood. Occupation would be restricted to gypsies or travelling show people and may be limited to a temporary period and/or for the benefit of named occupier(s). Where the need is proven to the Council's satisfaction the following criteria will have to be met:
 1. The site is reasonably located for schools, shops and other local services;
 2. The site would have minimal impact on the amenities of existing local residents and adjoining land uses; concentration of sites will be avoided;
 3. The site would not, either on its own or cumulatively, have a significant adverse effect on the rural character and appearance, or the amenities of the surrounding area;
 4. The site can be satisfactorily assimilated into its surrounds by existing or proposed landscaping; an approved landscaping scheme will be required;
 5. The use of the site would not give rise to unacceptable parking, highway access or service provision problems;
 6. The site would not adversely affect any buildings of historic or archaeological importance, or sites of wildlife or nature conservation value;
 7. Where planning permission is allowed, built forms of development will not be permitted except for utility outhouses. Small stables will be considered on their merits depending upon need and the nature of the site.

8. The site has adequate infrastructural connections to local services including water supply;
9. The use would not detract from convenient, safe and enjoyable use of a public right of way.
11. The supporting text states: 'Where special need is shown for a site to be occupied by a gypsy family which would not ordinarily be permitted, any planning permission will be likely to restrict occupation and use to either that family or gypsy occupiers generally. Once that use is no longer required the Council may not permit further use as a caravan site for another gypsy family, or for gypsy use generally, or as a caravan site at all.'

Consultations

11. Willingham Parish Council objects to the proposal: 'At the Annual Parish Meeting the police had described Scholes Road as one of Willingham's "hotspots". The planning authority must have due regard to the provision of section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 when making its decisions. There are concerns about road safety due to the poor state of the road and the dangerous exit into Rampton Road.
12. 'There are doubts that this would be sustainable development in the broadest sense. The AntiSocial Behaviour Task Group has revealed gaps in youth provision. Travellers' children have special needs that the village is ill-equipped to meet. The existing modus vivendi between travellers and non-travellers is holding. Changing the balance can only be detrimental to all current parishioners – whatever their background. The Parish Council must consider the Human Rights of all parishioners.
13. 'Willingham has reached the limit in the number of mobile homes that it may reasonably be expected to accommodate. The time has come to draw the line and ensure a consistent approach in the future'.
14. Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service: additional supplies for fire fighting are not required.
15. Cambridgeshire Education Officer: advises that there would be no impact on school resources in the area from the proposal.
16. Local Highway Authority - has expressed concern about additional residential units, traffic generation and extra pedestrian movements along Scholes Road, which is substandard.
17. Friends, Families and Travellers: supports the application, and draws attention to the 'desperate need for and huge shortage of authorised sites for gypsies and travellers in England'. The group hopes that SCDC will grant planning permission 'in an attempt to go some way forward in meeting the huge need for authorised Gypsy sites in South Cambridgeshire'.
18. The Community Law Partnership: supports the application. The Partnership states, 'Clearly, Mr Bibby has gone through some very difficult times over the last three years and his wish to have his family around him in those circumstances is entirely understandable. Family connections are given very significant prominence in traditional English and Irish Traveller culture and, where circumstances permit, it is usual for several if not all of the adult children in a family to remain with their parents, even after

they have married and started their own families. Therefore, if Mr Bibby comes from a traditional Traveller background, we would expect that the absence of the family is felt particularly keenly by him. Therefore, on both humanitarian grounds and with a view to increasing the much needed provision of additional pitches for Gypsies and Travellers, we would support the application being granted'.

Representations

19. An objection has been lodged on behalf of some landowners and residents in Schole Road. The proposal represents an increase in site area and numbers of mobile homes on this land without any essential need being shown in relation to a traveller lifestyle. The application does not conform to the terms of Policy HG23.
20. The agent has drawn attention to the 1991 appeal decision in which the site is described by the Inspector as lying in the open countryside and that the appearance of the unauthorised pitches and service road that he was considering at that time was out of keeping with the appearance of this area of countryside. The agent considers that the current proposal will have a similar detrimental effect, and would be a further encroachment into the open countryside.
21. Whilst sympathising with Mr Bibby's personal circumstances, the agent considers that the existing permission for two mobile units is sufficient to accommodate both him and an attending member of his family. There are no special circumstances to justify the proposed development, in her opinion.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

22. The main issue to be considered in this case is whether the proposal complies within the terms of adopted policies, principally Policy HG23. The consideration falls on Mr Bibby's children, rather than himself, since he has a personal consent to remain on the site by virtue of the Inspector's decision in 1994. This permission extends to a second mobile unit, which may be occupied by a member of his immediate family. On the basis of the evidence provided, it is not clear that either of Mr Bibby's sons have a travelling lifestyle, as they are mainly employed in the family business and a local roofing business. I do not believe that this can reasonably be described as being a nomadic habit of life. In the case of his daughter, she has been away from the site for many months this year and may not return until December. Even if hers (and her family's) lifestyle could be regarded as nomadic, it is not clear why any additional accommodation beyond that which has been allowed by the Inspector in 1994 would be necessary.
23. If additional mobile homes were to be established on the site, I would consider this to constitute an unacceptable consolidation of the residential use on the site. The site is well screened at present, and no doubt additional landscaping could be achieved. However, the activity on the site would increase, and additional traffic be generated on Schole Road. The applicant claims that the family already live on the site (and so no additional traffic would be generated), but it appears that only two of these mobile units have the benefit of planning permission, and the remaining (between one and three) are unauthorised. The Local Highway Authority has concerns about the condition of Schole Road, and I consider the application to be unacceptable for this reason.
24. Whilst Members will sympathise with the difficult circumstances of the applicant, I do not believe that an adequate case has been made to justify the stationing of additional mobile units on the site within the terms of Structure Plan and Local Plan

policies, nor that the reasons put forward are sufficient to warrant a departure from the adopted policies for the area.

25. In the event of planning permission being refused, I will discuss with the applicant arrangements to ensure compliance with the permitted number of mobile units on the site.

Recommendation

Refusal

1. In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the additional four mobile homes are not intended to be occupied by persons for whom this form of accommodation is essential in order to exercise a travelling lifestyle for the purpose of making and seeking their livelihood. The Local Planning Authority is not satisfied that sufficient justification exists to warrant a departure from the usual policy of restraint of development in the countryside unless demonstrated to be essential in a particular rural location, as set out in Policy P1/2 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 and Policy SE2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.
2. The stationing of four mobile homes on the land would represent an undesirable consolidation of residential activity on the site which is in the open countryside, to the detriment of the appearance of the countryside and would result in additional vehicular and pedestrian use of Schole Road, a private unmade track without the provision of street lighting or footways, to the detriment of highway safety. For these reasons, the proposal fails to comply with Policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003.
3. In the event that the application falls to be considered under the terms of Policy HG23 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004, the Local Planning Authority is concerned at the cumulative effect of the additional mobile units on the rural character of the area adjacent to a public Bridleway and unacceptable means of highway access. The proposal is therefore considered to fail to conform with Policy HG23, particularly at criteria (3), (4), (5) and (9).

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report: Planning application S/0856/04; Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003; South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.

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

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	6 th October 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

**S/1585/04/F – West Wratting
Extension to Hardstanding (Retrospective Application) – Land Adj 12 The Common for T Spicer**

Recommendation: Approval

Members will visit the site on Monday 4th October 2004.

Site and Proposal

1. The application site is located in open countryside to the east of West Wratting. It comprises a dwelling, stables and adjoining garden and paddock areas.
2. The full application, submitted on 29th July 2004, and amended by additional information dated 7th September 2004, seeks retrospective consent for an extension to an area of hardstanding sited on the eastern side of the stables. The extended hardstanding measures approximately 31 metres long x 14 metres deep.

Planning History

3. **S/2108/90/F** – Planning consent granted for the stables.

Planning Policy

4. The site lies within the countryside. **Policy P1/2** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 states that development in the countryside will be restricted unless proposals can be demonstrated to be essential in a particular rural location.

Consultations

5. **West Wratting Parish Council** objects to the application stating:

“The inclusion of ‘other larger vehicles’ in the applicants’ letter suggests business/commercial rather than domestic/agricultural use and the application should be refused unless strict enforceable conditions can be specified. A turning area of 14m x 20m is sufficient size for horsebox turning therefore the new hardstanding is unnecessarily large. It should be reduced in size and have a hedge planted along the south east side. The area must not be used as storage and repair for cars as it is agricultural land.

Representations

6. 3 letters of objection have been received from Nos. 8a, 29 and 37 The Common. The main points raised are:
 - The residential curtilage was marked on site by a fence until June 2004. This fence, which has now been removed, defined the boundary between residential and paddock land;
 - The hardstanding that existed prior to June 2004 was provided to enable a horse trailer to be moved between the trailer park/hay store at the southern end of the stables and the public highway. No vehicles were stored or parked on the paddock or hardstanding between 1990 and 2004;

- As the paddock and residential curtilage fencing has been removed, it is inappropriate for the keeping of horses;
- The paddock land has been mown raising doubts about its use for grazing horses;
- The area of hardstanding is greater than is needed for the parking of one horse box;
- The use of the stables and hardstanding should be restricted to equestrian/agricultural purposes. They should not be used for the commercial purposes;
- The extended hardstanding has been constructed on paddock rather than residential land;
- If approved, the hardstanding should be screened with trees/hedges.

Representation by the applicant

7. Additional information submitted in support of the application states that the stables have always been used for recreational horses belonging to the owners and that the hardstanding that has been extended has always been in use for parking of vehicles associated with the use of the house and stables.
8. The extension to the hardstanding is required as the applicants intend to continue the use of the stables and require increased space for parking and turning of their horseboxes. It is also intended to use the area for domestic vehicles. In the near future, the family will probably own 4 cars and the driveway in front of the house itself only has enough room for two cars to manoeuvre without reversing into the road. The new hardstanding and rear access would also be used by vehicles delivering domestic goods and by tankers delivering oil for the central heating and coming to empty the septic tank.
9. The former post and rail fence was in poor condition and was therefore removed for replacement later. Horses will not be kept at the site until the planning issue is resolved and the paddock is being kept tidy at present by mowing the grass. Finally, to help screen the hardstanding, the applicant intends to plant a belt of mixed trees along the south-east boundary of the site.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

10. The key issues in relation to this application are:
 - The visual impact of the development;
 - The need for and use of the hardstanding.
11. The site lies within the countryside. Policy P1/2 of the County Structure Plan restricts development in the countryside to that which is essential in a rural location. The applicant has clarified in writing that the extension to the hardstanding is required in association with the use of the stables to enable sufficient room for horseboxes to turn on site and exit in forward gear. It will also be used for domestic purposes in association with the residential use of No. 12 The Common. On this basis, I consider that sufficient justification for the need for the hardstanding has been put forward and I do not have any objections in principle to the extension to the hardstanding that has been carried out.
12. The Parish Council and local residents have expressed concern on the basis that the stables and hardstanding could be used for business purposes in the future. However, any permission would only allow the land to be used for residential purposes or as paddock/agricultural land and the use of the land for business purposes would require a separate planning application. For the

avoidance of doubt, however, I would suggest that a condition restricting the use of the hardstanding for purposes associated to the use of the stables and the dwelling be attached to any planning consent.

13. With respect to the visual impact of the hardstanding, a row of approximately 1.5 metre high conifers has been planted on the northern/roadside edge of the hardstanding. The applicant has also indicated that he is willing to carry out significant planting along the south-eastern boundary of land within his ownership. This would help to screen the development when viewed from the dwellings beyond the site to the east and I would therefore recommend that any consent be conditional upon the provision of a suitable landscaping scheme.

Recommendation

14. Approval, as clarified by letter date stamped 7th September 2004, subject to the following conditions:
1. Within three months of the date of this decision, there shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a scheme of hard and soft landscaping, which 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 species, density and size of stock. (Reason - To enhance the quality of the development and to assimilate it within the area.)
 2. Sc52 – Implementation of landscaping (Rc52);
 3. The hardstanding, hereby permitted, shall not be used other than in association with the use of the adjacent stables and the residential use of the dwelling at 12 The Common, West Wrattling to the west (Reason – To ensure that the development complies with the aims of 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)

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);
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:** None
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:
 - Visual impact in the countryside;
 - Use of the land
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; File Ref: S/1585/04/F.

Contact Officer: Lorraine Casey – Senior Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713251

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation Control Committee 6th October 2004
AUTHOR/S: Director of Development Services

**S/0055/04/F - Grantchester
Erection of 15 Metre High Telecommunications Mast and Associated Development for
a Temporary Period of One Year (Retrospective) at Land to the South of Fulbrooke
Road, Cambridge and West of Cambridge Rugby Football Ground
For Hutchison 3G UK Ltd**

Recommendation: Approval

Departure application

Site and Proposal

1. The site lies to the north of the village of Grantchester close to the Cambridge City border, within the Cambridge Green Belt on the northern boundary of the field that lies to the west of the Cambridge Rugby Football Ground, and close to it. To the north is a belt of trees. The eastern and western boundaries of the field are marked with trees and hedgerows and to the south is a farm track.
2. The full planning application, received on 12th January 2004, proposes (retrospectively) the erection of a 15m high lattice type mast with 3 vertical antennae and 1 dish attached.
3. The closest dwellings are in Fulbrooke Road. The closest of these, 47 Fulbrooke Road lies some 140m away from the mast.
4. The application is accompanied by a Declaration of Conformity with International Commission on Non-Ionising Radiation Protection (ICNIRP Public Exposure Guidelines).
5. The application has been advertised as a departure from the Development Plan.

Planning History

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

Planning Policy

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

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, amongst others.
 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”.
 17. In Green Belts, telecommunications development is likely to be inappropriate unless it maintains openness. Inappropriate development may proceed only if very special circumstances are demonstrated which outweigh the degree of harm to the Green Belt. The lack of a suitable alternative site that would meet the needs of network coverage or capacity might be considered as very special circumstances.
9. 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*" 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”.

10. **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 Local Planning Authorities will need to take into account environmental and health impacts of telecommunications development when drawing up Local Plans or considering planning applications”.

11. **Policy GB2** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 (the Local Plan)
This policy outlines the general Green Belt principles. It states (in part): “Planning permission will not be granted for inappropriate development in the Green Belt unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated”. The rest of the policy defines what is considered to be appropriate development. Telecommunication development is not listed as appropriate.

12. **Policy CS8** of the Local Plan 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”.

13. **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

14. **Grantchester Parish Council**

The Parish Council has not commented.

15. **Cambridge City Council**

It is noted that this is to be a temporary structure and a permanent site is still being sought. It appears that some of the mast and most of the cabin and compound fencing will be reasonably well screened by trees to the north and east of the site. Measures should be taken to ensure that the proposed generator does not cause a noise nuisance to nearby houses.

I have no other comments on this proposal. I assume that the residents of Fulbrooke Road and Grantchester Road will be consulted”.

16. **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 risks are minimised, whilst allowing flexibility to raise thresholds if scientific data permits.”

Additionally it was noted that the generator whilst running was not very noisy.

Representations

17. 19 letters of objection have been received from residents of Fulbrooke and Grantchester Roads, together with one petition signed by 33 residents. The points of objection are summarised below:

- Mast has been erected without any planning permission

- Mast in very close proximity to dwellings
- Already two masts in close proximity and another granted permission at the Barton Road layby.
- Impact on the Area of Best Landscape
- Insufficient justification of need.
- No pre-application discussions
- Would be clearly visible from footpaths to the south and playing fields to the east and rear windows and gardens of the houses on the south side of Fulbrooke Road.
- Close proximity to the Bin Brook.
- Additional antennae will be erected over time making the mast more visible.
- Health effects – particularly within 500m where concentrations of energy are at their maximum. Microwave pulsed radiation is not known to be safe.
- Other sites have not been fully considered such as Barton Road/M11
- Reduction in property values.
- Will harm quality of the environment.
- Site only 50m away from one refused by the City Council (see preceding item).
- Proximity to model railway site that is used by children.
- Harmful to the rural and open character of the Green Belt.
- Will affect the setting and skyline of the City.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

18. The key issues are: The visual impact of the development on the surrounding countryside and Green Belt; 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 track that runs to the south of the site and through the trees from the model railway site.
20. The mast is to be positioned to the north of the field and not in an open area. There are no public footpaths in the vicinity.

The compound will be screened by the existing trees to the north.

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 and Green Belt.

The proposal is for a temporary period of one year so that any visual harm will be temporary.

21. **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. Woolfson College was considered for a rooftop installation but the applicants state that the site provider was unwilling. Use of floodlights at Cambridge RFC was considered but the site provider apparently withdrew due to local opposition. Robinson College was considered for a rooftop installation but again it is stated that the site provider was unwilling due to objections from various members of staff and students. Other buildings considered and discounted because, the applicant states, the site provider was unwilling are at Selwyn College, the University Library and Cambridge University Rugby Union Football Club. Mast sharing at Dumpling Farm (opposite the layby on Barton Road, within the City) has been discounted by the City Council as this would require a raising of the height of one of the existing masts which would be unacceptably visually detrimental.

22. The Barton Road/M11 site known also as Haggis Farm referred to in letters of objection as an appropriate alternative is already in use by the operator. The proposed site is intended to provide coverage into the City which is not adequately served by the Haggis Farm Station.

23. The Barton Road layby site where permission has been granted for a mast for another operator is stated as being too close to the Haggis Farm base station to be used and would in any case require an increase in height of the approved mast or another mast to be erected both of which are undesirable.

24. I am not aware of any existing masts, buildings or other structures that would meet the needs of the operator. In my opinion the applicant has made attempts to find existing buildings/structures that could provide an alternative without the need to erect a mast.

Alternative sites

25. In addition to the above alternative sites have been considered for the erection of a mast and none is considered by the operator to be satisfactory. The following table contains information supplied by the operator:

Site Name and Address	NGR	Reason
Dumpling Farm	543095, 257705	Neither the site provider nor the LPA would allow.
Barton Road, layby	543150, 257625	Too exposed to gain LPAs support.
Barton Road (Street furniture)	543585, 257600	We would need 15m+ to clear the surrounding clutter, which would be unlikely to be allowed by the LPA.
Cambridge RFC	543460, 257225	Ultra slim monopole proposed but the LPA would not support

26. An application to the City Council for a 15m high mast to be erected to the east of the site for this application has also been made and refused.

27. In my opinion the operator has made significant efforts to consider alternative sites. In discussions with the City Council I have established that efforts have been made within the City and that Dumpling Farm has been discounted.

28. With regard to Policy CS8 of the Local Plan, there are three main issues in relation to consideration of alternative sites (as opposed to existing masts, buildings or other structures) these are:
29. 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.
30. 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.
31. Preference
If an alternative site will meet the operator’s 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.
32. 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.”
33. Visual Impact
In my opinion Members should first consider if this mast has an unacceptable visual impact.
34. 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.
35. 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.
36. In addition to the consideration of this Policy, Members should have regard to the impact of the proposal on the Cambridge Green Belt. The development is by definition inappropriate. However, Planning Policy Guidance Note No 8 states that “The lack of a suitable alternative site that would meet the needs of network coverage or capacity might be considered as very special circumstances”. In my view there is no better alternative site.
37. **Landscaping**
Additional landscaping could not be required as this could not be justified for a temporary development
38. **Perceived threat to health.**
The mast is some 140m 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.

39. ***Amenity of nearby residents***

The mast will be sufficiently distant from existing dwellings so that it will not appear overbearing when viewed from within properties or from their gardens.

