

## **SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

At a meeting of the Development and Conservation Control Committee held on  
Wednesday, 1 June 2005 at 10.00 a.m.

Councillors:	Dr DR Bard	RE Barrett
	JD Batchelor	RF Bryant
	Mrs A Elsby	R Hall
	Mrs SA Hatton	Mrs JM Healey
	Mrs EM Heazell	Mrs CA Hunt
	HC Hurrell	SGM Kindersley
	RB Martlew	Mrs JA Muncey
	Mrs CAED Murfitt	CR Nightingale
	Dr JPR Orme	EJ Pateman
	JA Quinlan	Mrs DP Roberts
	NJ Scarr	Mrs HM Smith
	Mrs DSK Spink MBE	JH Stewart
	RJ Turner	JF Williams
	Dr JR Williamson	

Councillors MJ Mason, Mrs GJ Smith and Dr SEK van de Ven were in attendance, by invitation.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Mrs PS Corney, Mrs J Dixon, SM Edwards, A Riley, NIC Wright and SS Ziaian-Gillan.

---

**Councillor Mrs CAED Murfitt  
(Chairman of the Council) in  
the Chair**

---

### **1. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN**

Councillor Mrs JM Healey nominated Councillor Dr JPR Orme as Chairman of the Development and Conservation Control Committee. This was seconded by Councillor Dr DR Bard and, there being no further nominations, it was

**RESOLVED** That Councillor Dr JPR Orme be elected Chairman of the Development and Conservation Control Committee for the coming year.

Councillor Dr JPR Orme took the Chair.

### **2. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN**

Councillor Mrs DSK Spink nominated Councillor NIC Wright as Vice-Chairman of the Development and Conservation Control Committee. This was seconded by Councillor JH Stewart and, there being no further nominations, it was

**RESOLVED** That Councillor NIC Wright be appointed Vice-Chairman of the Development and Conservation Control Committee for the coming year.

In the absence of Councillor NIC Wright, the Committee appointed Councillor RF Bryant

as Vice-Chairman for this meeting.

### **3. THE DESIGN GUIDE**

The Conservation Manager gave a PowerPoint presentation of the Council's proposed Design Guide, and informed Members that they would each receive a copy of the first consultation draft in due course.

The document was welcomed by Members as providing the impetus for ensuring that future development in South Cambridgeshire reflects the character of local villages. The Conservation Manager commented that, once adopted as Council policy, the Design Guide would encourage an appropriate analysis of the context of development.

A Member expressed the hope that "context of development" would result in street names being more closely associated with the District.

A note of caution was sounded in that the raising of standards could lead to the raising of house prices which, ultimately, could have an adverse impact on affordable housing.

The Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder said that the real challenge amounted to persuading developers of new settlements to design entire neighbourhoods rather than simply to select from a portfolio of existing house designs already used elsewhere.

The Director of Development Services observed that the Design Guide would set the tone for design throughout the District, especially in those areas destined for major change during the coming years. It would highlight the importance of good design in respecting the character of local communities.

The Director of Development Services joined Members in their appreciation of the work carried out by the Conservation Area and Design Officer in preparing the Design Guide.

### **4. TRAVELLER ISSUES AND PLANNING ENFORCEMENT**

The Committee considered a procedural report seeking its views on the terms of reference, membership and name of the re-established "Sub-Committee" (to be referred to as an Advisory Committee) on planning enforcement matters at traveller sites.

There were two distinct schools of thought. The first maintained that creating an Advisory Committee specifically relating to enforcement issues on traveller sites could raise concerns about discrimination, and that enforcement of all planning contraventions (including those on traveller sites) should be the responsibility of the entire Development and Conservation Control Committee, be it at the ordinary meeting or at a special one.

The contrary view argued that a small Advisory Committee remained the most effective way of focussing expertise in an area with many complex enforcement issues unique to traveller sites. The former sub-committee members had been active, often at short notice, at meetings, including those with local residents in Cottenham. The different demands made by enforcement issues on traveller sites had been recognised and accepted both by central Government and by the Local Government Association. While the Advisory Committee's membership should be restricted, its meetings should be open to all Members of Council, especially local Members. One Member countered the argument that establishing an Advisory Committee to deal with enforcement issues at traveller sites might be construed as being discriminatory, by suggesting that a "blanket approach" to enforcement could just as easily fall foul of the same argument. Members discussed

membership, and whether or not local Members should be entitled to vote. They also argued for and against a Advisory Committee having delegated powers to act.