Recommendation

40. Approval subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard Condition A – Time limited permission (Reason A);
2. The mast, including all apparatus, equipment, fencing and hard surfacing shall be removed from the site and the land restored to its former condition on or before 31st December 2005 or when a permanent structure is erected following the grant of planning permission by the Local Planning Authority, whichever is the sooner. (Reason – To protect the visual quality of the countryside and Green Belt)

41. **Reasons for Approval**

1. Although the proposal has been considered as a Departure from the Development Plan, and particularly in regard to policies aimed at protecting the Green Belt from inappropriate development, the Local Planning Authority considers very special circumstances exist which outweigh the harm by being located in the Cambridge Green Belt:
 - **The operator has sought to find alternative suitable sites that would meet the needs of coverage or capacity. None has been identified.**
 - **The proposal does not have an unacceptable visual impact on the countryside and will not harm the openness of the Cambridge Green Belt.**
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/0055/04/F.

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

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	6 th October 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

S/0690/04/F - Grantchester
Erection of 17.5 Metre High Telecommunications Tower and Associated Development
at Land to the South of Fulbrooke Road, Cambridge and West of Cambridge Rugby
Football Ground - for Hutchison 3G UK Ltd

Recommendation: Delegated Approval

Departure application

Site and Proposal

1. The site lies to the north of the village of Grantchester close to the Cambridge City border, within the Cambridge Green Belt in the north west corner of the field that lies to the west of the Cambridge Rugby Football Ground. To the north is a belt of trees, to the west an approximately 50m long line of trees and the open field to the east and south. The eastern boundary of the field is marked with trees and hedgerow and to the south is a farm track.
2. The full planning application, received on 31st March 2004, proposes the erection of a 17.5m high lattice type mast with 3 vertical antennae and 3 dishes attached. The compound surrounding the mast has an area of approximately 36m².
3. The closest dwellings are in Fulbrooke Road. The closest of these, 47 Fulbrooke Road lies some 230-240m away from the mast.
4. The application is accompanied by a Declaration of Conformity with International Commission on Non-Ionising Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) Public Exposure Guidelines.
5. The application has been advertised as a departure from the Development Plan.

Planning History

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

Planning Policy

7. **Planning Policy Guidance Note No. 8 - Telecommunications**
8. This guidance note is a material consideration to which significant weight should be attached. Its general policies are set out below:
 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, amongst others, Green Belts. 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".
 17. In Green Belts, telecommunications development is likely to be inappropriate unless it maintains openness. Inappropriate development may proceed only if very special circumstances are demonstrated which outweigh the degree of harm to the Green Belt. The lack of a suitable alternative site that would meet the needs of network coverage or capacity might be considered as very special circumstances.
9. 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*" 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”.

10. **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 Local Planning Authorities will need to take into account environmental and health impacts of telecommunications development when drawing up Local Plans or considering planning applications”.

11. **Policy GB2** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 (the Local Plan)

This policy outlines the general Green Belt principles. It states (in part): “Planning permission will not be granted for inappropriate development in the Green Belt unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated”. The rest of the policy defines what is considered to be appropriate development. Telecommunication development is not listed as appropriate.

12. **Policy CS8** of the Local Plan 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”.

13. **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

14. **Grantchester Parish Council**
The Parish Council has not commented.
15. **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 risks are minimised, whilst allowing flexibility to raise thresholds if scientific data permits.”

Representations

16. Seven letters of objection have been received from residents of Fulbrooke and Grantchester Roads, together with one petition signed by 14 residents. The points of objection are summarised below:
 - Height is excessive.
 - Impact on the Area of Best Landscape
 - Additional antennae will be erected over time making the mast more visible.
 - Health effects – particularly within 500m where concentrations of energy are at their maximum. Microwave pulsed radiation is not known to be safe.
 - Other sites have not been fully considered such as Barton Road/M11
 - Reduction in property values
 - Will harm quality of the environment.

- A proposal in Cambridge City for a smaller 15m high mast to the east of this site within the Cambridge Rugby grounds was refused for reasons of:
 1. The development would adversely affect an Area of Best Landscape contrary to the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan and the Cambridge Local Plan;
 2. The development would fall within cones of view for both the setting and the skyline of the city and would detract significantly from these views, contrary to the Local Plan which requires that new development should not detract from the views of Cambridge's historic skyline;
 3. The site is within the Green Belt and the development would adversely affect its rural and open character, contrary to the Cambridge Green Belt Local Plan, the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan, the Cambridge Local Plan and national Planning Policy Guidance Note 2;
 4. The development would not relate sensitively to the environment of the urban fringe and would spoil the visual amenities of the approach to Cambridge from the south-west, contrary to the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan.
- Proximity to model railway site that is used by children.
- Harmful to the rural and open character of the Green Belt.
- Will affect the setting and skyline of the City.
- The petition states (in part): "We all live between approximately 175 and 450 metres from the site proposed and there are quite a lot of children in our two streets who, it is reasonable to suppose, may be more susceptible to various kinds of environmental pollution, including EMF, during various developmental windows".

Planning Comments – Key Issues

17. The key issues are: The visual impact of the development on the surrounding countryside and Green Belt; alternative masts, buildings, other structures and sites; perceived impact on health and amenity of nearby residents.
18. **Visual impact.**

The mast will be visible from the track that runs to the south of the site. The model railway site has many trees on its western portion and I do not believe that the mast will be readily visible to users of the model railway.
19. The mast is to be positioned in the north-west corner of the field and not in an open area. There are no public footpaths in the vicinity.
20. The compound will be screened by the existing trees to the north and west. Additional planting can be required to help screen the eastern and southern boundaries. The position in the corner of the field that is currently well screened on two boundaries leads me to believe that the mast will not harm the openness of the Green Belt.
21. The mast can be painted in a suitable dark colour, to be agreed, to help reduce its impact when viewed from its surroundings. Most of the mast will be viewed with the trees as a backdrop. The top of the mast will however, be visible as the antennae have to clear the tops of the trees in order to operate effectively.

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 and Green Belt.

22. **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. Woolfson College was considered for a rooftop installation but the applicants state that the site provider was unwilling. Use of floodlights at Cambridge RFC was considered but the site provider apparently withdrew due to local opposition. Robinson College was considered for a rooftop installation but again it is stated that the site provider was unwilling due to objections from various members of staff and students. Other buildings considered and discounted because, the applicant states, the site provider was unwilling are at Selwyn College, the University Library and Cambridge University Rugby Union Football Club. Mast sharing at Dumpling Farm (opposite the layby on Barton Road, within the City) has been discounted by the City Council as this would require a raising of the height of one of the existing masts which would be unacceptably visually detrimental.

The Barton Road/M11 site known also as Haggis Farm referred to in letters of objection as an appropriate alternative is already in use by the operator. The proposed site is intended to provide coverage into the City which is not adequately served by the Haggis Farm Station.

The Barton Road layby site where permission has been granted for a mast for another operator is stated as being too close to the Haggis Farm base station to be used and would in any case require an increase in height of the approved mast or another mast to be erected both of which are undesirable.

23. I am not aware of any existing masts, buildings or other structures that would meet the needs of the operator. In my opinion the applicant has made attempts to find existing buildings/structures that could provide an alternative without the need to erect a mast.

Alternative sites

24. In addition to the above, alternative sites have been considered for the erection of a mast and none is considered by the operator to be satisfactory. The following table contains information supplied by the operator:

Site Name and Address	NGR	Reason
Dumpling Farm	543095, 257705	Neither the site provider or the LPA would allow a site in this location. The LPA stated that they did not want a third site here, and would be likely to have vociferous opposition from residents at Gough Way.
Barton Road, layby	543150, 257625	Too exposed to gain LPAs support. The surrounding tree and shrub cover is not sufficiently mature to provide reasonable screening therefore it would prove visually intrusive.

Barton Road (Street furniture)	543585, 257600	We would need 15m+ to clear the surrounding clutter, which would be unlikely to be allowed by the LPA. The trees in this location are tall and would provide interference to the signal. A street works solution cannot be shared thus requiring a further installation within the search area to obtain coverage required.
Cambridge RFC	543460, 257225	Ultra slim monopole proposed but the LPA would not support when they were approached due to the potential for visual intrusion likely to be caused.

25. An application to the City Council for a 15m high mast to be erected to the east of the site for this application has also been made and refused.
26. In my opinion the operator has made significant efforts to consider alternative sites. In discussions with the City Council I have established that efforts have been made within the City and that Dumpling Farm has been discounted. The City Council was consulted on this application but no formal response has been received. However, discussions with the Telecommunications Liaison Officer have indicated that the City Council does not object to this application. It is felt to be better located away from existing dwellings, other buildings and existing sports facilities and the presence of the field boundary to the east is felt to provide better visual separation from the City.
27. With regard to Policy CS8 of the Local Plan, there are three main issues in relation to consideration of alternative sites (as opposed to existing masts, buildings or other structures) these are:
28. 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.
29. 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.
30. Preference
If an alternative site will meet the operator’s 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.
31. 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.”
32. Visual Impact
In my opinion Members should first consider if this mast has an unacceptable visual impact.
33. 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.

34. 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.

35. In addition to the consideration of this Policy, Members should have regard to the impact of the proposal on the Cambridge Green Belt. The development is by definition inappropriate. However, Planning Policy Guidance Note No 8 states that "The lack of a suitable alternative site that would meet the needs of network coverage or capacity might be considered as very special circumstances". In my view there is no better alternative site.

36. **Landscaping**

The compound would be visible from the east and south. 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.

37. **Perceived threat to health.**

The mast is some 230m 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.

38. **Amenity of nearby residents**

The mast will be sufficiently distant from existing dwellings so that it will not appear overbearing when viewed from within properties or from their gardens.

Recommendation

39. Delegated powers of approval are sought subject to a revised plan showing an increased area of land for landscaping 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).

5. No development shall commence until details of the colour finish for the mast have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority; the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

(Reason – To help minimise the visual impact of the mast and help assimilate it into its surroundings)

40. **Reasons for Approval**

1. Although the proposal has been considered as a Departure from the Development Plan, and particularly in regard to policies aimed at protecting the Green Belt from inappropriate development, the Local Planning Authority considers very special circumstances exist which outweigh the harm by being located in the Cambridge Green Belt:
 - **The operator has sought to find alternative suitable sites that would meet the needs of coverage or capacity. None has been identified.**
 - **The proposal does not have an unacceptable visual impact on the countryside and will not harm the openness of the Cambridge Green Belt.**
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/0690/04/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	6 th October 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

**S/1472/04/F - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth
Erection of Workshop Building, Change of Use of Existing Agricultural Building to
Ancillary Offices with Associated Parking of Vehicles and Trailers, Brook Orchard
Farm, Brook Road, for N Howard.**

Recommendation: Delegated Approval

Members will visit this site on Monday 4th October 2004

Departure Application

Site and Proposal

1. This application, submitted on 13th July 2004, as amended by drawings received on 17th September 2004, proposes the erection of a workshop building, change of use of existing agricultural building to ancillary offices with associated parking of vehicles and trailers at Brook Orchard Farm, Bassingbourn for N Howard. The applicant is the owner of On Set Location Services, which currently operates from a site at Clear Farm in South End, Bassingbourn. The Clear Farm site has recently been the subject of a serious fire. The consultation replies and representations reported in this report were received before that incident.
2. The 0.95ha site is located to the south of the road between the villages of Bassingbourn and Litlington and is served by a narrow roadway some 150 metres long. The site is a former piggery and currently comprises a large number of low agricultural buildings, of various forms of construction. There is one larger barn in the north-east corner of the site.
3. The application, as amended, proposes the demolition of the existing buildings within the site, with the exception of the larger building in the north east corner and the erection of a new workshop building along the north east boundary of the site., to the side of the retained building. The proposed building measures 42.8 metres x 18.8 meters (804 m²). It has an eaves height of 6 metres and a ridge height of 8 metres. Materials are to be agreed. The existing building is to be converted to a small workshop and offices (370m²).
4. The remainder of the site is to be laid out for the parking and turning of vehicles. There are a total of 40 spaces for HGV/Trailer Home parking and 15 spaces for cars. The application states that 8 persons will be employed on the site. Details of the applicants operation can be found under Applicant's Representations below.
5. An 8 metre wide strip of land is provided for planting at the rear of the site. The applicant owns adjoining land to the north east, north west and south west of the application site that could be made available for planting.

6. To the north of the site, fronting the road is a pair of cottages, 20 metres to the south west of and sharing the entrance to the site. There is a public bridleway which runs north-south 150 metres to the south west of the site.

Planning History

7. In 2002 consent was granted for the conversion of some of the former agricultural buildings on the site (1330m²) to commercial uses (Classes B1 and B2). That consent (**Ref S/1174/01/F**) has not been implemented. The largest existing building within the site did not form part of that scheme which included the removal of a number of buildings within the site.

Planning Policy

8. **Policy P1/2** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 (“The County Structure Plan”) restricts development in the countryside unless it can be demonstrated to be essential in a particular location.
9. **Policy 2/6** of the Structure Plan sets out criteria under which small scale employment in rural areas will be reported.
10. **Policy EM10** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 (“The Local Plan”) sets out the criteria against which applications for the change of use and conversion of rural buildings in the countryside will be considered.
11. **Policy EM7** of the Local Plan supports the expansion of existing firms within village frameworks or on suitable brownfield sites next to or very close to village frameworks subject to the provisions of Policies EM3 and EM6.
12. The Government’s Planning **Policy 7**, “Sustainable Development in Rural Areas” (2004), is supportive of replacement of suitably located existing buildings of permanent design and construction for economic development purposes. The criteria that will apply to the replacement of countryside buildings should be set out in Local Development documents.

Consultation

13. **Bassingbourn Parish Council** recommends approval.
14. **The Local Highway Authority** states that the junction arrangement should reflect that which has already been granted under the previous consent. A copy of the amended drawing has been sent to the Highway Authority for further comments which will be reported verbally.
15. **The Environment Agency** has objected to the application on the basis of inadequate information and requested the submission of a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). This has now been submitted and forwarded to the Agency for further comments which will be reported verbally.
16. **The Chief Environmental Health Officer** requests conditions restricting the hours of operation of power driven machinery during the construction process and the submission of a scheme of investigation to establish the nature and extent of any contamination of the site and remedial works to deal with it.

17. **The Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service** requests that adequate provision is made for fire hydrants.
18. The comments of **Litlington Parish Council** will be reported verbally.

Representations

19. Three letters have been received from residents of the village objecting to the application on the following grounds:
 - The large number of heavy goods and mobile home vehicle movements are not suitable for a village location and are often driven at inappropriate speeds.
 - South End is not suitable for such large vehicles and the route from South End to the proposed new one runs past a playing field and a school in South End and two schools in Brook Road.
 - If consent is granted it should be on the basis of the existing one being closed and suitable planting being carried out at the new one.
 - The existing business has grown far beyond what was anticipated when the original permission for the South End site was granted. If the growth of the business in the future mirrors the past, then the number of vehicles parked at Brook Farm will make the place look like a giant lorry/trailer park in the middle of open country.
 - A petition signed by 20 residents in South End states that they have all suffered the impact of the use at the Clear Farm site in terms of noise, speeding vehicles and the substantial growth in traffic through the village and South End in particular. All object to the application making it clear that this is not a low-key operation suitable for location in a village.
 - On Set Location Services is only one of the businesses being operated by the applicant from Clear Farm. The letter submitted with the application admits to 70 vehicles but omits to mention vehicles operated under the applicants other companies, such as The American Trailer Company. The letter accompanying the application refers only to the relocation of On Set Location Services, leaving the facilities and the American Trailer Company at Clear Farm and does not guarantee any reduction in traffic in South End
 - On Set Location Services is already operating from Brook Orchard Farm, having transferred vehicles from the other sites at Road Farm, Wendy (on the A1198) and Barrington. There has been considerable disturbance caused by vehicle movements between these site and the central facilities at Clear Farm.
 - This concentration of vehicles at Brook Orchard Farm makes matters worse for Litlington and Bassingbourn, since all vehicle movements to and from On-Sets sites must be through the villages.
 - The only exits to the main roads from Brook Orchard Farm are via the narrow congested streets of Bassingbourn and Litlington; these are not suitable for a fleet of vehicles of this scale. The On-Set vehicles include articulated trucks, box-van trucks, very large caravans, double-decker buses, site offices,

costume vehicles, etc. In one direction the route is past the Bassingbourn schools in Brook Road.

- The letter from the applicant's agent tries to make the case for 24-hour/7 day working. This would inevitably produce night-time disturbance for the residents of Bassingbourn and Litlington.
- Not all of the On-Set business is to do with vehicles occasionally going to and returning from remote sites. The Company operates a range of vehicle types, including HGV's, and there are frequent movements on and off the Clear Farm site.
- A large industrial development of this scale is quite inappropriate in the open countryside between the villages of Bassingbourn and Litlington and will become more an eyesore should the business expand.
- The site is adjacent to the school playing fields and close to a wildlife conservation area. The danger of pollution from detergents and diesel etc is self-evident. In no respect is this a brownfield site.

Applicants Representations

20. A letter from the applicants agent submitted with the application (and written before the recent fire) states that the applicant currently runs a business through his company On Set Location Services Limited providing custom built vehicles for the film and television industry from premises at Clear Farm, South End, Bassingbourn. The business is successful and is looking for modest expansion. The present location in the centre of the village, although it has planning permission or the use, is not ideal.
21. The principle of the business re-use of the application site is established by the earlier planning permission. In order to meet the current applicant's requirements a little more remodelling of the site is required than envisaged under that permission. Thus, because of the need for a large area of hardstanding it is proposed to demolish all but one of the existing buildings which will be converted into an office, and erect a purpose built workshop. Due to the nature of the applicants business it is difficult to predict what vehicle movements there will be at any one time; the usual pattern is that most of the vehicles will be away on film sets for up to 6 months at a time, or shorter periods of 2-6 weeks for TV work. Likewise it is difficult to control the timing of vehicle movements; vehicles will often have to leave outside normal hours to accommodate ferry times or filming schedules. At present the applicant has up to 70 vehicles and trailers, most of which are away for long periods of time. The only constant vehicle movements will be private motor cars from eight members of staff, including staff and mechanics. The application proposal has been designed to mitigate against potential impact and it is envisaged that a chain link fence will be erected around the site, which will be heavily landscaped in accordance with an agreed scheme.
22. Reference is made to Structure Plan **Policy P2/6** and Local Plan **Policy EM7** (see Policy section above). The letter states that although not strictly brownfield (because of its previous pig farm use) sensible analogies can be drawn with this policy and On Set Location Services Limited has been located in the Cambridge area for over two years.
23. The relocation of the business will provide a significant planning benefit to the village of Bassingbourn as it will reduce traffic movements in the village, disturbance to

neighbours of Clear Farm Barns, and allow for the visual improvement in village character flowing from the reduction in parked vehicles. The business would still be located sufficiently close to the village to allow for employment opportunities. The redundant Brook Orchard site is an ideal location sufficiently far away from the centre of the village to ensure minimal disturbance.

24. In a subsequent letter accompanying the amended drawings it is stated that the height of the building is required to ensure that when the box vans are on ramps for repairs the mechanics are able to get under the vehicles. In respect to lighting it is confirmed that the applicant would like low level lighting round the perimeter of the yard, with floodlights operated from passive infrared detectors on the front of both buildings.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

25. This application is a Departure from the Development Plan as it proposes the erection of a new building in the countryside. The key issues to be considered are whether there is sufficient justification to warrant a departure from the Development Plan, having regard in particular to **Policy P1/2** of the County Structure Plan, the impact of the proposed use on the surrounding countryside and villages, and the benefits of relocation from the existing site in South End, Bassingbourn.
26. The recently submitted amended drawings have been sent out for consultation and responses, where available, will be reported at the meeting. I have brought the application to Committee at this stage, given the recent fire at the Clear Farm site in order that Members can take a view whether the use of the Brook Orchard Farm site might be acceptable in principle, subject to resolution of any outstanding matters.
27. Whilst planning consent was granted in 1996 for the use of the Clear Farm site the applicants business has grown substantially since that time and storage of vehicles has taken place on other sites in the area. The applicant has clearly outgrown the Clear Farm site in the village and has been looking for alternative sites for some time.
28. I have spoken to the applicant's agent who has confirmed that if approval is given for the Company to relocate to this site it will vacate the Clear Farm and other sites. A Section 106 Agreement would be required to secure this in respect of the Clear Farm site, although its future will be the subject to discussion in any event following the recent fire. I would not support this application in the absence of such an agreement
29. Planning consent exists for the conversion of existing buildings within the site to Class B1 and B2 uses, amounting to a total floor area of 1330m². The principle of the use of the site for commercial purposes is therefore established. The Local Highway Authority has raised no objection to the current application, having had regard to the potential implementation of the existing consent. In coming to this view it has had regard to the issue of traffic movement through adjacent buildings. An amended plan has been submitted showing the upgrading of the existing access and the further comments of the Highway Authority will be reported.
30. The current application would result in buildings on the site totalling 1174m², less than that approved under the conversion scheme, although the area of the site itself has been extended to the south west.
31. The existing former piggery buildings on the site are relatively low. The replacement of these buildings by a single larger building, twice the height of the buildings to be demolished, will increase the visual impact of the site on the surrounding countryside.

In addition the use of a large area of hardsurfacing within the site for the parking of vehicles equally has the potential to increase the visual impact in the countryside beyond that which could reasonably have been anticipated as a result of the consent for conversion of the existing buildings. The applicant however controls land on three side of the site allowing for the implementation of a substantial landscaping scheme, which could, over time, help to significantly offset this impact.

32. The applicant does not however control land to the south of the site and I am concerned at the visual impact of the site when viewed from that direction and the nearby public bridleway. At the moment the scheme as amended allows for a minimum of an 8 metre wide strip of land along the south boundary of the site. I will explore the possibility of increasing this area where it abuts the parking area.
33. The applicant has indicated that lighting within the site would be low level with the exception of floodlights on the front of both buildings, which would be operated by infrared detectors. I am concerned about the impact of lighting in this rural location, particularly as the applicant states that vehicles may have to leave or return to the site outside usual hours. A detailed scheme of lighting would be required by condition if consent were granted.
34. The vehicular access to the site is within 20 metres of a pair of cottages, which share the entrance with the former piggery site. No representations have been received from the occupiers of these cottages which I understand are owned by the former owner of the application site and occupied by tenants. I am concerned about the impact of vehicular movements to and from the site on the amenity of the occupiers of these cottages, although the approved scheme of conversion of the buildings, if implemented, is likely to result in a greater number of daily movements to and from the site, albeit the type of vehicles and hours of movements may have differed.
35. The applicant has submitted a flood risk assessment which has been passed to the Environment Agency whose further comments will be reported.
36. Letters of representation refer to other companies operated by the applicant that are not mentioned in the application. Additional information is being sought on this point and will be reported verbally although I understand that one of these companies, the American Trailer Company no longer exists. If consent is granted the use of the site should be restricted to the applicant's own business and vehicles.
37. Hours of operation of vehicle repairs on the site should be restricted by condition.
38. In my view that applicant has outgrown the existing site in South End and needs to relocate. The recent fire has obviously affected the applicant's position. Whilst I have reservations about the suitability of the Brook Orchard Farm site, in particular in terms of the amount of outside parking in this countryside location the applicant has the ability to substantially screen the site with new planting, with the exception of the rear boundary as discussed above.
39. If the outstanding matters can be satisfactorily resolved I am of the view that the use of this site could be supported as a departure, subject to the applicant entering into a Section 106 Agreement agreeing to the cessation of the use at the Clear Farm site and stringent safeguarding conditions.

Recommendation

40. Subject to the satisfactory resolution of outstanding matters that Members be minded to approve the application as a departure from the Development Plan and that the applicant be invited to enter into a Section 106 Agreement requiring the cessation of use of the Clear Farm site. Subject to the prior signing of this agreement that delegated powers of approval are given to grant consent subject to safeguarding conditions.

Informatives

Reasons for Approval

1. In considering this application regard has been had to policies in the Development Plan. Although the application proposes the erection of a new building in the countryside it replaces existing buildings, comprises less floorspace and the site benefits from an extant planning permission for commercial purposes. The Local Planning Authority is of the view that application can be approved as a departure from the Development Plan.
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
 - 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:

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
Planning Application File S/1472/04/F and S/1174/01/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	6 th October 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

**S/1676/04/F - Castle Camps
Extensions and Conversion of 2 Barns into a Dwelling and Erection of Garage/Stores
at Barns at Camps End for Mr & Mrs Haylock**

Recommendation: Refusal

Departure Application**Site and Proposal**

1. This application relates to a 0.16 hectare (0.4 acre) approximately site which is part of a field and is currently occupied by a pair of timber framed brick plinth, timber boarding and corrugated sheeting barns in a poor state of repair and a number of attached and detached corrugated sheeting buildings. At the time of the case officer's visit, the smaller of the two barns was being used of the storage of hay. Little Biggs Farm to the northwest is comprised of a listed farmhouse and agricultural buildings.
2. This full application, registered on the 11th August 2004, proposes to create a 4 bedroom dwelling by connecting the two barns by a single storey link, adding a gable roof to part of one of the barns and inserting openings into the barns. A new render over brickwork and clay plain tile roof building is also proposed to be used as a garage, store and shed. A new driveway would link the buildings to the existing field gate onto the road. The application is accompanied by a Structural Survey and a Supporting Statement. The Statement states that it would not be viable to convert the buildings for light industrial or other commercial uses.

Planning History

3. None.

Planning Policy

4. The site is within the countryside and the South Suffolk and North Essex Claylands Landscape Character Area as defined in the Local Plan 2004.
5. Structure Plan 2003 **Policy P1/2** states that development in the countryside will be resisted unless the proposals can be demonstrated to be essential in a particular rural location.
6. Local Plan 2004 **Policy SE8** states that residential development outside village frameworks will not permitted.

7. Paragraph 17 of Planning Policy Statement 7 'Sustainable Development in Rural Area' (2004) states that "The Government's policy is to support the re-use of appropriate located and suitably constructed existing buildings in the countryside where this would meet sustainable development objectives. Re-use for economic development purposes will usually be preferable, but residential conversions may be more appropriate in some locations, and for some types of building. Planning authorities should therefore set out in LDDs their policy criteria for permitting the conversion and re-use of buildings in the countryside for economic, residential and any other purposes, including mixed uses.

These criteria should take account of:

- The potential impact on the countryside and landscapes and wildlife;
 - Specific local economic and social needs and opportunities;
 - Settlement patterns and accessibility to service centres, markets and housing;
 - The suitability of different types of buildings, and of different scales, of re-use;
 - The need to preserve, or the desirability of preserving, buildings of historic or architectural importance or interest, or which otherwise contribute to local character.
8. Local Plan 2004 **Policy EN1** states that planning permission will not be granted for development which would have an adverse effect on the character and local distinctiveness of the Landscape Character Areas.
9. Local Plan 2004 **Policy EN28** states that the District Council will refuse applications which dominate a listed building; damage the setting, well-being or attractiveness of a listed building; or would harm the visual relationship between a listed building and its formal or natural landscape surroundings. Structure Plan 2003 **Policy P7/6** states that Local Planning Authorities will protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the historic built environment.

Consultation

10. **Castle Camps Parish Council** recommends approval.
11. **Conservation Manager** states that:

The barn buildings are not held to be curtilage listed. Although they appear to have been part of the land which formed Little Biggs Farm, they are set away from the main group of buildings and over time have become physically separated as well as being in separate ownership.

Being set away from the main farmhouse by over 40 metres, the structures do not have a significant impact on the setting of the Listed Building. They are also set back from the road by over 25 metres so their contribution to the street scene is limited. The main contribution of the buildings is within the rural setting to the hamlet – as traditional rural buildings they form part of the countryside.

The barns are considered to be of local historical interest but they have been much altered over time. Only about half of the historic timber frames survive and the buildings have also been doubled in size with modern extensions. The roofing is tin.

Issues:

- The retention of the buildings : they are currently in a low use storage function and do not have any significant agricultural use at present. The surviving historic fabric is deteriorating and without any major investment in the fabric of the building the structures could become unsound. There is no control over the demolition of the structures.
- The amount of alteration required for the new use. The scheme does propose the removal of the modern additions to the building but the exterior of the new dwelling would be modern fabric – the only surviving element would be the parts of the timber frame capable of being salvaged for reuse. The condition of this is likely to mean this would have a purely cosmetic role within the structure.

The buildings are considered to have limited value in terms of their contribution to the immediate setting of the Listed Building. The amount of surviving historic fabric is limited and it is considered that this would be further compromised by the alterations required for the new works. The main value of the buildings is from their setting in the countryside. The external appearance of the building would all be new fabric. The surrounding curtilage to the barns would change by virtue of the new driveway, erection of a garage block and formation of a domestic garden. This domestication of the rural landscape is considered to have a significant impact on the character of the hamlet. It is considered this would also harm the visual relationship of the listed farmhouse with its wider rural surroundings. The adverse impact on the character and appearance of the locality is considered to outweigh any benefits of preserving the surviving historic fabric of the structures.

The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to the provisions of Policy EN28 of the Local Plan by causing harm to the setting of the Listed farmhouse.

12. **Chief Environmental Health Officer** recommends conditions are attached to any approval relating to the times during the construction period when power operated machinery shall not be operated and requiring a site contamination investigation and details of any necessary remedial works.
13. **Environment Agency** recommends a condition relating to foul water drainage is attached to any approval and makes advisory comments.

Representations

14. The occupier of Little Biggs Farm objects on the grounds that he would be overlooked and the development would devalue his listed building.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

15. The key issues in relation to this application are:
 - Whether there are any material considerations which outweigh the presumption against residential development in the countryside; and
 - The affect of the proposal on the visual amenities of the countryside and the setting of the adjacent listed farmhouse at Little Biggs Farm.

16. At this Committee, Members will recall approving applications for the conversion of vernacular buildings in the countryside to dwellings where the planning benefits in terms of matters such as finding an appropriate use for a historic and/or vernacular building outweigh the harm of allowing a dwelling away from settlements and local facilities. Applications have also been refused where the benefits do not outweigh the harm.
17. In this instance, whilst the application refers to conversion, the submitted structural survey confirms that the walls of the barns would need to be rebuilt, re-structured foundations would be needed, re-formed slabs may be needed and the roofs replaced. Only some of the original timber frame would remain. The proposal also involves extensions, a new building to be used as garaging/stores, a new driveway and the creation of a garden, all within the countryside. In my view, the proposal would also detract from the visual amenities and rural character of the locality and the setting of the listed farmhouse at Little Biggs Farm. For these reasons, the application is considered to be contrary to National Government Policy and Development Plan Policies and should be refused.
18. Given the poor condition of the buildings, it is difficult to see that they have any potential use other than for low-key storage and, in all likelihood, they will continue to deteriorate until they collapse. However, the harm identified above is considered to outweigh any benefits of preserving the surviving historic fabric of the structures.
19. I do not consider that the proposal would seriously affect the amenity of the occupiers of the farmhouse at Little Biggs Farm.

Recommendations

20. Refusal
 1. The site is in the countryside as defined in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 and a considerable distance from any settlement and local services. Rather than only involving the conversion of existing buildings, the proposal involves substantial rebuilding of the barns, extensions, a new building to be used as garaging/stores, a new driveway and the creation of a domestic garden. The proposal is not therefore considered to comply with the Government's policy, as stated in Planning Policy Statement 7, to only support the re-use of appropriate located and suitably constructed existing buildings in the countryside where this would meet sustainable development objectives. Furthermore, there are no material considerations in this instance to justify setting aside South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 Policy SE8, which states that residential development outside village frameworks will not be permitted, and, as it has not been demonstrated why the development is essential in this particular rural location, the proposal is also contrary to Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 Policy P1/2.
 2. The change in the appearance of this site as a result of the proposed development is also considered to be harmful to the visual amenity of the countryside, the rural character of the hamlet and the relationship of the adjacent Listed farmhouse with the natural landscape.

The proposal is therefore contrary to the aims of: South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 Policy EN1, which states that planning permission will not be granted for development which would have an adverse effect on the character of the South Suffolk and North Essex Landscape Character Area; South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 Policy EN28, which states that the District Council will refuse applications which damage the setting,

well-being or attractiveness of a listed building or would harm the visual relationship between a listed building and its natural landscape surroundings; and Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 Policy P7/6 which requires Local Planning Authorities to protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the historic built environment.

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 Policy Statement 7 'Sustainable Development in Rural Area' 2004

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	6 th October 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

**S/1164/04/F - Comberton
Erection of dwelling and garden/summer house; Land rear of 4 and 8 West Street,
for Mr B Obank.**

Recommendation: Approval

Conservation Area**Site and Proposal**

1. The application relates to part of an area of former open grazing land in the middle of the village that is bounded on all sides by other development. There are views of the site across the village pond from the crossroads of Green End and West Street. The land lies to the rear of No.2 West Street, a grade II listed building, and the dwelling at No.8. A barn to the rear of these dwellings has recently been converted to a dwelling, which has views from its rear elevation over the application site. The site also forms part of the setting of No.10 West Street, a grade II listed building. To the west, the site is adjoined by the house at No. 11 Green End. The boundary of this garden with the application site is marked by a row of mature Beech trees that overhang the applicant's land.
2. The site lies within the conservation area, whose boundaries coincide with the northern and western boundaries of the site.
3. The application, registered 4th June 2004, is for full planning permission for the erection of a single storey dwelling and a detached summer house, with vehicular access being gained from the existing track to West Street. The plot has a depth of 49m, and has a width that increases from 18m in the south to 33m in the north, giving a site area of 0.13ha. The positioning of the house was originally shown to be 2.2m from the western boundary with No.11 Green End. Amended plans were received 1 September 2004 to show the distance to the boundary increased to 5.0m in order to accommodate the spread of the adjacent Beech trees. The design shows a long timber-clad 2-bed dwelling with a low ridgeline (4.2m) with eaves overhang supported by timber posts. A pantiled roof is proposed. The length of the house has been reduced from 29.0m to 25.0m in response to comments made by the Conservation Manager. The applicant states that the L-shaped dwelling is designed in the style of a converted agricultural building. The density equates to 7.7 dwellings per hectare.
4. A detached summer/garden house, with dimensions width 3.0m x length 5.0m x height (to ridge) 3.0m, is shown to be sited adjacent to the northern boundary of the site, within the proposed garden area.

Planning History

5. There is no planning history on the application site itself. However, outline planning permission for the erection of a detached 5-bedroomed house to the rear of the converted barn was dismissed at appeal in 2000 (S/0995/99/O). The Inspector concluded that the open grazing land formed 'an intrinsic part' of the conservation area's character and appearance. It formed a part of the 'pleasing and appropriate

setting' to the listed buildings at No.2 and (to a lesser extent) No.10 West Street, and to the village pond. As the proposed house would be visible from the crossroads, it would 'destroy much of the open and rural character of the grazing land'.

6. The extension and conversion of the barn adjoining the southern boundary of the site and the boundary walls, were the subject of planning permissions S/0754/01/F and S/0676/03/F.

Planning Policy

7. In the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003, **Policy P1/1** (Approach to Development)- development should be located where travel distances by car can be minimised, walking and cycling encouraged and where good transport accessibility exists or can be provided.
8. **Policy P5/5** (Homes in Rural Areas) – small scale housing developments will be permitted in villages only where appropriate, taking into account the need for affordable rural housing, the character of the village and its setting, and the level of jobs, services, infrastructure and passenger transport provision in the immediate area.
9. **Policy SE4** (Group Villages) of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 states that redevelopment up a maximum scheme of 8 dwellings will be permitted within the village framework provided that the retention of the site in its present form is not essential to the character of the village; and the development would be sensitive to the character of the village and the amenities of neighbours.
10. **Policy HG11** (Backland Development) – Development to the rear of existing properties will not be permitted where development would: 1) be overbearing, overlooking or overshadowing of an existing residential property, 2) be noisy or disturbing to an existing residential property through use of its access, 3) give rise to highway dangers through use of its access, 4) be out of character with the pattern of development in the vicinity.
11. **Policy EN30** (Development in Conservation Areas) – proposals in conservation areas will be expected to preserve or enhance the special character and appearance of the area, especially in terms of their scale, massing, roof materials and wall materials. Schemes that do not specify traditional local materials or details that do not fit comfortably into their context will not be permitted.
12. The **Village Inset Plan** states that development at the north-western corner of the crossroads will not be permitted, as it would further erode the linear character of this part of the village (para.17.20).

Consultation

13. **Comberton Parish Council** - recommends refusal of the application. The Council has concerns about the precedent for further development on the former pasture land and the use of the access drive to serve it; the potential for a dwelling to be developed on the site of the summer house in the future; and the principle of using the remainder of the former pasture land for development. In response to the application as originally proposed, the Council were also concerned about the adverse effect on the street scene, conservation area and setting of the duck pond from where the roof line could be viewed.
14. **Conservation Manager** – has been in discussion with the applicant prior to submission. He is satisfied that a suitably designed and carefully sited dwelling could

be placed upon the former pasture land without harming the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. He believes that the proposal is modest and largely hidden from view, notwithstanding the re-siting of the dwelling in order to safeguard the adjoining Beech trees. He has provided detailed advice in the preparation of the design of the dwelling.

15. **Trees and Landscape Officer** – was originally concerned at the proximity of the dwelling to the Beech trees, but is satisfied with the amended siting, subject to the use of a suitable design for the foundations of the property.

Representations

16. A letter of objection has been received from the occupiers of 5, Green End, that adjoins the eastern boundary of the former pasture land area. They are concerned about overlooking and deposit of builder's rubble close to their property. They request the erection of close boarded fencing to remove overlooking, and a condition to control builders rubble during the construction period. The occupiers of the listed building at No.2 West Street have expressed concern about the development, and have drawn attention to the Inspector's decision in 2000. They consider that the land forms a pleasant backdrop to their property, and that the existing access is unsuitable to serve any additional development. They are concerned that the applicant will seek to develop the remaining land in the future.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

17. The main issues to be considered are whether the principle of development in this position is acceptable, and if so, whether the detailed design and siting submitted are suitable.
18. The site occupies the western-most end of the open area, where there are few views from public spaces outside the site. The southern end of this land forms a rounding off plot with adjoining development at No.8 West Street and the converted barn. The site is in a sensitive location, being within the Conservation Area and having the potential to affect the setting of listed buildings and the village pond. This has been recognised both in the Village Inset Plan and by an Inspector at appeal. Nevertheless, I believe that a carefully designed low-key dwelling could be accommodated on the site without causing harm to these aspects, and without undue harm to the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring properties. I am not persuaded that the erection of a single dwelling in this specific location will provide a precedent for further development in this area, because of the unique features of this part of the land, neither do I agree that the siting of the proposed summerhouse will provide a precedent for a dwelling in that position.
19. The proposed building has a low roof line and is designed in materials typical of a traditional farm building. I consider that this form of development, sited close to the converted barn, will not appear to be incongruous and will have little impact upon the street scene, adjoining tree belt, neighbours or setting of the listed buildings or village pond. The character and appearance of the Conservation Area will be preserved, and there will be none of the disadvantages found in unacceptable backland development. I consider that the proposal will conform to policies HG11 and EN30.