The Head of Legal Services offered some observations about procedure, including setting up an Advisory Committee consisting of all Members of the Development and Conservation Control Committee.

Councillor SGM Kindersley proposed the establishment of a Development and Conservation Control Advisory Committee consisting of the entire membership of the Development and Conservation Control Committee together with local Members not on that committee. This was seconded by Councillor R Martlew and, by 13 votes to 11, with one Member registering their presence but not voting, the proposal was **LOST**.

Councillor Mrs DP Roberts proposed the formal re-establishment of a small Advisory Committee with local Members entitled to attend its meetings. This was seconded by Councillor Mrs JA Muncey and, by 15 votes to ten, the proposal was **WON**.

Members then discussed membership of the Advisory Committee, and whether it should recommend courses of action to the Development and Conservation Control Committee by formal votes or by agreement at Advisory Committee level. It was argued that members should be appointed by their role on the Council, not by name.

There was a call for the minority view to be reported separately to the Development and Conservation Control Committee.

Councillor Mrs DP Roberts proposed that membership of the Development and Conservation Control Advisory Committee consist of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Development and Conservation Control Committee together with those four other members of the Committee, whose Executive functions covered Leader of the Council, and the Portfolios of Planning and Economic Development, Environmental Health and Community Development. This was seconded by Councillor Mrs JA Muncey and, by 15 votes to nine, with one Member registering their presence but not voting, the proposal was **WON**.

The substantive motion was put to the vote and, by 19 votes to five, with one Member registering their presence but not voting, it was

## **RESOLVED**

- (1) That an Advisory Committee be established;
- (2) That the role of that body be to focus on enforcement issues on traveller sites, and to evolve a course of action prior to make a recommendation for action by the Development and Conservation Control Committee;
- (3) That it be responsible for determining enforcement action on traveller sites in line with strategy developed by the Cabinet;
- (4) That all Members of Council be invited to attend meetings, and be encouraged to assist in developing recommendations to the Development and Conservation Control Committee;
- (5) That the new body be called the Development and Conservation Control (Advisory) Committee; and

- (6) That the Advisory Committee consist of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Development and Conservation Control Committee, and those four other members of the Development and Conservation Control Committee whose Executive functions relate to Leader of the Council and to the portfolios for Planning and Economic Development, Environmental Health and Community Development.

**5. LITTLE EVERSDEN - S/0669/05/F**

Members noted that this application had been **WITHDRAWN**.

**6. HISTON - S/0754/05/F**

**REFUSED**, contrary to the recommendation contained in the report from the Director of Development Services, for reasons of the adverse effect on the trees, overdevelopment, design and, if supported by a Highway Consultant, highways concerns

**7. LINTON - S/0141/05/F**

**DELEGATED APPROVAL**, as amended by drawings date stamped 28<sup>th</sup> April 2005, for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to:

- the receipt of a further amended layout plan addressing the latest comments of the Local Highway Authority and reflecting the footprints of the revised flat types
- the prior completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement ensuring that the housing is only occupied by qualifying persons and secured in perpetuity for that purpose, and securing arrangements for the ongoing maintenance of the public open space
- The Conditions referred to in the report.

A local Member welcomed the exemplary manner in which the developer had involved the community in providing this much appreciated development.

**8. MELBOURN - S/0637/05/F**

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

**9. MELBOURN - S/0739/05/F**

**REFUSED** for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services and an additional reason reflecting uncertainty as to the legal status of the vehicular access to the site.

**10. ELSWORTH - S/0611/05/F**

**DEFERRED** pending further discussion between this Council's Environmental Health Officers and officers at Cambridgeshire County Council to clarify the rationale behind the application and to explore alternative courses of action.

**11. SAWSTON - S/0710/05/F**

**APPROVAL** for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development

Services, subject to the Conditions referred to therein.

**12. SAWSTON - S/2579/04/F**

**DELEGATED APPROVAL**, as amended, for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to “carding” of those neighbours not already notified and the consideration of any material representations received and the prior completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement ensuring that the housing is only occupied by qualifying persons and secured in perpetuity for that purpose, the Conditions referred to in the report, an additional Condition requiring an archaeological survey to be conducted and an informative stating that, during construction, particular attention should be paid to ensuring that all waste and materials are properly secured, particularly overnight, to ensure material is not blown across the adjacent countryside.

Councillor Dr DR Bard declared a personal interest by virtue of his daughter and her fiancé being on the housing waiting list for Sawston.

**13. GREAT SHELFORD - S/0743/05/F**

**DELEGATED APPROVAL** for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to the receipt of consistent plans of the accesses to which the Trees and Landscape Officer raises no objections, to any amendments to the fenestration recommended by the Conservation Manager, to the Conditions referred to in the report and to an additional Condition relating to pollution control. Officers were also asked to write to the County Council urging it to implement a scheme of traffic calming along this section of Cherry Hinton Road in view of the high speed of traffic and the close proximity of farm accesses, the golf club and the park & ride entrance.

**14. WATERBEACH - S/0391/05/F**

**APPROVAL** for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to the Conditions referred to therein, and to the preparation of an acceptable Management Plan for the construction phase.

Councillor Dr J Williamson was present when the Planning Committee of Waterbeach Parish Council discussed this application, but is not a member of that committee.

**15. WATERBEACH - S/0659/05/O**

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

Councillor Dr J Williamson was present when the Planning Committee of Waterbeach Parish Council discussed this application, but is not a member of that committee. She declared a personal interest by virtue of being acquainted with the applicant's father.

**16. THRILOW - S/0713/05/O**

**DEFERRED** for a site visit and to enable further details to be obtained. Specifically, Members requested answers to the following questions: where would the agricultural and vehicle repair business buildings/uses be rebuilt/relocated?; why was the development not 100% affordable?; how would the application rate in terms of all sustainability issues, including helping to keep the local shop and school open, rather than just in terms of minimising travel and dependence on cars?; would approval be a precedent for similar applications elsewhere? Members also requested details of the proposed layout/scheme.

Councillor H Hurrell informed Members that he was a farming neighbour of the applicant, but lived nowhere near the site. He did not consider there to be a declarable personal interest.

**17. OVER - S/0959/04/O**

Members noted that this application had been **WITHDRAWN FROM THE AGENDA** to enable Members to undertake a site visit.

**18. BAR HILL - S/0549/05/F**

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

**19. BAR HILL - S/0821/05/F**

**APPROVAL** for the reason set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to the Condition referred to therein.

**20. DRY DRAYTON - S/0660/05/F**

**APPROVAL**, as amended by Drawing No. 05/02:001A date stamped 13<sup>th</sup> May 2005, for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services and subject to the Conditions referred to therein.

**21. DRY DRAYTON - S/0828/04/F**

**DELEGATED APPROVAL** for the reason set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to the Conditions referred to therein and to the existing Section 106 Legal Agreement being modified to bind the application.

**22. BOURN - S/0416/05F, S/0417/05/O AND S/0418/05/F**

**APPROVAL** of application S/0416/05/F (Phase 1), as amended by plans (Ref: PL-S-031A, PL-S-032A, PL-S-033A) date-stamped 9<sup>th</sup> May 2005, for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services and subject to the Conditions referred to therein.

**APPROVAL** of application S/0417/05/O (Phase 2), as amended by plans (Ref PL-S0003A) date-stamped 9<sup>th</sup> May 2005, for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services and subject to the Conditions referred to therein.

**APPROVAL** of application S/0418/05/F (Artists' studios and gardeners' store), as amended by plans (Ref PL-S0003A) date-stamped 9<sup>th</sup> May 2005, for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services and subject to the Conditions referred to therein.

Councillor Mrs DP Roberts declared a personal and prejudicial interest by virtue of her close involvement with Wysing Arts as Community Development Portfolio Holder, and withdrew from the Chamber.

Councillor Mrs DSK Spink declared a personal interest as South Cambridgeshire District Council's representative on the Management Board of Wysing Arts, but did not contribute to the Board's consideration of these proposals.