Recommendation

20. Approval
 1. Standard Condition A – Time limited permission (Reason A);

2. SC5a – Details of materials for external walls and roofs (Rc 5a);
3. SC51 – Landscaping (Rc 51);
4. SC52 – Implementation of landscaping (Rc 52);
5. Prior to the commencement of any development, details of the design of foundations so as to avoid damage to tree roots shall be submitted and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The works/scheme shall be constructed and completed in accordance with the approved plans/specifications. (Reason – To safeguard the roots of nearby trees from damage);
6. SC21 – Withdrawal of permitted development rights (Rc 21(a));
7. SC20 (a) – parking and turning space. (Rc 20);
8. SC26 - Limitations on power operated machinery 08:00 “during the period of construction 18:00 and 13:00 hours (Rc 26).

Reasons for Approval

Informatives

1. The approved development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:
 - **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003: P1/1** (Approach to Development), **P5/5** (Homes in Rural Areas)
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004: SE4** (Group Villages), **HG11** (Backland Development), **EN30** (Development in/adjacent to Conservation Areas), **Comberton Village Inset Plan**.
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:
 - Impact upon the setting of adjacent Listed Buildings;
 - Impact upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area;
 - Impact upon the roots of nearby trees;
 - Residential amenity;
 - Highway safety
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 applications S/1164/04/F and S/0995/99/F; Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003; South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.

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

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	6 th October 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

**S/1367/04/F - Foxton
Erection of Light Industrial and Storage Units, 27 Royston Road, for J Welch**

Recommendation: Approval

Departure Application**Site and Proposal**

1. This full application, registered on 1st July 2004, proposes the erection of 608sq m of light industrial and storage floor space on a 0.48ha area of land to the east of the A10, south of the Foxton crossing. In the front of the site is an existing car showroom and workshop, which are not affected by the proposed scheme
2. The rear part of the site currently contains a 380sq m workshop building along part of the south east boundary and a 58sq m nissen style building in the north east corner. In addition to these buildings there is a line of metal storage containers along the north east and south west boundary. The remainder of the site is hard-surfaced.
3. The application proposes the removal of the two existing buildings and metal containers and the erection of a block of five single storey light industrial and storage units, measuring in total 40m x 15.2m adjacent to the north east boundary of the site. Although no car parking plan is submitted adequate space exists on site.

History

4. At the April 2004 meeting (Item 17) planning permission for a larger replacement building (1046sq m) was refused on the grounds that the site was in the countryside and that the additional traffic likely to be generated by the proposal would have an adverse effect on highway safety.

Policy

5. The site is outside the village framework. The application has been advertised as a departure.
6. **Policy P1/2** 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.
7. There are no policies in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 that support new employment development in the countryside other than the change of use or conversion of rural buildings, or development on suitable brownfield sites next to or very close to the village frameworks of Rural Growth or Limited Rural Growth Settlements (Policy EM6). Foxton is not such a settlement.

8. The Government's Planning Policy 7, "Sustainable development in Rural Areas" (2004), is supportive of replacement of suitably located existing buildings of permanent design and construction for economic development purposes. The criteria that will apply to the replacement of countryside buildings should be set out in Local Development documents.

Consultations

9. **Foxton Parish Council** recommends approval. "Although there is some concern over the visual impact of the rear of the premises on the village, and a possible increase in traffic movement, on balance we wish to support the application subject to the condition that the work is completed within four years. Our reasons for support are:
- The development will improve the look of the site and generally "tidy it up."
 - The development may increase services and amenities of the village.
 - The development will increase the number of tenancies on the site and may therefore increase employment in the area."
10. The **Local Highway Authority** notes that the total floor space after development is stated as being some 72m² less than existing. It would be difficult to sustain an objection to replacement buildings comprising floor area no greater than exists at the present time. Suitable facilities for parking and turning should be provided for all vehicles likely to be generated by the proposal.
11. The **Chief Environmental Health Officer** has considered the implications of the proposal in terms of noise, environmental pollution and concludes that there are no significant impacts from an Environmental Health point of view.
12. The **Environment Agency** originally objected to the application as insufficient information had been submitted in respect of foul and surface water disposal and pollution prevention, to allow the Agency to fully assess the application. A flood risk assessment was requested. Following discussions with the applicant's agent it has agreed that these matters can be dealt with by means of conditions attached to any consent.
13. The **Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service** states that additional water supplies for firefighting are not required.
14. The comments of the **Trees and Landscapes Officer** will be reported verbally

Representations

15. None received.

Planning Comments

16. The key issues to be considered here are Structure Plan Policy P1/2 which restricts development in the countryside to those which can be demonstrated to be essential in a particular rural location, and the comments of the Local Highway Authority.
17. The proposal involves the erection of a new light industrial and storage building on the site to replace existing buildings and containers. The proposed building is considerably smaller than that refused earlier this year and, although the floor area is still greater than that of the buildings it will replace, I consider it acceptable given that

it will also result in the removal a number of metal storage containers that are currently in use on the site.

18. **The Local Highway Authority** has raised no objection to the application, although its comments that the proposal represents a reduction in floor space is only true if the existing storage containers are counted as floor space. I have not included these containers as floor space in my calculations, however they are used for commercial purposes and would therefore generate traffic movements to and from the site. It is not unreasonable for the Highway Authority to take these into account in assessing the highway implications of the proposal.
19. There are a number of trees close to the north east boundary of the site where the proposed building is to be located. The comments of the **Trees and Landscapes Officer** will be reported verbally but should concerns be raised there is potential to re-site the proposed building.
20. The matters raised by the **Environment Agency** can be dealt with by condition.
21. There have been no representations made in response to the departure advert and I do not consider that the application needs to be referred to the Secretary of State.

Recommendation

22. That, subject to the comments of the Trees and Landscapes Officer, the application is approved with the following conditions.
 1. SCA RCA
 2. SC5 Details a) & e) RC5 a)i) & ii) & e)
 3. Prior to the commencement of any development, a scheme for the provision and implementation of pollution control, including foul and surface water drainage, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The works/scheme shall be constructed and completed in accordance with the approved plans/specification at such time(s) as may be specified in the approved scheme.
 4. SC51 Landscaping RC51
 5. SC52 Implementation of Landscaping. RC52
 6. The existing buildings on the site shall be demolished, and the existing storage containers removed, and all materials removed from the site within 3 months of the building hereby permitted being occupied. RC To safeguard the character of the area.
 7. The development shall not be occupied until space has been laid out within the site, in accordance with a plan which has previously been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, for cars and cycles to be parked in accordance with the standards set out in Appendix 7/1 and 7/2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004, and for the loading and unloading of vehicles and for vehicles to turn so that they may enter and leave the site in forward gear, and that area shall not thereafter be used for any purpose other than parking/loading and unloading/turning of vehicles. RC20

Informatives

Reasons for Approval

1. In considering this application regard has been had to policies in the Development Plan. Although the application proposes the erection of a new building in the countryside it replaces existing buildings and storage containers on the site and the Local Planning Authority is of the view that application can be approved as a departure from the Development Plan
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:
 - Drainage
 - Visual impact on the locality
 - Highway Safety
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:

Application files S/1367/04/F and S/0292/04/F
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004

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

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	6 th October 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

**S/1237/04/F - Gamlingay
Lean-To Extension to Existing Garage Building,
Brook End, Potton Road for
J Chapman**

Recommendation: Delegated Approval

Departure Application

Site and Proposal

1. The site lies outside the village framework on the Potton Road out of Gamlingay heading south. It is an existing commercial premises accessed from Potton Road. The operation is essentially concerned with the repair and service of commercial vehicles. There is one building of some 200 sq. metres footprint on the site set back approximately 50m from the road where most of the work takes place. A dwelling sits at the front of the site.
2. The application, registered on 16th June 2004 proposes a rear lean-to extension (approximately 160 sq. metres footprint) to the workshop building across its entire width and projecting back approximately 9m. At its highest point it will be approximately 5.7m sloping down to 5.3m.
3. Amended plans have been submitted to correct site area dimensions and to correctly show the position of the existing building within the site.

Planning History

4. The building, and its use, were approved under planning permission reference S/1788/91 in December 1991 subject to conditions. One of these required the use of the building to be carried on only so long as the residential property (at the front of the site) is occupied by the present or any future owner of the premises or by an employee of such an owner working at the application premises.

Planning Policy

5. **Policy P1/2** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 states (in part): "Development will be restricted in the countryside unless the proposals can be demonstrated to be essential in a particular rural location".
6. **Planning Policy Statement No 7** – Sustainable Development in Rural Areas states (in part): New building development in the open countryside away from existing settlements, or outside areas allocated for development in development plans, should be strictly controlled; the Government's overall aim is to protect the countryside for the sake of its intrinsic character and beauty, the diversity of its landscapes, heritage and wildlife, the wealth of its natural resources and so it may be enjoyed by all... Priority

should be given to the re-use of previously-developed ('brownfield') sites... All development in rural areas should be well designed and inclusive, in keeping and scale with its location, and sensitive to the character of the countryside and local distinctiveness.

Consultation

7. **Gamlingay Parish Council**

The Parish Council has recommended approval.

8. **Bedfordshire and River Ivel Internal Drainage Board**

"The site is within the Board's drainage district and within the Environment Agency's indicative flood plain. Following the precautionary principles of PPG 25 a flood risk assessment consistent with the size and type of development should be submitted prior to the application being determined."

9. **Environment Agency**

"Whilst the site is within the floodplain I considered when I viewed the planning application that a reasonably modest sized extension would have no measurable impact upon floodplain. An appropriate flood risk assessment, in this instance, would be a statement to following effect.

- Final construction level of floor will be as existing ground level.
- All excavated material removed off-site
- No raising of ground levels within the floodplain
- Soakaways will be designed and constructed in accordance with BRE365"

Representations

10. One letter of support has been received from the occupiers of Tudor Oak, 2 Mill Hill, Potton Road: The supporter states "I live adjacent to the property in question and have full view of the lorry yard and I have no objection to this planning application whatsoever"

Planning Comments – Key Issues

11. The key issues are the impact of the site on its surroundings and the justification for new build in the countryside.
12. There are a number of mature trees surrounding this site and in the vicinity. There is also commercial activity on adjacent sites. The building is visible from the road but it does not stand in open countryside and is set well back. The proposed lean-to extension is to the rear and, at its highest point, is no higher than the eaves of the existing building. All of these factors lead me to the conclusion that this building will not have a detrimental impact on the visual quality of the surrounding countryside.
13. The applicant approached the Council last year to highlight the problem with working on large vehicles. The depth of the existing building is insufficient to allow the vehicles to be entirely enclosed within the building. In the winter months this necessitates working with the doors open and the vehicles being partly outside. This makes for uncomfortable working conditions for the applicants workforce. The extension is not intended to allow for an intensification of the use of the premises.

14. It is my view that the need for the extension coupled with the minimal impact the extension will have on the surrounding countryside is sufficient justification to recommend approval of the application.
15. The applicant has been requested to undertake a flood risk assessment.

Recommendations

Delegated powers of approval are sought, as amended by plans franked 26th August 2004, subject to the submission of a Flood Risk Assessment that satisfies the concerns of the Environment Agency and safeguarding conditions to ensure its implementation and subject to the following additional conditions:

1. Standard Condition A – Time limited permission (Reason A)
2. Standard Condition SC19 – Materials to match existing.
3. The use of the extension, hereby permitted, shall be carried on only so long as the residential property known as Brook End, Potton Road, Gamlingay, Cambs. SG19 3LJ is occupied by the present or any future owner of the application premises or by an employee of such an owner working at the application premises.
(Reason – To protect the amenities enjoyed by the occupiers of Brook End Potton Road, Gamlingay, Cambs. SG19 3LJ due to the proximity of that property to the application premises).
4. Implementation of recommendation of the Flood Risk Assessment.

Informatives

Reasons for Approval

1. Although the proposal has been considered as a Departure from the Development Plan, and particularly in regard to policies aimed at protecting the countryside, the Local Planning Authority considers very special circumstances exist which outweigh the harm by being located in the countryside:
 - **The extension sits within existing commercial development screened by mature trees and is not located in an open area rendering it visually acceptable within the countryside;**
 - **The extension is required to improve staff working conditions and will not result in any significant intensification of the use of the site.**
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 and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004

Planning Policy Statement 7 – Sustainable Development in Rural Areas
Planning File Refs. S/1788/91/F, S/1237/04/F.

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

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	6 th October 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

**S/1708/04/F - Gamlingay
Additional Residents Parking Area, Blythe Way for South Cambridgeshire District
Council, Shire Homes**

Recommendation: Approval

Site and Proposal

1. The 160 sq metre application site is located in a cul de sac off Stocks Lane outside of the designated conservation area for Gamlingay. Two resident parking areas already exist and are located within the green amenity space in the street. The housing in the cul de sac are mainly bungalows, none of which have off road parking facilities and predominately lived in by elderly residents.
2. The application, received on 13th August 2004, proposes an access to, and spaces for, 5 parking bays on part of the existing grassed area at the head of the cul-de-sac of Blythe Way. One space would be for disabled use. The land would be block-paved.

Planning History

3. **S/0869/04 – Additional Residents Parking Area – Withdrawn**
This application was withdrawn after it received a recommendation for refusal following comments from the Trees and Landscape officer that the proposed parking area would have an adverse impact on the existing trees on the site.

Planning Policy

TP5 - People with disabilities and limited mobility of The Local Plan 2004

P1/3 – Sustainable Design in Built Development of the Country Structure Plan 2003

Consultation

4. **Gamlingay Parish Council** recommends refusal
“Parish Council objects due to the loss of amenity space. The revised plan takes a significantly large area for just five parking spaces. The Council also advises that the existing car park is underutilised.”
5. **Trees and Landscape Officer** No objections. A tree protection condition should be imposed.

Representations

6. None received

Planning Comments – Key Issues

7. The key issue is the impact of the loss of part of an amenity space. Within Blythe Way there are two resident parking areas and approximately 31 bungalows that do not have off road parking facilities. Each parking area can park up to 5 cars. The amenity space available is planted with trees and laid to grass. At present it seems that residents and visitors are parking in the turning head of Blythe Way and causing an obstruction to emergency vehicles.
8. I am of the view that further parking spaces would discourage parking in the turning head and would not adversely affect the street scene. Further planting is proposed to soften the proposed parking area. The parking area has been reduced in size to address the previous concerns of the Trees and Landscape Officer. The existing trees are to be retained and are not compromised by this proposal.

Recommendation

Approve

1. Standard Condition A – Time limited permission (Reason A);
2. Sc5f – Details of materials to be used for hard surfaced car-parking area (Reason – To minimise disturbance to adjoining residents);
3. Tree protection during construction (Reason – to protect the surrounding trees).

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: TP5** (People with disabilities and limited mobility)
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 and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
Planning Application file S/1708/04/F

Contact Officer: Saffron Garner – Assistant Development Services Assistant.
Telephone: (01954) 713162

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	6 October 2004
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

S/1592/04/F - Girton
Erection of Offices (Class B1) Retrospective Application at Girton Farm, Oakington Road for Cambridge Federation of Women's Institutes

Recommendation: Delegated Approval

Departure Application

Site and Proposal

1. The application site lies 0.4km beyond the northern edge of Girton and is positioned to the rear of properties in Oakington Road. It uses the vehicle access running immediately adjacent to the chalet bungalow at No. 1a Oakington Road, which is also the vehicular access to Girton House. There are redundant agricultural buildings in separate ownership to the south and houses to the east. The site is within the Cambridge Green Belt.
2. The full application, received on 29 July 2004, seeks retrospective permission for the erection of offices (Class B1) measuring 181 sq. metres. The offices measure 28.3m in width and up to 7.6m in depth, with a ridge height of 3.0m.
3. The site is to be used as the administrative headquarters of the Cambridge Federation of Women's Institutes and will house two full-time staff.

Planning History

4. Planning permission was given in October 2003 for the Alteration, Extension and Conversion of Agricultural Building into Offices (Class B1) (Ref: S/1500/03/F). Condition 6 of the planning consent stated that "with the exception of the north-west end of the building and part of the south-western elevation, there shall be no demolition of the existing building".
5. The agent was informed by letter dated 15 June 2004 that Council officers were of the view that work on the site had amounted to the demolition of the building and the erection of new offices.

Planning Policy

6. **Government Planning Policy Guidance Notes (PPG) 2** "Green Belts" identifies the erection of new buildings within the Green Belt as inappropriate development, which is by definition harmful to the Green Belt. Very special circumstances are needed to justify inappropriate development in these areas.
7. **Government Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 7** "Sustainable Development in Rural Areas" supports the replacement of "suitably located, existing buildings of permanent design and construction in the countryside for economic development

purposes”. It adds that the “replacement of buildings should be favoured where this would result in a more acceptable and sustainable development than might be achieved through conversion.”

8. **Policy 1/2** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 (“The County Structure Plan”) restricts development in the Countryside unless the proposals can be demonstrated to be essential in a particular rural location.
9. **Policy 1/3** of the County Structure Plan requires a high level of design for all new development that responds to the local character of the built environment.
10. **Policy 2/6** of the County Structure Plan states that sensitive small-scale employment development in rural areas will be facilitated where it contributes to specified objectives, including helping to maintain or renew the vitality of rural areas.
11. **Policy 7/4** of the County Structure Plan and **EN1 & EN3** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 (“The Local Plan”) seeks to protect the character and appearance of the local landscape.
12. **Policy GB2** of the Local Plan defines the erection of offices as inappropriate development within the Green Belt and adds that planning permission will not be granted for inappropriate development in the Green Belt unless very special circumstances can be granted.
13. This policy goes on to state that: “any development considered appropriate within the Green Belt under the above criteria must be located and designed so that it does not have an adverse effect on the rural character and openness of the Green Belt”.

Consultation

14. **Girton Parish Council** – No recommendation
15. **Chief Environmental Health Officer** – No objection, subject to a recommended condition of consent regarding power driven plant or equipment.
16. **Environment Agency** – Response to be verbally reported.
17. **Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service** – No objection. They add that the Fire Authority is of the opinion that additional water supplies for firefighting are not required.

Representations

18. Letter received from the occupant of Dapple Farm which, lies to the south east. The letter states that “we note there is no landscaping plan to the southeast boundary. This abuts our property and is clearly visible. Could a landscaping plan be included to screen the buildings and car parking area”.
19. This resident also asks for confirmation of how surface water drainage will be disposed of.

Planning Comments

20. The key issues for consideration in this application are:

- Whether the proposal represents appropriate development within the Green Belt and if not, are there very special circumstances that would justify a departure from planning policies;
 - The visual impact of the proposed building on the visual amenities of the Green Belt, Countryside and local landscape;
 - Potential impacts on the amenity of adjacent land users; and
 - Increased employment in a rural location.
21. The development plan defines the erection of new buildings within the Green Belt as inappropriate development. Although the application has been advertised as a Departure from the Development Plan, the proposal will result in an office building of the same size, siting and appearance as the approved planning application for the conversion of an existing agricultural building into offices. The proposal will have no additional impact on the visual amenities or the openness of the Green Belt, Countryside and local landscape than the previous application approved on this site. It is noted that the proposed building is setback approximately 50m from Girton Road and is of similar size and height to existing agricultural buildings to the south and west.
22. I wish to draw to Members attention that in January 2003 a Planning Inspector quashed an enforcement notice against, and granted planning permission for, the erection of a commercial building within the Green Belt at Arnold's Farm, Shelford Bottom, Great Shelford. Planning permission had previously been given on this site for the conversion of an agricultural building for commercial uses. In this case, the Inspector was of the view that the new building did not harm the openness of the Green Belt as the building had the same external appearance as shown on the approved plans for conversion.
23. The current proposal will have no additional impacts on the amenity of adjacent land owners as the previously approved building conversion on the site.
24. The proposal will marginally increase employment opportunities within this rural location.
25. Having regard to the nature of representations received and the special circumstances identified in paragraph 21 above, I do not consider that it will be necessary to refer the application to the Secretary of State as a Departure Application which would significantly prejudice the implementation of the Development Plan's Policies.