**23. CAMBOURNE - S/6292/05/F**

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

**24. OAKINGTON - S/0817/05/O**

Members noted that this application had been **WITHDRAWN**.

**25. GIRTON - S/0756/05/PNA**

**DECLINED TO COMMENT** by virtue of this application not having been submitted validly.

**26. 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 Hearing dates scheduled before the next meeting on 6<sup>th</sup> July 2005
- Advance notification of future local inquiry and informal Hearing dates (subject to postponement or cancellation)

**27. PERFORMANCE CRITERIA**

Members **NOTED** performance criteria for the three-month period ended 31<sup>st</sup> December 2004.

**28. GRAPHICAL INFORMATION**

Members **NOTED** graphs in respect of:

- Planning Decisions for the period 1<sup>st</sup> October to 31<sup>st</sup> December 2004
- Planning Decisions for the year ended 31<sup>st</sup> December 2004
- Minor and Major Decisions – Year ended 31<sup>st</sup> December 2004
- Minor and Major Decisions – 1<sup>st</sup> October to 31<sup>st</sup> December 2004
- Other Decisions – Year ended 31<sup>st</sup> December 2004
- Other Decisions – 1<sup>st</sup> October to 31<sup>st</sup> December 2004
- Percentage of applications determined within eight weeks
- Total Decisions issued quarterly by South Cambridgeshire District Council

**29. UNDETERMINED APPLICATIONS OVER 13 WEEKS (HARD COPY ONLY)**

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

**30. TO CONSIDER THE CONFIRMATION OF TPO NO. 05/05/SC AT WOODSIDE, LONGSTANTON**

The Committee considered a report on Tree Preservation Order no. 05/05/SC, made under delegated powers on 26<sup>th</sup> February 2005 at Woodside, Longstanton..

The statutory period for the registering of objections to the Order had ended on 4<sup>th</sup> April 2005.. Two letters of objection had been received. A site visit took place on 17<sup>th</sup> May 2005, at which the Committee Chairman and Vice-Chairman were present together with the Trees and Landscape Officer.

**RESOLVED** that Tree Preservation Order 05/05/SC at Woodside, Longstanton be confirmed without modification..

**31. TO RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT AND CONSERVATION CONTROL SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 10TH MAY 2005.**

The Committee received, in open session, open and confidential versions of the Minutes of the meeting of the Development and Conservation Control Sub-Committee held on 10<sup>th</sup> May 2005.

Members discussed how best to proceed in a manner that promoted fairness, honesty and effectiveness. In particular, the Council should be pro-active in ensuring that all Council-related issues, including traveller issues, were reported accurately by the Media.

---

**The Meeting ended at 3.35 p.m.**

---



**SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

---

**REPORT TO:** Development and Conservation Control Committee 13<sup>th</sup> May 2005  
**AUTHOR/S:** Director of Development Services

---

**S/0391/05/F - Waterbeach****Erection of Bungalow, Land Adjacent to 16 Winfold Road for Januarys.**

**Recommendation: Approval**  
**Date for Determination: 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2005**

**Site and Proposal**

1. The site extends to approximately 0.032 hectares (0.08 acres) and currently forms part of the grassed side garden of No 16 Winfold Road, an end of terrace two storey property. The site is located to the west of No 16 Winfold Road, access to which is provided via an adopted footpath that runs along the frontage of this terrace of 5 properties and connects to a communal car parking area, (also part of the adopted highway). The western boundary of the site is represented by a low timber and wire fence, which forms the village framework boundary. The open fields beyond are designated Green Belt. 14a Winfold Road, a detached bungalow sited to the north is separated from the site by a dense 2 metre high hedge. On-street car parking spaces are provided within a communal parking area while two garage courts accessed of this cul-de-sac provided further car parking facilities.
2. This full application received on the 28<sup>th</sup> February 2005, as amended on the 8<sup>th</sup> April 2005 following the submission of a revised red edge site plan, proposes the erection of a 2 bedroom bungalow. The bungalow is to be sited to the front of the site, set 1 metre back from the front building line of the adjacent terrace. The roof of the bungalow is to be gabled, the ridge height of which measures 5.1 metres. The rear elevation of the proposed dwelling extends 3.6 metres beyond the rear most point of the adjacent property, No 16 Winfold Road. The details of the application were amended on the 21<sup>st</sup> April 2005 with the width of the dwelling reduced by 400mm. A minimum of 2 metres separation is now provided between the dwelling and side boundary. No off-street car parking is to be provided.
3. The proposed density of development equates to 31 dwellings per hectare

**Planning History**

4. Planning application **S/2609/04/F** which sought consent for the erection of a bungalow was withdrawn prior to a decision being made.

**Planning Policy**

5. **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.
6. **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. Development should provide an appropriate mix of dwellings and should achieve a minimum density of 30 dph unless there are strong design grounds for not doing so.

7. **Policy SE9 ' Village Edges'** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 states that development on the edges of villages should be sympathetically designed and landscaped to minimise any impact on the surrounding countryside.

### Consultations

8. **Waterbeach Parish Council** – Refuse. Inadequate parking in Winfold Road and Clare Close where there is an ongoing problem of parking congestion. Concerns also raised with regard to access with building materials and their storage being detrimental to neighbouring properties.
9. **Waterbeach Level Internal Drainage Board** – No objections subject to a condition insisting that surface water be disposed of by infiltration methods or attenuate to Greenfield rates of run-off any surface water disposal to an existing mains system.
10. **Landscape Design Officer** – Planting to the open boundary would be important in this location. Concerned that separation to boundary is insufficient to permit a hedge to develop. A minimum of 2 metres is required at the tightest point.
11. With regards to the amended plans, a revised landscaping scheme is now required with all proposed planting shown within the red edge site.
12. **Chief Environmental Health Officer** – Concerned problems could arise from noise. 2 conditions protecting the amenities of neighbours during the construction process are requested.
13. **Local Highways Authority** – A plan has been submitted confirming the extent of the public highway. No obligations have been raised to the highway merits of the proposal.

### Representations

- Supporting statement from applicant
14. With regards to the siting and mass of the dwelling when viewed from within the rear garden of 16 Winfold Road, the applicant has made reference to the orientation of the site, south facing, the depth of the dwelling, extending just 3.6 metres beyond the rear elevation of No 16 and the 2 metres separation provided between No 16 and the proposed bungalow.
  15. A landscaping scheme has been submitted in support of this application and reference is made to the level of separation provided to the Village Framework boundary.
  16. A car parking survey has also been submitted in support of this application listing the number of off and on-street car parking spaces provided in Winfold Road and the number of vehicles parked in this area on four separate occasions over an 11-day period.
    - Objections from neighbours

17. Three letters of objection have been received from nearby residents raising the following comments:
- Overlooking potential of dwelling with regards to the rear garden and conservatory of 14a Winfold Road
  - Lack of off street car parking and the impact on already limited on-street parking provision
  - Increased congestion within the cul-de-sac
  - Existing garages provided in the two adjacent garage courts too small to park a modern vehicle
  - Impact on highway safety and safety of pedestrians within the cul-de-sac
  - Lack of storage space for building equipment
  - Questioned times at which parking survey was conducted, querying how representative this data is.

### **Planning Comments – Key Issues**

18. The main issues to consider in relation to this application are the impact of the development on the character and appearance of the area, residential amenities of neighbours and highway safety.

#### **Character and appearance of area**

19. The application site is located at the end of a terrace of 5 properties and abuts the rear gardens of Nos. 14a and 16 Winfold Road. With only pedestrian access provided into the site, the proposed bungalow will not form a prominent feature within the street. The proposed dwelling is single storey only, and with any views of the front elevation at best limited, it is the view of Officers that the proposed dwelling will not result in a cramped or overdeveloped appearance to the site.
20. The western boundary of the site does abut the Green Belt and Village Framework boundary. Whilst long distance views are provided across the open countryside, the low-rise building will be viewed against the taller two-storey gable elevation of No 16 Winfold Road. Given the reduced height and bulk of the dwelling the proposed structure will not adversely affect the openness of the Green Belt.
21. Whilst a landscaping scheme was submitted in support of this application, the Council's Landscape Design Officer had stated that at least 2 metres separation to the site boundary is required to ensure a meaningful hedge can be planted. Following this advice, the footprint of the dwelling has been revised and a minimum gap of two metres has been provided to the western boundary of the site. The applicant has also stated that the west facing elevation of the bungalow has purposefully remained blank so as to reduce the likelihood of the boundary planting being cut back by future occupiers. Whilst the footprint of the dwelling has been reduced the proposed landscaping scheme has not been amended. It is suggested that if approved, the planting scheme submitted be excluded from the permission and a standard landscaping scheme condition be imposed.