Recommendation

26. Delegated Approval following response received from Environment Agency.

Conditions of Consent

1. Standard Condition A – Time limited permission (Reason A);
2. The building, hereby approved, shall not be occupied until a scheme for the provision and implementation of pollution control which shall include foul and surface water drainage, has been submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The works/scheme shall be constructed and completed in accordance with the approved plans before the building is occupied. Reason: to ensure a satisfactory method of foul and surface

water drainage and to prevent the increased risk of pollution to the water environment.

3. The building, hereby approved, shall not be occupied until the existing access has been widened to 5.5 metres for a distance back of 15.0 metres as measured from the channel line of Oakington Road in accordance with details which shall previously have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Reason: In the interests of highway safety.
4. The building, hereby approved, shall not be occupied until the access driveway has been provided with a sealed surface for its entire length in accordance with details which shall previously have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Reason: to minimise noise disturbance to adjoining residents.
5. The car parking spaces shown on drawing no. 037/02/P002 shall be provided before the use commences and thereafter made available for staff/visitors to the premises. Reason: to ensure adequate parking is made available.
6. Details of the location and type of power driven plant or equipment, including equipment for heating, ventilation and for the control or extraction of any odour, dust or fumes from the building but excluding any office equipment and vehicles and the location of the outlet from the building of such plant and equipment, shall be submitted and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority before such plant or equipment is installed; the said plant or equipment shall be installed in accordance with the approved details and with any agreed noise restrictions. Reason a) to protect the occupiers of adjoining buildings from the effect of odour, dust or fumes and to ensure that plant and equipment is not visually intrusive.

+ Conditions recommended by Environment Agency

Informatives

Reasons for Approval

26. Although the proposal is contrary to policies in the Development Plan restricting new development within the Green Belt, it is considered that there are material considerations in this case which warrant a departure from the provisions of this plan. The proposal would result in a new office building of the same size, siting and appearance as a previous planning permission for the conversion of an agricultural building; and hence would have no additional impact on the openness of the Green Belt or the visual amenities of the local landscape.

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 Policy Guidance Note 2 – Green Belt
Planning Policy Statement 7 – Countryside
Planning File Refs S/1592/04/F and S/1500/03/F
Enforcement File Ref E/451

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

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/1058/03/F	Mr & Mrs Sherwood R/o 117 High Street <u>Melbourn</u> Erection of a dwelling & double garage (Delegated Refusal)	Dismissed 18/08/2004
S/2033/03/F	Mr & Mrs Flitton Adj 39 Church Street <u>Thriplow</u> Bungalow (Delegated Refusal)	Dismissed 19/08/2004
S/2256/03/F	R Adlington Wood View, Potton End <u>Eltisley</u> Temporary Structure above garage (retrospective) (Delegated Refusal)	Dismissed 19/08/2004
S/2042/03/F	Mr & Mrs Heron Byron Lodge, 3 Royston Road <u>Harston</u> Extension (Delegated Refusal)	Allowed 19/08/2004
S/1539/03/F	Mr & Mrs Heron Byron Lodge, 3 Royston Road <u>Harston</u> Extension (Officer Recommendation to Approve)	Allowed 19/08/2004
S/1647/03/F	Mr R Shipsey & Ms J List Croxley House, Royston Road <u>Litlington</u> Extension to dwelling & erection of triple garage (Delegated Refusal)	Allowed 23/08/2004

S/2141/03/F	Mr & Mrs Willis 2B Church Road <u>Teversham</u> Outbuilding providing swimming pool, changing rooms and ancillary facilities for private use (Officer Recommendation to Refuse)	Dismissed 24/08/2004
S/1879/03/O	Vision Homes Cinques Road <u>Gamlingay</u> Residential development (Delegated Refusal)	Dismissed 31/08/2004
S/2204/03/F	Mr J Tilley The Old Fire Engine Shed, High Street <u>Sawston</u> Conversion of former fire engine shed to offices (Delegated Refusal)	Dismissed 01/09/2004
S/2257/03/F	Mr G Cadoo 6 & 8 St Michaels Lane <u>Longstanton</u> Dwelling (Delegated Refusal)	Dismissed 07/09/2004
S/1528/03/F	Mr I Harvey 36 Dubbs Knoll Road <u>Guilden Morden</u> Appeal against condition 2 of approval requiring approval of sample materials (Officer Recommendation to Approve)	Dismissed 07/09/2004

2. Summaries Of Recent Decisions Of Interest

Mr J. Biddall- Change of Use of Land to Travelling Showpeople's Quarters (11 Plots)- Kneesworth Road, Meldreth- Appeal Allowed

This appeal was dealt with by way of a public inquiry. The vice chairman of Meldreth Parish Council attended and gave evidence.

The Inspector considered the main issue of this appeal to be whether the development would harm the character and appearance of the area, having regard to its countryside location, other uses in the immediate area and the material considerations advanced in this case.

The site is situated outside the defined framework boundary of Meldreth on the northern side of Kneesworth Road. It is a rectangular piece of overgrown land that is surrounded on three sides by mature hedges. In the south eastern corner there is a blocked up access to Kneesworth Road. Agricultural land lies to the north. Five Acres is a travelling showpeople's site that is situated to the east. The disused County Council owned traveller's site lies directly opposite Five Acres.

The only harm identified by the Council with regards to the proposed development was the resultant undesirable concentration of such sites in the area that would cumulatively have a significant adverse affect upon the rural character and appearance of the area.

The Inspector agreed with both the Council and the appellant that the appeal site is visually dominated by the existing permitted travelling showpeople's site to the west, as there is no screening along the common boundary between the two sites. The cumulative impact of the concentration of three sites for similar uses was therefore considered negligible as the existing site had already changed the character of the area and that it had resulted in potential sites for similar uses on both sides of the road.

The appeal site was considered to be much better screened in comparison to the existing site at Five Acres that is set at a slightly higher level and visible for long distances from Kneesworth Road. The Inspector concluded that additional landscaping to improve the depth of the existing planting, fill the gaps and provide year round screening would ensure that the proposed use does not have a significant visual impact upon the surrounding countryside.

The Council conceded that there was a general unmet need within the district for sites for travelling showpeople. The appellant and a member of the Showmen's Guild of Great Britain produced evidence to show that there is little prospect of finding suitable alternative sites within London and the South East and that the number of sites is falling, partly as a result of the compulsory purchase of sites.

The Inspector took into consideration the specific needs and current circumstances of the appellant on his current site at South Ockenden in Essex. There are legal problems relating to an ongoing dispute over the ownership of land and evidence was produced to show that the safety and security of the family are severely compromised and that the appellant's wife has health problems as a result of living on that site. He also acknowledged that although the appellant was not born in the area, he has worked most of his life in London and the South East including East Anglia and nearby towns such as Cambridge and Royston.

The Inspector concluded by stating that there was an undisputed need for sites for travelling showpeople. He was satisfied that the appellant had demonstrated that he has a need a site and that this particular site was reasonably well located to enable him to continue to exercise a travelling lifestyle for the purpose of making and seeking his livelihood.

The appeal was allowed subject to conditions. These included a limitation on the occupation of the site to members of the Showmen's Guild of Great Britain, a restriction on the number of plots and caravans allowed on each plot, and details of hard and soft landscaping, boundary treatment, foul and surface water drainage, the layout of the site and the vehicular access to Kneesworth Road.

Comment: The inspector was clearly influenced by Member's decision to approve the Five Acres site back in November 2002. This site was found to be significantly more prominent in the landscape than the Biddall site.

Mr H Price- Enforcement Against Change of Use of Land to Residential Caravan Site (8 Plots) and Ancillary Development- Primrose Meadow, Cow Lane, Rampton - Appeal Allowed

The Inspector considered the main determining factors in the outcome of this appeal to be whether the development harms the rural character and appearance of the area, whether the development is detrimental to highway safety and whether the development is well located for access to schools, shops and other local services.

The site lies in the open countryside outside the Rampton village framework. The site is screened on all four sides by mature trees and hedges and is surrounded by small hedged fields to the north and south and a large open arable fields to the east and beyond the small fields.

The Council accepted that the appellant and others living on the site are of gypsy status for planning purposes and that the Price family had lived within the district for the past 50 years. The Inspector acknowledged that the appellant had recently moved from a site with planning permission in the nearby village of Cottenham as a result of an influx of Irish gypsies. These people did not mix well with the English gypsies and had therefore made the appellant's living conditions "intolerable" through anti-social activities.

In contrast, there was considerable support from the local community in Rampton at the Inquiry.

The site is located 650 metres from Rampton and around 3-4 km from the nearby villages of Willingham and Cottenham. Although Rampton has a limited range of amenities, the larger villages close by are considered readily accessible by walking, cycling or driving. Whilst the Inspector conceded that most journeys would be made by car, he decided that as the occupants of the site were all family, they would share lifts and combine journeys. The site was therefore said to be located within reasonable distances of local services and facilities with regard to both convenience and sustainability issues.

The Inspector considered that the site retains much of its rural character as the hedges and trees around the perimeter of the site provide an effective screen that gives the appearance of a copse. Whilst some caravans may be visible in winter, the dense screening limits both long distance views from the surrounding area and close range public views from Cow Lane. The Inspector concluded by stating that it would be difficult to find a site that has more potential than the appeal site to be assimilated into its surroundings by landscaping.

Cow Lane is a single width, long, straight track with good visibility. From a traffic survey carried out by a local resident and the Inspectors own observations on site, he found that it was a very lightly trafficked road. He respected the Council's view that passing bays would harm the character and appearance of the area but considered that the use was acceptable in highway terms as there would only be a limited number of occasions where vehicles would have to pass each other safely. Passing bays were therefore not required.

The Inspector considered that the Council's objection regarding the use of septic tanks was unsubstantiated. There was no evidence to suggest that this method of disposal was not working adequately and if that were the case, it would be the responsibility of other authorities to resolve the matter. This matter together with other outstanding drainage matters could therefore be controlled by condition.

The appeal was allowed subject to conditions. These included a personal condition limiting the occupancy of the site to Mr Hope Price, his immediate family and their dependents and only when they are exercising a travelling lifestyle as a gypsy, a restriction on the number of plots, the prohibition of any trade or business, the removal of permitted development rights with regards to external lighting and details of landscaping and drainage.

Comment: As with the Biddall decision, this is a well-screened site. The impact of the caravans is very limited. While the family's circumstances were taken into account, the appeal was largely allowed because of the suitability of the site.

Mr & Mrs Bryce-Smith- Extension- Home Farm, 10 High Street, Shepreth- Appeal Dismissed**Mr & Mrs Bryce-Smith- Alterations: Removal of Window/ Wall to Create Doorway for Access to New Extension- Home Farm, 10 High Street, Shepreth- Appeal Dismissed**

The Inspector considered the main issue of these appeals to be whether the extension would harm the special architectural and historic interest of Home Farm and whether the extension would adversely affect the character and appearance of the Shepreth conservation area.

Home Farm is a detached, mediaeval style, thatched cottage that is a Grade II listed building. It is a three bay building that was built in the 16th century and extended in the 17th century. It is set well back from the High Street in a secluded position behind fairly large mature gardens.

The Inspector considered that the replacement of the existing window and wall with a doorway to provide a link to the new extension would not significantly harm the fabric of the cottage. The current window did not form part of the original design and has been subsequently inserted. The proposed doorway would use the same opening with little structural change.

The appellants had a genuine need for more accommodation. There was support from a local councillor and the Council was prepared to grant a small extension as a matter of principle. However, the proposed extension was found to be substantial and its relationship with the cottage would be unsympathetic. It would detract from the appearance of the cottage. This would also result in harm to the overall character of the conservation area.

3. Appeals received

Ref. No.	Details	Date
S/0579/04/F	Mr and Mrs Payne Land R/O 59 Fowlmere Road <u>Foxton</u> Dwelling (Delegated Refusal)	13/08/2004
S/0629/04/F	Mr and Mrs Noyes 22 North Brook End <u>Steeple Morden</u> Extension (Delegated Refusal)	13/08/2004
S/0628/04/LB	Mr and Mrs Noyes 22 North Brook End <u>Steeple Morden</u> Internal and external alterations including conversion of bathroom to utility room and two ground floor bedrooms (Delegated Refusal)	13/08/2004

S/0740/04/F	Optima (Cambridge) Ltd. The Bury, Newmarket Road <u>Stow-cum-Quy</u> Retention and conversion of unauthorised office extension to garden machinery store (Delegated Refusal)	16/08/2004
S/0797/04/F	Mr S Godsell 110 Watermead <u>Bar Hill</u> Extensions and change of use (Officer Recommendation to Refuse)	20/08/2004
S/0891/04/A	Greene King Pub Company The Blue Lion Public House, Horningsea Road <u>Fen Ditton</u> Signs (Officer Recommendation Part Approval/Part Refusal)	25/08/2004
E490	Mr A Carter 33 High Street <u>Waterbeach</u> Enforcement of removal of fence	25/08/2004
S/6248/04/RM	MCA Developments Ltd. Plot GC13, Jeavons Lane <u>Cambourne</u> 54 Dwellings (Delegated Refusal)	27/08/2004
S/1278/04/F	Mr T Mason Former Q8 Petrol Filling Station, Cambridge Road <u>Croxton</u> Change of use to hand car wash and security fencing Non-Determination/Officer Recommendation to Approve)	31/08/2004
S/0592/04/F	R W S Arnold Bennell Farm, West Street (Comberton) <u>Toft</u> Erection of B1 offices (Officer Recommendation to Refuse)	03/09/2004
S/1008/04/LB	Mr & Mrs Gadian The Old Vicarage, 7 May Street <u>Great & Little Chishill</u> Alterations/removal of section of wall, removal of open verandah and replacement by lean to conservatory (Delegated Refusal)	13/09/2004

S/1009/04/F Mr & Mrs Gadian 13/09/2004
 The Old Vicarage, 7 May Street,
Great & Little Chishill
 Conservatory
 (Delegated Refusal)

4. Local Inquiry and Informal Hearing dates scheduled before the next meeting on 3rd November 2004

Ref. No.	Details	Date/Time/Venue
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 Ground floor Room 10.00am

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

Ref. No.	Details	Date
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/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)	18/11/2004 Confirmed
EP246A	Shelford Lodge Ltd 144 Cambridge Road <u>Great Shelford</u> Enforcement of removal of mobile home (Local Inquiry)	18/11/2004 Confirmed
E461C	Mr P O'Brien Land off Water Lane <u>Cottenham</u> Enforcement against change of use to residential caravan site (Local Inquiry Resumed)	23/11/2004 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 Resumed)	23/11/2004 Confirmed
S/2370/02/F	J Culligan 7 Orchard Drive, Smithy Fen <u>Cottenham</u> Caravan & day room (Local Inquiry Resumed)	23/11/2004 Confirmed

9 Appeals	Plots 7-16 Pineview Smithy Fen <u>Cottenham</u> Siting of travelers caravan and day room (Local Inquiry Resumed)	23/11/2004 Confirmed
S/2089/03/F	Heddon Management Ltd 12 Pieces Lane <u>Waterbeach</u> 8 Houses (Informal Hearing)	30/11/2004 Confirmed
S/2194/03/F	Mr C Taylor 45 Spring Lane <u>Bassingbourn</u> Construction of raised decked area, path and sunken patio/lawn (part retrospective) (Informal Hearing)	11/01/2005 Confirmed
E473A	Optima (Cambridge) Ltd The Bury, Newmarket Road <u>Stow-cum-Quy</u> Enforcement against erection of flat roofed extension to existing office building (Informal Hearing)	18/01/2005 Offered/
S/0740/04/F	Optima (Cambridge) Ltd. The Bury, Newmarket Road <u>Stow-cum-Quy</u> Retention and conversion of unauthorised office extension to garden machinery store (Informal Hearing)	18/01/2005 Offered/
S/0019/04/F	Mr P Mansfield 29 Worcester Avenue <u>Hardwick</u> Change of use of land to garden land & extension to dwelling (Informal Hearing)	08/03/2005 Offered/Accepted
S/0358/04/F	Dr & Mrs N Coleman Adj 33 Mill Hill <u>Weston Colville</u> Erection of house and garage and carport for existing dwelling (Informal Hearing)	09/03/2005 Confirmed

S/0466/04/F

Mr & Mrs North
Clopton Lodge, The Cinques

10/05/2005

Offered/Accepted

Gamlingay

Appeal against condition 2 of permission - personal occupancy
condition and removal thereafter
(Local Inquiry)

INDEX OF CURRENT ENFORCEMENT CASES
6th October 2004

Ref.No	Location	See Page No. for full update	Remarks
18/98	Setchell Drove COTTENHAM	1-3	Prosecution files submitted for plots 7 and 10. Cases listed at Cambridge Magistrates Court 29 th September 2004.
26/98	Riverside Stables LITTLE ABINGTON	3-6	Site continues to be monitored.
34/98	Camside Farm Chesterton Fen Road MILTON	6-10	Enforcement is linked to resolution of outstanding conditions for S/2285/03/F which was approved on 16 th August 2004.
14/99	Carefield Button End HARSTON	10-14	Temporary planning permission granted to 7 th April 2007. Remove from active list until January 2007.
4/01	1 Meeting Lane MELBOURN	14-16	Currently unable to locate owner.
12/02	The Stables Chesterton Fen Road MILTON	16-17	Prosecution file submitted to Legal Office. Appeal against non determination of S/1934/03/F fixed for 7 th September 2004. Awaiting outcome of appeal.
17/02	Land at Sandy Park Chesterton Fen Road MILTON	17-18	Appeal dismissed on 1 st July 2004 subject of a Judicial Review. No date fixed.
18/02	Rose and Crown Road SWAVESEY	18-19	Appeal dismissed 22 nd July 2004. Subject of a Judicial Review.
21/02	Land at Chesterton Fen Road, (Ponyfield) MILTON	19-20	Compliance period extended to 1 st January 2005.
6/03	The Oaks Meadow Road WILLINGHAM	20	Enforcement Notice appeal dismissed. Compliance date 4 th November 2004.

7/03	Land adjacent to Setchell Drove COTTENHAM (A Land)	21	Appeal allowed on 14 th October 2003. Subject to conditions which are currently being considered.
8/03	Land adjacent to Setchell Drove COTTENHAM (B Land)	22	Appeal adjourned to 23 rd November 2004
9/03	Land adjacent to Setchell Drove COTTENHAM (G Land)	23	Appeal adjourned to 23 rd November 2004.
10/03	Land at Plot 2 and R/O Plot 3 Setchell Drove COTTENHAM	23-24	Subject of an appeal to the High Court. No date fixed.
14/03	4 St Andrews Close STAPLEFORD	24	Enforcement Notice complied with. Remove from active list.
15/03	Victoria View Land to rear of Plots 3, 4 and 5 Setchel Drove COTTENHAM	25	Resolved to ensure compliance by means of Direct Action and prosecution.
16/03	Shelford Lodge Cambridge Road GREAT SHELFORD	26	Appeal inquiry listed for 16 th November 2004.
17/03	65 Wimpole Road BARTON	26	Prosecution file submitted to Legal Office for Breach of Enforcement Notice.
18/03	Primrose Meadow Cow Lane RAMPTON	27	Appeal allowed. Remove from active list.
19/03	Land adjacent to Moor Drove Cottenham Road HISTON	27	Enforcement Notices and refusal of planning permission appealed. Public Inquiry fixed for 14 th December 2004
1/04	Woodview Potton End ELTISLEY	28	Failed to comply with Enforcement Notice. Prosecution file to be submitted.