#### **Residential amenities of neighbours**

22. The proposed bungalow is set 1 metre back from the front elevation of the adjacent terrace and extends 3.6 metres beyond the rear elevation of No 16 Winfold Road. The wide rear facing patio doors of No 16 face due south and will not be significantly overshadowed by the proposed dwelling.

23. No 14a, a detached bungalow sited north of the application site, is rotated through 90 degrees and has a blank gable wall that faces the front elevation of the proposed dwelling. No 14a also has a small conservatory sited within the rear garden. While the proposed kitchen and bedroom window will provide views towards No 14a the main outlook provided will be towards the blank gable of the neighbouring property. Whilst some views maybe provided from within the kitchen towards the conservatory, given the screening affect of the boundary hedge and separation provided, 9 metres approximately, the relationship with the neighbouring dwellings is, in the opinion of Officers, considered acceptable.

**Highway safety**

24. Whilst the application site has no vehicular access point, pedestrian access is provided via the adopted highway which runs along the front of the terrace and abuts the northeastern corner of the site. Members should note that the application site has been amended to include a small strip of land directly adjacent to the adopted highway. As previously submitted, the application site had no highway frontage.
25. With no off street car parking spaces provided it is proposed that the occupiers of the 2-bed bungalow would park within communal car parking area sited in front of the adjacent terrace. This communal parking area is already heavily used and considerable local concern has been raised with regard to increased congestion levels that will be caused by this development.
26. In support of this application the applicant has carried out a detailed car parking survey of the area. It is stated that the surrounding properties. No 2-34 Winfold Road, (17 houses located within the vicinity of the site, including the 9 dwellings sited directly adjacent to the communal parking area which abuts the application site) all have access to a single garage sited within the two garage courts accessed from within the communal parking area. The only exceptions are No 2 and 14a Winfold Road, both of which have off-street car parking spaces provided within their own residential curtilage. In addition, approximately 9 on-street car parking spaces are provided within the communal parking area and a further 6 spaces within the northern garage court, (a total of 15 spaces). On-street parking is also provided for much of the length of Winfold Road.
27. Whilst, on the basis of the survey submitted, the provision of on and off-street car parking spaces appears reasonable, nearby residents have stated that the private garaging is too small to accommodate modern vehicles. As a result all properties which do not have parking spaces provided within their residential curtilage are forced to park within the street. As for all residential cul-de-sacs of this type, the lack of off-street car parking spaces means the demand for spaces within the street is high. Whilst granting consent for a 2-bed bungalow which has no allocated car parking spaces will add to the congestion within the street, in considering the merits of this application, Members must consider the extent of harm that will be caused by the proposed development.
28. Waterbeach is defined as a Rural Growth Settlement within the Local Plan and is one of the most sustainable villages within South Cambridgeshire. The train station is located within 1km of the site while other public transport facilities are considered good. A wide range of public services are also provided within the village centre. In accordance with Central Governments sustainability objectives, where the opportunities to use alternative means of transport to the private car are high, the Council would require a maximum of 1.5 car parking spaces to be provided per dwelling, (as stated in PPG13). For a dwelling of this size in this location it is likely that a maximum of just 1 off-street car parking space would be required.