2/04	The Bury Newmarket Road STOW-CUM-QUY	28	Enforcement Notice E473 appealed.
4/04	65 Eland Way Teversham	28-29	Enforcement Notice issued subject to an appeal.
5/04	Setbroad Farm Oakington Road Cottenham	29	Enforcement Notices withdrawn as a result of approval of planning permission. Remove from active list.
6/04	Land adjacent to Kneesworth Road Meldreth	29	Injunction issued 4 th June 2004. No caravans/mobile homes to be brought onto the land. Planning permission for show peoples' quarters allowed on appeal.
7/04	Hinxton Grange Hinxton	29	Enforcement Notice E450 appealed.
8/04	Berry House 33 High Street Waterbeach	30	Enforcement Notice E490 issued for unauthorised fence.
9/04	Land adjacent to Fen Road Swavesey	30	Enforcement Notice E485 issued for unauthorised development.

This page is intentionally left blank

ENFORCEMENT ACTION

PROGRESS REPORT – 6th October 2004

CASE NUMBER AND SITE	DETAILS OF CONTRAVENTION	ACTION TAKEN	PRESENT SITUATION
<p>18/98 B/1/45/20 Mobile Home Site Setchell Drove COTTENHAM</p>	<p>A. Stationing of caravans without planning permission. B. Unauthorised building works. C. Unauthorised Engineering works.</p>	<p>Planning Committee 1st July 1998 - Item 26. Members gave delegated authority to take Enforcement Action in respect of those breaches of planning control which could not be regularised by the submission of a planning application or resolved by negotiation.</p>	<p>3.4.2002 The requirements of the Enforcement Notices in respect of over size buildings on the front part of Plots Fourwinds, 7A, 7 and 10 have not been met. Arrangements are in hand for those concerned to take part in a formal interview, and once they have taken place (or declined) prosecution files will be compiled and forwarded to the Legal Office for processing.</p> <p>3.7.2002 The owners of the oversized structures on the front land of Plot 7, 7A and 10 have been formally interviewed as to why they have not been reduced in size, and discussions are taking place to agree a way forward to ensure maximum success in any ensuing Court proceedings.</p> <p>2.10.2002 Further discussions with local Members being planned to consider a number of issues relating to development in this area.</p> <p>8.1.2003 Prosecution files submitted to Legal Office for Plots 7, 7A and 10</p> <p>2.4.2003 Planning applications S/0024/03/F and S/0025/03/F received for 7A and 10 Setchell Drove have now been refused.</p>

CASE NUMBER AND SITE	DETAILS OF CONTRAVENTION	ACTION TAKEN	PRESENT SITUATION
			<p>Case listed at Cambridge Magistrates Court 19th March 2003 for breach of Enforcement Notice. Adjourned to 9th April 2003</p> <p>2.7.2003 On 9th April the owners of Plots 7, 7A and 10 appeared before Cambridge Magistrates Court. They were each fined £200 with £45 costs. An appeal was made against the refusal of planning permission for the retention of a day room on Plot 10 S/0024/03 refers but the appeal has now been withdrawn.</p> <p>The owners of Plots 7, 7A and 10 have moved off the site and Plots 7 and 10 are now occupied. Planning Contravention Notices have been issued to establish details of ownership before commencing further proceedings.</p> <p>1.10.2003 The owners of Plots 7 and 10 have been reported for being in breach of Enforcement Notices. Prosecution file being submitted to Legal Office.</p> <p>Owner of Plot 7A not identified. Enquiries continue.</p> <p>7.1.2004 Prosecution file submitted to Legal Office for Plots 7 and 10. Enquiries continue concerning Plot 7A.</p> <p>7.4.2004 Prosecution files submitted for oversize buildings on Plots 7 and 10</p> <p>7.7.2004 Cases listed at Cambridge Magistrates Court for 30th June 2004.</p>

CASE NUMBER AND SITE	DETAILS OF CONTRAVENTION	ACTION TAKEN	PRESENT SITUATION
			<p>6.10.2004 Cases listed for plots 7 and 10 at Cambridge Magistrates Court on 29th September 2004.</p> <p>Resolved to take Direct Action for breach of extant Enforcement Notices to the rear of plots 2 to 8 Setchel Drove.</p>
<p>26/98 B/1/45/61 Riverside Stables Bourn Bridge Road LITTLE ABINGTON</p>	<p>Without the benefit of planning permission</p> <p>A. The stationing of a mobile home for residential purposes.</p> <p>B. Unauthorised engineering works.</p> <p>C. Change of use - storage of motor vehicle and vehicle parts.</p>	<p>Planning Committee 7th October 1998 - Item 18.</p> <p>Members authorised enforcement action in respect of identified breaches of planning control which could not be resolved by means of negotiation.</p> <p>A. To clear land of all items not associated with agriculture and to use the land only for the purposes of agriculture.</p> <p>B. A period of three months to comply with the Notice.</p> <p>C. Proceedings in the Magistrates Court be authorised in the event of failure to comply with the Notice and subject to there being no material change in the circumstances</p>	<p>Negotiations to address the breaches of planning control were unsuccessful, and Legal department have now been requested to issue the necessary Enforcement Notice.</p> <p>Enforcement Notice issued 14th January 1998, and has been appealed. To await outcome of appeal.</p> <p>Hearing scheduled for 5th October 1999.</p> <p>Hearing re-scheduled to 11th January 2000.</p> <p>Subject to some minor alterations to the Enforcement Notice, the appeal was dismissed 13th March 2000, there is a compliance period of 3 months - 13th June 2000 and the site will be monitored to ensure full compliance.</p> <p>5.7.2000 Inspection made 19th June 2000 revealed no movement towards complying with the requirements of the Enforcement Notice.</p> <p>The owner(s) to be interviewed with a view to instigating a prosecution for non-compliance with the requirements of the Enforcement Notice.</p>

CASE NUMBER AND SITE	DETAILS OF CONTRAVENTION	ACTION TAKEN	PRESENT SITUATION
			<p>4.10.2000 The appellant appealed to the High Court, with his appeal being dismissed 3rd July 2000. Compliance period ends 3rd October 2000.</p> <p>3.1.2001 The planning application verbally referred to 4th October 2000 has been registered under Council's reference S/1868/00/F and is to be refused. A verbal update will be given to Members.</p> <p>2.5.2001 No recent visits have been made due to the foot and mouth situation, but it thought full compliance with the requirements of the Enforcement Notice have been met. Contact with the owner is being sought in order to formally inform him a date for compliance in accordance with Section 173A (3) Town and Country Planning Act 1990, with a suggested date of 30th June 2001.</p> <p>4.7.2001 Letters sent 16th May 2001 giving 30th June 2001 as new compliance date. It is highly unlikely that a visit will be possible between that date and the date of this meeting, but the site will be monitored and appropriate action taken.</p> <p>3.10.2001 The refused planning application under reference S/1868/00/F has now been appealed. The enforcement compliance period, in accordance with our usual practice in such circumstances, will be extended to coincide with the outcome of the appeal.</p>

CASE NUMBER AND SITE	DETAILS OF CONTRAVENTION	ACTION TAKEN	PRESENT SITUATION
			<p>2.1.2002 Planning refusal S/1868/00/F was dismissed at appeal on 9th October 2001. The amended compliance date is 1st March 2002.</p> <p>3.4.2002 The requirements of the Enforcement Notice were not met within the prescribed time, and as a result the owner/occupier was formerly interviewed 28th February 2002, and a prosecution file is being compiled for forwarding to the Legal Office for proceedings in the Magistrates Court.</p> <p>3.7.2002 The prosecution file is in the final stages of completion, and will be forwarded to Legal to commence Court proceedings as soon as possible.</p> <p>2.10.2002 Prosecution file submitted to Legal Office</p> <p>8.1.2003 Summons issued case adjourned on 4th December to 11th December 2002</p> <p>2.4.2003 On 19th March 2003 the case was adjourned to 2nd April 2003.</p> <p>2.7.2003 The case has been committed to Crown Court and a trial date has been set for the week commencing 4th August. A pre-trial hearing is listed for the 14th July.</p> <p>1.10.2003 Case adjourned to November.</p>

CASE NUMBER AND SITE	DETAILS OF CONTRAVENTION	ACTION TAKEN	PRESENT SITUATION
			<p>7.1.2004 On 13th November 2003 the defendant appeared before Cambridge Crown Court and pleaded guilty. He was fined £1,500 with £8,000 costs. A site visit will be made in January to establish if further action is required.</p> <p>7.4.2004 No vehicles on site. Site continues to be monitored.</p> <p>7.7.2004 No change.</p> <p>6.10.2004 No change</p>
<p>34/98 B/1/45/72 and S/0133/97/O Camside Farm Chesterton Fen Road MILTON</p>	<p>Without planning permission the stationing of two mobile homes for residential use.</p>	<p>Planning Committee 2nd December 1998 - Item 20 Members authorised</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) To seek an injunction . (ii) To issue an Enforcement Notice if the application for an injunction was refused. (iii) A Period of three months to comply with any Enforcement Notice issued. (iv) That in the event of failure to comply with the Notice and subject to there being no material change in circumstances proceedings be taken in the Magistrates Court. 	<p>The necessary information and documentation to seek an injunction is currently being processed.</p> <p>Letters of intended actions served upon contravenors, who subsequently submitted a planning application to retain the two mobile homes and also an application for a Lawful Development Certificate alleging lawful use of the two mobile homes as bedroom use only. Injunctive action held pending determination of the above applications.</p> <p>On advice from the Legal department an Enforcement Notice was issued under reference E342 8th June 1999 requiring (a) removal of the mobile homes from the site together with ancillary works, (b) cease to use the land as a general dealers yard, (c) restore the land to its condition before the breaches of planning control took place, (d) use the land only for agriculture and paddock with stables as before. The Notice takes effect 15th July 1999 and has a compliance period of 6 months.</p>

CASE NUMBER AND SITE	DETAILS OF CONTRAVENTION	ACTION TAKEN	PRESENT SITUATION
			<p>The Enforcement Notice has been appealed. The site is also part of the general review of travellers accommodation in the Chesterton Fen Road area.</p> <p>The outcome of the appeal against the Enforcement Notice is awaited.</p> <p>The appeal was dismissed 10th January 2000 with the compliance period being varied to 9 months (10th October 2000).</p> <p>5.7.2000 Compliance period ends 10th October 2000.</p> <p>4.10.2000 Still within the period before compliance which ends 10th October 2000.</p> <p>3.1.2001 Arrangements were made to formally interview two of the appellants 8th December 2000 at these offices, and both attended together with their Counsel and Solicitor. On the advice of their legal advisers both declined a formal interview, with their Counsel agreeing to write to our Head of Legal Services by the end of January 2001 listing those issues his clients wished to be considered in connection with any intended prosecution. Counsel indicated that the Human Rights Act 2000 would feature greatly in his submissions.</p> <p>2.5.2001 Summonses returnable to Cambridge Magistrates Court 16th May 2001 were served 18th April 2001.</p> <p>4.7.2001 A plea of not guilty was entered at Cambridge Magistrates Court 8th June 2001 and the case committed to Crown Court for trial, and will be listed in due course.</p>

CASE NUMBER AND SITE	DETAILS OF CONTRAVENTION	ACTION TAKEN	PRESENT SITUATION
			<p>3.10.2001 A pre-trial hearing scheduled for 23rd September 2001.</p> <p>2.1.2002 The case has been adjourned by Judge Howarth, generally, until the outcome of another case dealing with a human rights point which the defendant's Counsel asserts has a bearing on the Webb's liability. Likely to be several months.</p> <p>3.4.2002 The outcome of the case referred to at 2.01.2002 is still awaited.</p> <p>3.7.2002 The trial has now been fixed for November. It is expected that the first day will be to hear legal arguments, followed by a further five days.</p> <p>2.10.2002 Trial still pending.</p> <p>8.1.2003 On 8th November 2002 the defendants appeared before Norwich Crown Court. They pleaded guilty and were fined as follows: A Webb (Senior) fined £3,500, costs £1,500, 2 months imprisonment in default of payment of fines. A Webb fined £1,000, £1,500 costs. M Webb fined £1,000, £1,500 costs.</p>

CASE NUMBER AND SITE	DETAILS OF CONTRAVENTION	ACTION TAKEN	PRESENT SITUATION
			<p>A letter has been sent by the Legal Office to the defendants legal representative informing them that a further site visit will be made on 10th February 2003. If the Enforcement Notice has not been complied with consideration will be given to further prosecutions.</p> <p>2.4.2003 A further summons has been issued for breach of the Enforcement Notice. Case listed at Cambridge Magistrates Court 30th April 2003.</p> <p>2.7.2003 Case adjourned to 18th June 2003. A verbal update will be given.</p> <p>1.10.2003 Case adjourned to November.</p> <p>7.1.2004 On 11th November 2003 the defendants appeared before Cambridge Crown Court. They pleaded guilty and were convicted as follows:</p> <p>A Webb (Senior) – Conditional Discharge for 2 years. A Webb – Fined £2,500 M Webb – Fined £2,500 Costs of £3,000 were awarded. A planning application S/2285/03/F has been submitted, which if approved, would allow the defendants to move the mobile homes subject of the Enforcement Notice to the new site.</p> <p>The situation will be monitored and a timescale agreed once the planning application has been determined.</p>

CASE NUMBER AND SITE	DETAILS OF CONTRAVENTION	ACTION TAKEN	PRESENT SITUATION
<p>14/99 B/1/4544 - 7/99 Mrs Patricia Hedges 'Carefield' Button End HARSTON</p>	<p>Without planning permission the material change of use of land from agriculture to the siting of caravans, including the delivering to the land of paving slabs, sand and the erection of a shed not requisite for agricultural purposes.</p>	<p>An Enforcement and Stop Notice were issued under delegated authority and the matter was a report to Planning Committee 4th August 1999 at Item 14, when Members authorised proceedings in the Magistrates Court against the owner/occupier in the event of failure to comply with the Notices and to apply for the issue of an Injunction if the former proved ineffective.</p>	<p>7.4.2004 Awaiting determination of planning application S/2285/03/F.</p> <p>7.7.2004 No change.</p> <p>6.10.2004 Planning application S/2285/03/F approved on 16th August 2004. Conditions have been imposed which are subject of further consultation.</p>
			<p>The Enforcement Notice was issued 23rd July 1999 and takes effect 6th September 1999 with a compliance period of 14 days. The Stop Notice was issued 26th July 1999 and took effect 27th July 1999. Both Notices were served on the 26th July 1999. The Stop Notice was not complied with, and following a formal interview with the occupier, a prosecution file was submitted to Legal Department. The Head of Legal Services is of the opinion that that with particular reference to Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights a prosecution, representing an interference by this Authority as a Public Authority with the exercise of that persons right to respect for private and family life, would be entirely in accordance with the law, he was not satisfied that such a course of action is necessary in the public interest set out in the Article until either the Enforcement Notice takes effect or an appeal is lodged and the appeal is determined on planning principles in favour of the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>An appeal against the Enforcement Notice has been lodged, and is currently being determined.</p>

CASE NUMBER AND SITE	DETAILS OF CONTRAVENTION	ACTION TAKEN	PRESENT SITUATION
			<p>An informal hearing in respect of the Enforcement Notice was heard 8th December 1999, and the outcome is awaited.</p> <p>Appeal dismissed 10th January 2000. Compliance period varied to 4 months - 10th May 2000.</p> <p>4.10.2000 The formal interview was conducted 12th July 2000 and this was followed with a meeting involving the local Member on 24th July 2000 to consider the points raised. The appellant is scheduled to undergo major surgery at Addenbrookes Hospital and negotiations to establish the time-scale with a view to extending the compliance period are being conducted by the Head of Legal Services.</p> <p>5.7.2000 Solicitors acting for applicant have requested an extension to the compliance period on medical grounds. A formal interview has been arranged for 4th July 2000 to be followed by a meeting with the Head of Legal Services and Local Member, before making any recommendation to Members.</p> <p>4.10.2000 The formal interview was conducted 12th July 2000 and this was followed by a meeting involving the local Member on 24th July 2000 to consider the points raised. The appellant is scheduled to undergo major surgery at Addenbrookes Hospital and negotiations to establish the timescale with a view to extending the compliance period are being conducted by the Head of Legal Services.</p> <p>3.1.2001 The Head of Legal Services will give Members an update.</p>

CASE NUMBER AND SITE	DETAILS OF CONTRAVENTION	ACTION TAKEN	PRESENT SITUATION
			<p>2.5.2001 This matter is ready to proceed to prosecution as and when considered appropriate with special regard to the personal circumstances of the occupier.</p> <p>4.7.2001 Our Legal Department continues to negotiate with the occupiers legal advisers in an endeavour to negotiate a way forward.</p> <p>3.10.2001 Negotiations still being conducted by Legal Department.</p> <p>2.1.2002 No change – negotiations still being conducted by Legal Department.</p> <p>3.4.2002 Our Legal Department is still engaged in the exchange of correspondence with solicitors representing the owner, with the possibility that the matter will be put before the Court in the near future.</p> <p>3.7.2002 No change. The occupier is still waiting for her hip operation.</p> <p>2.10.2002 No change. Head of Legal Services to give an update.</p>

CASE NUMBER AND SITE	DETAILS OF CONTRAVENTION	ACTION TAKEN	PRESENT SITUATION
			<p>8.1.2003 It has now been confirmed that the operation has taken place. As a result of consultations with the Chairman and the Local Member it was agreed that a site visit would be made after 11th February 2003 and that if the Enforcement Notice had not been complied with legal proceedings will be commenced. A letter has been sent to the occupier confirming the action that will be taken.</p> <p>2.4.2003 On 8th January 2003 it was agreed not to proceed with the prosecution until the outcome of planning application S/0040/03/F was known. To be considered at Committee 2nd April 2003.</p> <p>2.7.2003 Planning permission for S/0040/03/F refused. A file is being prepared to commence legal proceedings.</p> <p>1.10.2003 Appeal against refusal of planning permission S/0040/03/F. Inquiry date 17th February 2004. Waiting for outcome of appeal before proceeding with prosecution.</p> <p>7.1.2004 Further development of the site has taken place. A request for a further Enforcement Notice has been submitted to the Legal Office.</p> <p>7.4.2004 Awaiting outcome of planning appeal heard on 17/18th February 2004.</p>

CASE NUMBER AND SITE	DETAILS OF CONTRAVENTION	ACTION TAKEN	PRESENT SITUATION
			<p>7.7.2004 Appeal allowed. Temporary planning permission granted to 7th April 2007.</p> <p>6.10.2004 No change. To be removed from active list until January 2007.</p>
<p>4/01 S/0337/97/LB 1 Meeting Lane MELBOURN Cambridge</p>	<p>Unauthorised extension to a listed building – rear porch.</p>	<p>Planning Committee 6th June 2001 – Item 30. Members authorised the serving of a listed building’s Enforcement Notice to cure the removal of the porch and the making good of the rear elevation of the listed building and further for the Conservation Manager and the Legal Officer to bring an action against the owner in the Magistrates Court in respect of the unauthorised works which have effected the character of a listed building.</p>	<p>4.7.2001 Conservation Manager and Legal Officer to carry out Members’ instructions.</p> <p>3.10.2001 Enforcement Notice issued 7th July 2001 to take effect 15th August 2001 with a one month compliance period – 15th September 2001.</p> <p>No appeal lodged, inspection revealed porch not removed, prosecution file being prepared by Conservation Section.</p> <p>2.1.2002 An appeal against refusal has been lodged, and the prosecution in respect of non-compliance with the Enforcement Notice will be adjourned pending the outcome of the appeal.</p> <p>3.4.2002 Informal hearing for appeal against refusal of planning permission is scheduled for 23rd April 2002. The prosecution resulting from non-compliance with the Enforcement Notice is pending the result of this hearing.</p>

CASE NUMBER AND SITE	DETAILS OF CONTRAVENTION	ACTION TAKEN	PRESENT SITUATION
			<p>3.7.2002 The appeal against the refusal to grant listed building consent was dismissed 9th May 2002. Negotiations by the Conservation Section are under way to try and agree an acceptable timescale to remove the rear porch and make good the rear elevation.</p> <p>2.10.2002 An application S/1656/02/LB has been submitted which should resolve the matter.</p> <p>8.1.2003 Our Legal Department is still engaged in correspondence with the owner, with the possibility that the matter will be put before the court in the near future.</p> <p>2.4.2003 It has not been possible at this time to serve the summons as the owner is abroad.</p> <p>2.7.2003 No change.</p> <p>1.10.2003 No change.</p> <p>7.1.2004 It has been confirmed that the owner is still abroad. He has appointed an agent to manage the site and to try and resolve the outstanding matters. Negotiations continue.</p> <p>7.4.2004 No change.</p>

CASE NUMBER AND SITE	DETAILS OF CONTRAVENTION	ACTION TAKEN	PRESENT SITUATION
			<p>7.7.2004 The owner is no longer represented by an agent and is still believed to be living abroad. At present we are unable to contact the owner.</p> <p>6.10.2004. No change</p>
<p>12/02 B/1/45/72 & S/1230/02/F The Stables Chesterton Fen Road MILTON</p>	<p>Unauthorised mobile home for residential use.</p>	<p>Development and Conservation Control Committee 7th August 2002. – Item 7</p> <p>Members authorised:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The issue of an Enforcement Notice to cease using the land for the stationing of a mobile home and associated hardstanding. 2. A compliance period of 6 months to comply with the Notice. 3. Prosecution in the Magistrates Court if the Enforcement Notice is not complied with and subject to reconsideration of all material factors. 	<p>2.10.2002 File submitted to Legal Department for issue of Enforcement Notice.</p> <p>8.1.2003 Enforcement Notice issued 5th September 2002 to take effect on 20th October 2002. Enforcement Notice appealed Date fixed for 8th April 2003.</p> <p>2.4.2003 No change.</p> <p>2.7.2003 7th May appeal dismissed. Compliance date 7th November 2003.</p> <p>1.10.2003 No change. Compliance date 7th November 2003.</p> <p>7.1.2004 Enforcement Notice not complied with therefore a prosecution file is being prepared. A planning application S/1934/0/F is currently being determined. The application seeks to retain the mobile home in connection with the use of the site as a tropical plant nursery.</p>

CASE NUMBER AND SITE	DETAILS OF CONTRAVENTION	ACTION TAKEN	PRESENT SITUATION
17/02 S/1452/02/F Land at Chesterton Fen Road MILTON	Without planning permission the stationing of mobile homes/caravans for residential use.	<p>At Development and Conservation Control Committee 2nd October. Item 11.</p> <p>Members authorised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) To issue an Enforcement Notice (should officers consider this necessary) to cease using the land for the stationing of mobile homes and associated hardstanding areas. 2) Should an Enforcement Notice be issued a six month compliance period. 3) Prosecution in the Magistrates Court if the Enforcement Notice is not complied with and subject to there being no material change in circumstances. 	<p>7.4.2004 Prosecution file submitted to Legal Office. An appeal against non-determination of S/1934/03/F has been listed for 7th September 2004.</p> <p>7.7.2004 No change.</p> <p>6.10.2004 Awaiting outcome of appeal heard on 7th September.</p>
			<p>8.1.2003 Interviews with occupiers of land have commenced.</p> <p>2.4.2003 No change.</p> <p>2.7.2003 Planning application S/0903/03/F to S/0931/03/F submitted for siting of gypsy caravans. Applications currently being considered. Awaiting outcome before proceeding with investigation.</p> <p>1.10.2003 Planning applications S/0903/03/F and S/0931/03/F refused. Appeal lodged.</p> <p>7.1.2004 Inquiry listed for 9th March 2004.</p> <p>7.4.2004 Awaiting outcome of appeal.</p>

CASE NUMBER AND SITE	DETAILS OF CONTRAVENTION	ACTION TAKEN	PRESENT SITUATION
			<p>7.7.2004 No change.</p> <p>6.10.2004 Appeal dismissed on 1st July 2004. Now subject to a Judicial Review. No date fixed.</p>
<p>18/02 B/1/45/88 Rose and Crown Road SWAVESEY</p>	<p>Without planning permission using agricultural land for the siting of caravans/mobile homes for residential purposes and carrying out ancillary building works including laying of drains, septic tanks, mains electricity connections, accesses and hardstandings.</p>	<p>At Development and Conservation Control Committee 2nd October 2002 Section 4 Travellers in Swavesey Members were informed that under delegated powers Enforcement Notice E454 which takes effect on 30th October 2002 with a compliance period of one month and Stop Notices E454A and E454B had been issued.</p> <p>Members authorised proceedings in the Magistrates Court against the occupiers of the land.</p>	<p>8.1.2003 The case was adjourned at Cambridge Magistrates Court on 4th December 2002 to 17th February 2003.</p> <p>2.4.2003 Appeal against Enforcement Notices withdrawn.</p> <p>Appeal against refusal of planning permission for S/1966/02/F to S/1973/02/F continues. Appeal date fixed for 30th April 2003. The compliance period for the Enforcement Notices extended to 6 months and take effect on 20th July 2003.</p> <p>Proceedings in the Magistrates Court adjourned to 16th April.</p> <p>2.7.2003 Appeal against planning permission dismissed on 19th May 2003. Proceeding in the Magistrates Court for breach of Stop Notice adjourned to 25th June 2003.</p> <p>1.10.2003 Challenge to Inspector's decision being made to the High Court by the owners. Prosecution for breach of Stop Notices adjourned pending outcome.</p>

CASE NUMBER AND SITE	DETAILS OF CONTRAVENTION	ACTION TAKEN	PRESENT SITUATION
			<p>7.1.2004 Appeal allowed by High Court. Case referred back to Planning Inspectorate to reconsider.</p> <p>7.4.2004 No date yet fixed for new appeal.</p> <p>7.7.2004 Public Inquiry on 16th June 2004.</p> <p>6.10.2004 Appeal dismissed on 22nd July 2004. Needs audit to be completed. Subject of a Judicial Review in relation to the issue of Stop and Enforcement Notices.</p>
<p>21/02 B/1/45/72 & S/1837/02 Land at Chesterton Fen Road, MILTON (known as 99 Ponyfield)</p>	<p>Unauthorised siting & residential use of mobile home.</p>	<p>Development & Conservation Committee 4th December 2002. Item 2.</p> <p>(1) Members authorised enforcement action.</p> <p>(2) A period of 6 months to comply with Notice.</p> <p>(3) That proceedings in the Magistrates Court be authorised in the event of failure to comply with such Notice and subject to reconsideration of all material factors.</p>	<p>8.1.2003 Draft instructions for Enforcement Notice in respect of breach of planning control sent to the Legal Department.</p> <p>2.4.2003 Enforcement Notice E456 7th February 2003. Takes effect on 31st March 2003 with a 6 month compliance period on 1st October 2003.</p> <p>2.7.2003 Enforcement Notice appealed.</p> <p>1.10.2003 22nd July 2003 appeal dismissed. Compliance date for Enforcement Notice 22nd January 2004.</p> <p>7.1.2004 No change.</p>

CASE NUMBER AND SITE	DETAILS OF CONTRAVENTION	ACTION TAKEN	PRESENT SITUATION
			<p>7.4.2004 Compliance date being extended, subject to negotiations.</p> <p>7.7.2004 Compliance date extended to 1st January 2005.</p> <p>6.10.2004 No change.</p>
<p>6/03 S/2311/02/F Mobile Home The Oaks Meadow Road WILLINGHAM</p>	<p>Material change of use of land</p>	<p>Development and Conservation Control Committee 5th February 2003 – Item 32 Members authorised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The issue of an Enforcement Notice to cease the use and the removal of the converted portakabin, touring caravan and washroom. 2. A period of 6 months to comply with the Enforcement Notice. 3. That proceedings in the Magistrates Court in the event of failure to comply with such a Notice and subject to all material factors. 	<p>2.4.2003 File submitted to Legal Office 14th February 2003 for issue of Enforcement Notice.</p> <p>2.7.2003 Enforcement Notice E463 issued 25th March 2003 to take effect 7th May 2003. Compliance period 6 months. Enforcement Notice appealed. Hearing fixed for 23rd September 2003</p> <p>1.10.2003 No change.</p> <p>7.1.2004 On 4th November 2003 an appeal was dismissed. Compliance period extended to 12 months. Compliance date 4th November 2004.</p> <p>7.4.2004 No change.</p> <p>7.7.2004 No change.</p> <p>6.10.2004 No change.</p>

CASE NUMBER AND SITE	DETAILS OF CONTRAVENTION	ACTION TAKEN	PRESENT SITUATION
<p>7/03 B/1/45/20 Land between Setchell Drove and Water Lane Smithy Fen COTTENHAM (A Land)</p>	<p>Material change of use of land as a residential caravan site, ancillary provision of drains and construction of accesses and hardstandings</p>	<p>Delegated authority to take Stop and Enforcement action. Reported to Development and Conservation Control Committee 2nd April 2003 – Item 9.</p> <p>Stop Notice E460A issued 20th March to take effect on 25th March 2003. Enforcement Notice E460 issued 19th March to take effect 30th April 2003. Compliance period 3 months – 30th July 2003.</p>	<p>2.7.2003 Failed to comply with Stop Notice. Case listed at Cambridge Magistrates Court 25th June 2003. Enforcement Notice appealed. Hearing 14th October 2003.</p> <p>1.10.2003 Inquiry moved to 17th September 2003. Proceedings adjourned pending outcome of appeal.</p> <p>7.1.2004 On 14th October 2003 an appeal was allowed. Proceedings withdrawn as a result of appeal. Conditions imposed by appeal decision to be monitored. Remove from active list.</p> <p>7.4.2004 The appeal was allowed subject to conditions which were required within 3 months.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A scheme for the layout of the site. 2. The provision of foul and surface water drainage. 3. Boundary treatment and landscaping. 4. Within 11 months a Scheme of Works shall have been approved. Details submitted are currently being considered and consulted upon. <p>7.7.2004 An update will be given by the Area Planning Officer.</p> <p>6.10.2004 Site being monitored. Negotiations continue concerning outstanding conditions. An update will be given by the Area Planning Officer.</p>

CASE NUMBER AND SITE	DETAILS OF CONTRAVENTION	ACTION TAKEN	PRESENT SITUATION
<p>8/03 B/1/45/20 Land between Setchell Drove and Water Lane Smithy Fen COTTENHAM (B Land)</p>	<p>Material change of use of land – forming an earth bund, laying hardcore and hardstanding</p>	<p>Delegated authority to take Stop and Enforcement action. Reported to Development and Conservation Control Committee 2nd April 2003 – Item 9. Stop Notice E461A issued 20th March 2003. Enforcement Notice E461 issued 19th March 2003 to take effect on 30th April 2003. Compliance period 3 months – 30th July 2003.</p>	<p>2.7.2003 Enforcement Notice appealed. Planning applications S/0456/03/F, S/0457/03/F, S/0871/03/F, S/0872/03/F and S/0873/03/F refused.</p> <p>1.10.2003 Enforcement appeal hearing on 14th October 2003. Stop Notice E461D and Enforcement Notice E461C issued 29th August 2003 prohibiting the use of the land for the stationing of caravans/mobile homes for residential purposes.</p> <p>Stop Notice took effect 5th September 2003. Enforcement Notice takes affect on 30th September 2003 with a 3 month compliance period.</p> <p>Site visit on 8th September 2003 confirmed that there were caravans on site in breach of the Stop Notice. Investigations commenced.</p> <p>7.1.2004 On 18th November 2003 appeal dismissed. Compliance date 18th February 2004. Appeal outstanding on Enforcement Notice E461C. Listed for hearing on 10th February 2004. There were no caravans on this site on 5th December 2003.</p> <p>7.4.2004 Appeal Inquiry pending. Date not fixed.</p> <p>7.7.2004 Appeal inquiry listed for 20th July 2004.</p> <p>6.10.2004 Appeal inquiry adjourned on 23rd July to 23 November 2004.</p>

CASE NUMBER AND SITE	DETAILS OF CONTRAVENTION	ACTION TAKEN	PRESENT SITUATION
<p>9/03 B/1/45/20 Land between Setchell Drove and Water Lane COTTENHAM (G Land)</p>	<p>Material change of use of land as a residential caravan site, ancillary provision of drains and construction of accesses and hardstandings</p>	<p>Delegated authority to take enforcement action. Reported to Development and Conservation Control Committee 2nd April 2003 – Item 9. Enforcement Notice E459 issued 19th March to take effect 30th April 2003. Compliance period 3 months – 30th July 2003.</p>	<p>2.7.2003 Enforcement Notice appealed. Hearing on 14th October 2003. Planning application S/0377/02/F refused on 13th March 2003. 1.10.2003 Refusal of planning permission and Enforcement Notice appealed. Hearing on 14th October 2003. 7.1.2004 On 18th November 2003 appeal dismissed. Compliance date 18th February 2004. 7.4.2004 Enforcement Notice not complied with. Requires further investigation. An appeal against non-determination of planning application S/2505/03/F has provisionally been arranged for 20th July. 7.7.2004 Appeal inquiry listed for 20th July. 6.10.2004 Appeal Inquiry adjourned 23rd July to 23rd November 2004.</p>
<p>10/03 B/1/45/20 Land at Plot 2 and R/O Plot 3 Setchell Drove COTTENHAM</p>	<p>Material change of use of land as a residential caravans site ancillary provision of drains and construction of access and hardstandings</p>	<p>Delegate authority to take enforcement action. Reported to Development and Conservation Control Committee 2nd April 2003 – Item 9. Stop Notice E353N issued 19th May 2003 took effect 25th May 2003. Enforcement Notice E353N issued 19th May 2003 takes effect 30th June 2003.</p>	<p>2.7.2003 Enforcement Notice appealed. Stop Notice not complied with. Prosecution file being prepared. 1.10.2003 Planning application S/1020/03/F refused 26th June 2003. Appeal against refusal of planning permission and Enforcement Notice. Hearing on 4th November 2003.</p>

CASE NUMBER AND SITE	DETAILS OF CONTRAVENTION	ACTION TAKEN	PRESENT SITUATION
			<p>7.1.2004 Hearing moved to 29th January 2004.</p> <p>7.4.2004 Appeal allowed. Legal to update about possible legal grounds to challenge Planning Inspector's decision.</p> <p>7.7.2004 Subject of an appeal by the Council to the High Court against the Planning Inspector's decision.</p> <p>6.10.2004 Subject to a Judicial Review. No date fixed.</p>
<p>14/03 B/1/45/85 & S/1472/03/F 4 St Andrews Close STAPLEFORD</p>	<p>Unauthorised extension</p>	<p>At Development and Conservation Control Committee on 3rd September 2003 – Item 25. Members authorized:</p> <p>The issue of an Enforcement Notice for the removal of the unauthorised extension.</p>	<p>1.10.2003 File being prepared for issue of Enforcement Notice.</p> <p>7.1.2004 Enforcement Notice E468 issued 29th October 2003. Takes effect 1st December 2003. Compliance period 6 months. Appeal against refusal of planning permission and Enforcement Notice.</p> <p>7.4.2004 No change.</p> <p>7.7.2004 Enforcement Notice appeal dismissed. Compliance date 26th September 2004.</p> <p>6.10.2004 Enforcement Notice complied with. Remove from active list.</p>

CASE NUMBER AND SITE	DETAILS OF CONTRAVENTION	ACTION TAKEN	PRESENT SITUATION
<p>15/03 B/1/45/20 Land to rear of Plots 3, 4 and 5 Setchel Drove COTTENHAM</p>	<p>Material change of use of land as a residential caravan site.</p>	<p>Breach of Planning Enforcement Notices E353B, E353C and E353D issued 9th June 1999.</p>	<p>1.10.2003 File submitted to Legal Office for breach of Enforcement Notices.</p> <p>7.1.2004 No change.</p> <p>7.4.2004 No change.</p> <p>7.7.2004 Site now known as Victoria View. Planning application S/0761/04/F currently being determined.</p> <p>Injunction issued 4th May 2004 which took effect 4th June 2004. Restrained further hardcore being deposited on the site and required the removal of hardcore from plots 2, 5,, 6, 9 and 10. It also restrained further caravans, mobile homes onto the site.</p> <p>A site visit on 4th June confirmed that there was a breach of the injunction committal proceedings listed at Cambridge County Court on 16th July.. Legal Officer will give an update.</p> <p>6.10.2004 Resolved to ensure compliance by means of direct action and prosecution. Summons issued listed for hearing at Cambridge Magistrates Court on 29th September 2004.</p>

CASE NUMBER AND SITE	DETAILS OF CONTRAVENTION	ACTION TAKEN	PRESENT SITUATION
16/03 B/1/45/39 & S/0181/03/LDC Shelford Lodge Cambridge Road GREAT SHELFORD	Unauthorised mobile home	Delegated authority given to issue an Enforcement Notice to remove the mobile home from the site.	<p>7.1.2004 File submitted to Legal Office for issue of Enforcement Notice</p> <p>7.4.2004 Enforcement Notice P246A issued 17th December 2003. Subject of an appeal provisionally arranged for 14th July.</p> <p>7.7.2004 Appeal adjourned pending outcome of planning application S/1018/04/F.</p> <p>6.10.2004 Appeal inquiry listed for 16th November 2004.</p>
17/03 B/1/45/8 65 Wimpole Road BARTON	Unauthorised work on listed building	Delegated authority given to prosecute for unauthorised work.	<p>7.1.2004 Case listed at Cambridge Magistrates Court on 10th December 2003. Case adjournment to 17th December 2003. A verbal update will be given.</p> <p>7.4.2004 Prosecution for unauthorised work on listed building. Defendant appeared at Cambridge Magistrates Court on 28th January 2004. Fined £5,000 with £1,260 costs. Site being monitored by Conservation Department.</p> <p>7.7.2004 Listed Building Enforcement Notice E475 issued on 23rd March 2004 for unauthorised work. Compliance period 3 months from 23rd April 2004. Takes effect 23rd July 2004.</p> <p>6.10.2004 Prosecution file submitted to Legal Office for breaching Enforcement Notice.</p>