29. In the absence of any off street car parking spaces it is reasonable to expect that occupiers of nearby dwellings will, where possible, park in the most convenient location, usual as near as possible to their front door. On this basis those properties currently most likely to park within the communal parking area are Nos. 14,16,18,20,22,24,26 and 28, Winfold Road, the 8 dwellings that abut the parking area but do not have off street parking provision.
  30. Having regard to the adopted car parking standard a maximum of 12 car parking spaces would be required to serve the 8 dwellings which currently abut the parking area and 13.5 spaces would be required if the bungalow were approved. Sufficient on-street car parking spaces are therefore available within the communal car parking area and northern garage court to serve the existing dwellings sited immediately adjacent to the site. Whilst in reality properties sited within Winfold Road may on average have more than 1.5 cars per dwelling, (site visits by the case officer and Cllr Williamson, referred to in more detail below, suggest this to be true), these are the adopted car parking standards which this application must be assessed against.
  31. The car parking survey conducted by the applicant was carried out on a Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday at 16:00 hrs, 18:40hrs, 18:30hrs and 15:00hrs respectively. At these times it is stated that a minimum of 7 car parking spaces were available in the communal parking area and northern garage court. Cllr Williamson has also visited the site at 18:30 hrs on a Friday and 8:30 hrs on a Sunday. At these times there were 2 and 4 spare spaces respectively available in the communal parking area alone. During my site visit held in the afternoon of Wednesday 30<sup>th</sup> March 2005, just 4 cars were parked in the communal parking area and 4 were parked within the northern garage court leaving 9 spaces free within this part of Winfold Road. Whilst the number of occasions that the local car parking conditions were surveyed is somewhat limited, on all 7 occasions the communal parking area and northern garage court have never been full.
  32. During a subsequent site visit it came to the Council's attention that 3 of the vehicles parked within the communal parking area and northern garage court were abandoned vehicles and had not moved since the last application, S/2609/04/F, was submitted in December 2004. Having liaised with the Council's Environmental Health Department, these vehicles have now been removed, releasing 3 further on street car parking spaces within the vicinity of the application site.
  33. Based on the above findings it is the opinion of Officers that sufficient capacity exists within this part of Winfold Road to accommodate the additional car parking needs that, based on the Council's adopted car parking standards, is required for this proposed 2 bedroom bungalow. Winfold Road is an access only road where vehicle speeds are low. Even if further cars are forced to park within the street it is not considered that this will be to the detriment of highway safety.
  34. Whilst concerns have been raised regarding pedestrian safety within the cul-de-sac, it is again the opinion of Officers that the modest 2 bedroom bungalow will have a very minimal impact. The net increase in daily traffic movements within the cul-de-sac will not be significant.
- Other issues**
35. Both the Parish Council and local residents have raised concerns regarding the storage of building materials during the construction period. Access to the application site is restricted to the Adopted footpath and there is limited available space for the storage of building materials and equipment. Whilst Officers can

appreciate the origins of this concern, the storage of building materials is not a material planning consideration and an objection cannot be raised on these grounds.

## **Recommendation**

### 36. Approval subject to conditions

- 1) Standard Condition A – Time limited permission (Reason A)
- 2) No development shall commence until details of the materials to be used for the external walls and roof 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 – RC5a)i)
- 3) The Landscaping scheme illustrated on Drawing No 50-05 is specifically excluded from this permission. No development shall commence 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.
- 4) All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation of the building or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner; and any trees or plants which within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.  
Reason - To enhance the quality of the development and to assimilate it within the area.
- 5) Notwithstanding the details given within this application, no development shall commence until details of the surface water drainage 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 ensure satisfactory drainage of the site.
- 6) During the period of construction no power operated machinery shall be operated on the premises before 08.00 hours on weekdays and 08.00 hours on Saturdays nor after 18.00 hours on weekdays and 13.00 hours on Saturdays (nor at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays) unless otherwise previously agreed in writing with the local Planning Authority in accordance with any agreed noise restrictions.  
Reason – To minimise noise and disturbance to nearby residential dwellings

## **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 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

## **Reasons for Approval**

1. The development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:
  - **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003: P1/3** (Sustainable Design in Built Development)
  - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004: Policy SE2** (Development in Rural Growth Settlements), **SE9** ' Village Edges'
2. The development is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations which have been raised during the consultation exercise:
  - Overlooking
  - Lack of off street car parking and the impact on already limited on-street parking provision
  - Increased congestion
  - 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:

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- Planning file Ref S/2609/04/F and S/0391/05/F

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

This page is intentionally left blank