CASE NUMBER AND SITE	DETAILS OF CONTRAVENTION	ACTION TAKEN	PRESENT SITUATION
18/03 B/1/45/80 & S/2229/03/F Primrose Meadow Cow Lane RAMPTON	Material change of use of land as a residential caravan site ancillary provision of drains and construction of accesses.	<p>At Development and Conservation Control Committee on 3rd December 2003. Item 12. Members authorized.</p> <p>1. The issue of an Enforcement Notice and Stop Notice to prevent further development of the site.</p>	<p>7.1.2004 Enforcement Notice E501 and Stop Notice E501A issued 5th December 2003. The Stop Notice takes effect on 10th December 2003. The Enforcement Notice takes effect on 15th January 2004. Planning application S/2229/03/F to be determined.</p> <p>7.4.2004 Enforcement Notice and refusal of planning permission appealed. Public Inquiry provisionally arranged for 6th July.</p> <p>7.7.2004 No change.</p> <p>6.10.2004 Appeal allowed on 7th September 2004. Remove from active list.</p>
19/03 B/1/45/51 & S/2230/03/F Land adjacent to Moor Drove Cottenham Road HISTON	Without planning permission carrying out operational development by the laying of hardcore roadways and septic tanks on the site.	<p>Delegated authority to take Stop and Enforcement action. Stop Notice E502 issued 11th December 2003 to take effect on 15th December 2003. Enforcement Notice E502 issued 11th December 2003 to take effect on 12th January 2004. Compliance period 3 months. Injunction issued 19th December 2003</p>	<p>7.1.2004 Stop and Enforcement Notices issued</p> <p>7.4.2004 Enforcement Notices and refusal of planning permission appealed. Public Inquiry arranged for 10th August.</p> <p>7.7.2004 No change.</p> <p>6.10.2004 Appeal Inquiry adjourned on 10th August to 14th December 2004.</p>

CASE NUMBER AND SITE	DETAILS OF CONTRAVENTION	ACTION TAKEN	PRESENT SITUATION
1/04 B/1/45/26 & S/2256/03/F Woodview Potton End ELTISLEY	Unauthorised structure above garage.	Delegated authority given to issue an Enforcement Notice to remove the unauthorised structure above the garage.	<p>7.4.2004 File submitted to Legal Office for issue of Enforcement Notice.</p> <p>Planning application, S/2256/03/F, refused. Appeal pending.</p> <p>7.7.2004 Enforcement Notice E478 issued 16th March 2004. Notice took effect on 20th April 2004 with a compliance period of 3 months. Compliance date 20th July 2004.</p> <p>6.10.2004 Appeal inquiry adjourned on 10th August to 14th December 2004.</p> <p>6.10.2004 Appeal against planning permission dismissed on 19th August 2004. Prosecution file to be submitted for breach of Enforcement Notice.</p>
2/04 B/1/45/87 The Bury Newmarket Road STOW-CUM-QUY	Unauthorised extension	Delegated authority given to issue an Enforcement Notice to remove the unauthorised extension to an office building.	<p>7.4.2004 File submitted to Legal Office for issue of Enforcement Notice.</p> <p>7.7.2004 Enforcement Notice E473 to be re-issued.</p> <p>6.10.2004 Enforcement Notice E473A issued. Appeal provisionally arranged for 18th January 2005.</p>
4/04 S/0453/04/F 65 Eland Way Teversham	Unauthorised building	Delegated authority given to issue Enforcement Notice to remove unauthorized building.	<p>7.7.2004 File submitted to Legal Officer for issue of Enforcement Notice.</p>

CASE NUMBER AND SITE	DETAILS OF CONTRAVENTION	ACTION TAKEN	PRESENT SITUATION
5/04 B/1/45/20 Set Broad Farm Oakington Road COTTENHAM	Unauthorised building	<p>Enforcement Notice E449 issued 16th July 2004 and took effect on 18th August 2004. Compliance period 3 months.</p> <p>Delegated authority given to issue Enforcement and Stop Notices to remove unauthorized work to buildings.</p> <p>Enforcement Notices E472A and E472B issued. Enforcement Notice took effect on 5th April 2004 with a 12 month compliance period.</p>	<p>6.10.2004 Enforcement Notice appealed.</p> <p>7.7.2004 Enforcement Notices subject to an appeal. The appeal has been adjourned pending determination of planning applications S/0938/04/F, S/0937/04/LDC, S/0701/04/F, S/700/04/F and S/699/04/F.</p> <p>6.10.2004 Enforcement Notice withdrawn as a result of determination of planning applications and Section 106 Agreement.</p>
6/04 B/1/45/71 S/0177/03/F Land adjacent to Kneesworth Road MELDRETH	Concerns about possible future development site.	<p>Interim Injunction issued on 4th June 2004 returnable to the High Court on 17th June 2004.</p> <p>The Injunction restrains caravans, mobile homes and any other form of residential accommodation on the site using or causing or permitting the land for residential or any other non-agricultural purposes. A further application will be made to the High Court on 17th June 2004 to extend the period.</p> <p>There is an extant Enforcement Notice E227 which was issued on 24th November 1995 and took effect on 1st January 1996. The Enforcement Notice requires the removal of caravans and for the land only to be used for agriculture.</p>	<p>7.7.2004 There is an appeal against refusal of planning permission due to be heard on 27th July 2004.</p> <p>An update will be given by our Legal Officer.</p> <p>6.10.2004 Planning permission S/0177/03/F allowed on appeal on 13th August 2004 for change of use of land to traveling show peoples quarters. Site being monitored.</p>
7/04 B/1/45/50 Hinxtion Grange Hinxtion	Installation of a fibrous plaster pre-made dome for light fitting in the kitchen ceiling.	Delegated Authority Listed Building Enforcement Notice E450 issued 4 th June 2004 to the effect on 15 th July 2004. Compliance period one month.	Enforcement Notice appealed.

CASE NUMBER AND SITE	DETAILS OF CONTRAVENTION	ACTION TAKEN	PRESENT SITUATION
<p>8/04 B/1/45/33 Berry House 33 High Street Waterbeach</p>	<p>Erection of fence within the cartilage of a listed building.</p>	<p>Delegated Authority. Enforcement Notice E490 issued 19th July 2004 to take effect on 25th August 2004. Compliance period two months.</p>	<p>Enforcement Notice appealed.</p>
<p>9/04 B/1/45/88 Land adj Fen Road Swavesey</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Stationing of caravans for residential use without planning permission. 2. Unauthorised erection of a temporary stable. 3. Material change of use of land for breeding dogs. 	<p>Delegated Authority. Stop Notice and Enforcement Notice E485B issued 17th August 2004. Stop Notice for residential use of caravans took effect on 7th September 2004. Enforcement Notice E485A issued 17th August 2004.</p> <p>The following to take effect on 17th September 2004:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) To cease to bring any further caravans onto the land. 2) Not to replace any caravan removed from the land. 3) To cease to bring any further vehicles not associated with agriculture or items ancillary thereto onto the land. 4) Not to replace vehicles associated with agriculture removed from the land. 5) Cease the use of the land for the stationing of residential caravans. 6) Remove all unauthorized caravans from the land and any associated work. <p>The following to take place on 17th December 2004:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7) Cease to use the land for the stationing of vehicles not associated with agriculture and any commercial activity concerning the breeding of dogs. 8) Remove from the land any vehicles not connected with agriculture. 	<p>6.10.2004 Verbal update to be given.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation
Control Committee

6th October 2004

AUTHOR/S: Finance and Resources Director

Tree Preservation Order – Teversham

Recommendation: To make an Order

Purpose

1. To seek the Committee's authority to make and serve a Tree Preservation Order in respect of land at Pembroke Way and Spurgeons Close, Teversham.

Effect on Corporate Objectives

1. Quality, Accessible Services	Not applicable
Village Life	The presence and protection of the natural environment enhances the quality of village life.
Sustainability	The presence and protection of trees helps to control pollution levels, and therefore contributes to the Council's commitment to the climate change agenda. Trees provide an important micro habitat for both flora and fauna.
Partnership	Not applicable

Background

3. Local planning authorities may make Tree Preservation Orders if it appears to them to be, "expedient in the interests of amenity to make provision for the preservation of trees or woodland in their area." (Town and Country Planning Act 1990, section 198(1)).
4. The Act does not define the word "amenity", nor does it set out the circumstances in which it is the interests of amenity to make a Tree Preservation Order. However, the Secretary of State takes the view that TPOs should be used to protect selected trees and woodlands if their removal would be likely to have a significant impact on the local environment and on the general public's enjoyment of that environment. Local authorities should be able to demonstrate a degree of public benefit before they make a Tree Preservation Order. For example, the tree should be visible from the Highway or some other public place.
5. Local planning authorities should be prepared to explain to landowners why their trees or woodlands have been made the subject of a Tree Preservation Order. Factors, which the LPA might take into account, include:
 - visibility from a public place
 - individual impact of the tree – its size, form, future potential, rarity and so on
 - wider impact of the tree, given its suitability in its particular location and the presence of other trees in the vicinity

6. Even if a Tree Preservation Order is desirable on amenity grounds, it may still not be expedient to make it if, for example, the tree or woodland, is under good arboricultural management. However, it may be expedient to make an Order if, say, it is likely that the tree would be cut down, or otherwise pruned in such a way as to have a significant impact on the amenity of the area.

Considerations

7. The land in question is at 1 Pembroke Way and 6 Spurgeons Close in Teversham. A plan of the area is attached at **Appendix 1**.
8. A schedule of trees is attached at **Appendix 2**.
9. Following concern expressed by Teversham Parish Council about the future of the trees in relation to possible redevelopment of the area, and full consultation with the New Villages Development Officer, the Trees and Landscape Officer considers that the Council should make an Order in this case because the trees constitute an important feature of the area, being skyline trees within the development with one being important to the street scene.

Options

10. The Development and Conservation Control Committee must determine whether or not to impose a Tree Preservation Order in this instance.

Financial Implications

11. The Council has made budget provision for Tree Preservation Orders.

Legal Implications

12. The landowner is South Cambridgeshire District Council. The District Council would serve an Order and Notice on itself (via the Chief Executive and Head of Shire Homes), and send copies to other "interested parties", including tenants of the properties, neighbours and utilities.
- 13.. If made, the Order would take effect, provisionally, upon due service of it, and remain in force as such for six months or until confirmed, whichever is the sooner, Following service, those affected would have a period of not fewer than four weeks during which they could object to the Order. Such objections must be in writing and can be made for any reason, including:
 - to challenge the LPA's view that it is expedient in the interests of amenity to make the Order
 - to claim that a tree included in the Order is either dead, dying or dangerous
 - to claim that a tree is causing damage to property
 - to point out errors in, or uncertainties with, the Order
 - to claim procedural irregularities
14. If an objection is received within the stated period, the Council must carry out a site visit. Members must take into account all objections and other representations before deciding whether or not to confirm the Order. The Council can either:
 - confirm the Order, having not received any objections

- confirm the Order, without modification, having considered objections but rejected them
- confirm the Order, subject to such modifications it deems expedient
- decide not to confirm the Order

15.. There is no right of appeal to the Secretary of State against the making or confirmation of a Tree Preservation Order. Once the Order has been confirmed though, an aggrieved, interested party may, within six weeks of the date of confirmation, apply to the High Court to have the decision reviewed

Staffing Implications

16. None.

Risk Management Implications

17. None.

Consultations

18. The local Member, **Councillor Mrs CA Hunt**, states as follows:

“I have been supporting these Tree Preservation Orders, which were requested by the Parish Council, for sometime. The huge tree in the garden of 1 Pembroke Way is the main feature as you enter the village from Airport Way/Cherry Hinton Road. I feel it is an important landmark at this end of the village and I am very keen to see it protected with a TPO. The walnut tree in Spurgeons Close is also an important feature on the skyline of Teversham. It is enjoyed by the residents whose garden it is in and those living in the many properties (about 14) which overlook the garden. Our village has very few mature trees, so I especially support the TPO for these two. Both the trees are in the gardens of South Cambridgeshire District Council houses.”

Recommendations

19. It is **recommended** that the Committee authorise officers to make and serve a Tree Preservation Order in respect of a sycamore tree on the south east corner of 1 Pembroke Way, Teversham and a walnut tree in the back garden of 6 Spurgeons Close, Teversham and, subject to there being no formal objection, which is not withdrawn and which therefore triggers a site visit, to confirm the Order in due course.

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

- Tree Preservation Orders – A Guide to the Law and Good Practice, Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions 2000
- Documentation relating to this proposed Tree Preservation Order on a file maintained by the Trees and Landscape Section

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

This page is intentionally left blank

First Schedule

N° on Map

Description

Situation

Individual Trees

(Circled in black on the map)

T1	Sycamore	Situated on the South Eastern corner of 1 Pembroke Way, Teversham
T2	Walnut	Situated in the rear garden of 6 Spurgeons Close, Teversham

Areas of Trees

(Within a dotted black line on the map)

NONE

Groups of Trees

(Within a broken black line on the map)

NONE

Woodland

(Within a solid black line on the map)

NONE

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation
Control Committee

6th October 2004

AUTHOR/S: Finance and Resources Director

Tree Preservation Order – Arrington

Recommendation: To confirm without modification

Purpose

- To review Tree Preservation Order no.05/04/SC, made under delegated powers at Church Farm, Arrington..

Effect on Corporate Objectives

2. Quality, Accessible Services	Not applicable
Village Life	The presence and protection of the natural environment enhances the quality of village life
Sustainability	The presence and protection of trees helps to control pollution levels, and therefore contributes to the Council's commitment to the climate change agenda. Trees provide an important micro habitat for both flora and fauna.
Partnership	Not applicable

Background

- Once made, Tree Preservation Orders remain in force for a provisional period of six months, but can be confirmed at any time.

Considerations

- Tree Preservation Order 05/04/SC was made on 19th July 2004. A plan is attached at Appendix 1 and the Schedule at Appendix 2.
- The Council made the Order because it considers the tree belt to be an important visual feature of the surrounding landscape, and an important landscape buffer to the adjacent property, which is located on a south-easterly facing slope adjacent to open agricultural land.
- The statutory period for the registering of objections to the Order ended on 23rd August 2004.. The letter of objection is attached at Appendix 3. A site visit took place on 22nd September 2004.

Options

- Under the legislation, the Council can confirm a Tree Preservation Order, confirm it subject to modification, or decide not to confirm it.

Financial Implications

8. There are no financial implications.

Legal Implications

9. There are no legal implications.

Staffing Implications

10. There are no staffing implications.

Risk Management Implications

11. There are no risk management implications.

Conclusion

12. TPO number 05/94/SC remains provisionally in force until 18th January 2005.. By confirming it now, the Council will ensure that the Tree Preservation Order remains in force beyond that date. The Vice-Chairman of the Development and Conservation Control Committee and Councillor SGM Kindersley (a local Member) attended the site visit, and agreed with the Trees and Landscape Officer that the Order should be confirmed without modification.

Recommendations

13. It is **recommended** that Tree Preservation Order 05/04/SC in Arrington be confirmed without modification..

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

- Tree Preservation Order no. 05/04/SC In Arrington and the relevant file maintained by the Trees and Landscape Section
- Letter dated 22nd August 2004 from B E Newton

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

IMPORTANT – THIS COMMUNICATION MAY AFFECT YOUR PROPERTY

To: BE and RE Newton, Church Farm, Arrington, Royston, Herts, SG8 0BD

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990
TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (TREES) REGULATIONS 1999**

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Tree Preservation Order: 05/04/SC

Land at Church Farm, Arrington

THIS IS A FORMAL NOTICE to let you know that on 19th July 2004 the Council made the above Tree Preservation Order.

A copy of the Order is enclosed. In simple terms, it prohibits anyone from cutting down, topping or lopping any of the trees described in the First Schedule and shown on the map without the Council's consent.

Some explanatory guidance on Tree Preservation Orders is contained in a leaflet, 'Protected Trees: A Guide to Tree Preservation Orders', produced by the Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions and available from this Council.

The Council has made the Tree Preservation Order because it considers the tree belt to be an important visual feature of the surrounding landscape, and an important landscape buffer to the adjacent property, which is located on a south-easterly facing slope adjacent to open agricultural land.

The Order took effect, on a provisional basis, on 21st July 2004. It will continue in force on this basis for a further six months or until the Order is confirmed by the Council, whichever first occurs.

The Council will consider whether the Order should be confirmed, that is to say, whether it should take effect formally. Before this decision is made, the people affected by the Order have a right to make objections or other representations about any of the trees, groups of trees or woodlands covered by the Order.

If you would like to make any objections or other comments, please make sure that we receive them in writing by 23rd August 2004. Your comments must comply with Regulation 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Trees) Regulations 1999, a copy of which is provided overleaf. Send your comments to John Ballantyne, Chief Executive, South Cambridgeshire District Council, Cambourne Business Park, Cambourne, Cambridge, CB3 6EA, marked for the attention of Ian Senior. All valid objections or representations are carefully considered before a decision on whether to confirm the Order is made.

The Council will write to you again when that decision has been made. In the meantime, if you would like any further information or have any questions about this letter, please contact John Hellingsworth, Trees and Landscape Officer, South Cambridgeshire District Council, Cambourne Business Park, Cambourne, Cambridge CB3 6EA telephone (01954) 713176.

Dated: 20th July 2004

Signed:

for the Head of Legal Services

South Cambridgeshire District Council, Cambourne Business Park, Cambourne, Cambridge.
CB3 6EA

COPY OF REGULATION 4 OF THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (TREES) REGULATIONS 1999

Objections and representations

4(1) Subject to paragraph (2), objections and representations

(a) shall be made in writing and

(i) delivered to the authority not later than the date specified by them under regulation 3(2)(c); or

(ii) sent to the authority in a properly addressed and pre-paid letter posted at such time that, in the ordinary course of post, it would be delivered to them not later than that date;

(b) shall specify the particular tree(s), groups of trees or woodlands (as the case may be) in respect of which the objections or representations are made; and

(c) in the case of an objection, shall state the reasons for the objection.

4(2) The authority may treat as duly made objections and representations which do not comply with the requirements of paragraph (1) if, in the particular case, they are satisfied that compliance with those requirements could not reasonably have been expected.

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation
Control Committee

AUTHOR/S: Finance and Resources Director

6th October 2004

Public Bridleway in Oakington

Recommendation: to respond to consultation

Purpose

- To consider a proposal by Cambridgeshire County Council to create a new bridleway in Oakington.

Effect on Corporate Objectives

2.	Quality, Accessible Services	n/a
	Village Life	n/a
	Sustainability	Bridleways promote horse riding, which is a sustainable method of transport.
	Partnership	n/a

Background

- At its meeting on 1st September 2004, the Development and Conservation Control Committee authorised officers to take all necessary steps to extinguish Footpath 7 in order to accommodate the access road and pavement, that will form part of a development at Coles Lane.. It is intended that the adopted highway will link up with a new bridleway being proposed by Cambridgeshire County Council that will follow the approximate line of the former section of public footpath, which was extinguished when Oakington Airfield was built. The surfaces of the highway and bridleway will more-or-less be flush with each other. Plans are attached as an Appendix to this report.
- Relevant **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003** policies are:
 - **Policy P4/2** – Informal recreation in the countryside
 - **Policy P8/8** – Encouraging walking and cycling
 - **Policy P8/9** – Provision of Public Rights of Way

Financial Implications

- South Cambridgeshire District Council is a statutory consultee, so there are no direct financial implications.

Legal Implications

- There are no legal implications.

Staffing Implications

7. There are no staffing implications.

Risk Management Implications

8. There are no risk management implications.

Consultations

9. The local Members (Councillors Mrs J Dixon, SM Edwards and TJ Wotherspoon) have been consulted, as have the Area Planning Officer, Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) and Conservation Manager. Comments received after dispatch of the agenda will be reported verbally at the meeting.

Recommendations

10. So that a formal response can be sent to Cambridgeshire County Council, it is **recommended** that Members comment on the proposal to create a new bridleway in Oakington.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report: Letter Ref. CLFH/168/7 from Cambridgeshire County Council, dated 8th September 2004 and received on 21st September 2004

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