

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



23 May 2005

To: 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, 1 JUNE 2005** 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. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN	
2. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN	
3. APOLOGIES	
4. THE DESIGN GUIDE To receive a short presentation outlining the policy context; content and purpose of the Design Guide, and consider launching the consultation draft (Members will receive an illustrated version), developing a programme of staff seminars, and issuing promotional material.	
APPOINTMENT OF SUB-COMMITTEE	
5. TRAVELLER ISSUES AND PLANNING ENFORCEMENT	1 - 4
PLANNING APPLICATIONS	
6. LITTLE EVERS DEN - S/0669/05/F	5 - 8
7. HISTON - S/0754/05/F	9 - 14

8.	LINTON - S/0141/05/F	15 - 26
9.	MELBOURN - S/0637/05/F	27 - 30
10.	MELBOURN - S/0739/05/F	31 - 34
11.	ELSWORTH - S/0611/05/F	35 - 40
12.	SAWSTON - S/0710/05/F	41 - 46
13.	SAWSTON - S/2579/04/F	47 - 56
14.	GREAT SHELFORD - S/0743/05/F	57 - 62
15.	WATERBEACH - S/0391/05/F	63 - 66
16.	WATERBEACH - S/0659/05/O	67 - 70
17.	THRILOW - S/0713/05/O	71 - 78
18.	OVER - S/0959/04/O	79 - 84
19.	BAR HILL - S/0549/05/F	85 - 88
20.	BAR HILL - S/0821/05/F	89 - 92
21.	DRY DRAYTON - S/0660/05/F	93 - 98
22.	DRY DRAYTON - S/0828/04/F	99 - 102
23.	BOURN - S/0416/05F, S/0417/05/O AND S/0418/05/F	103 - 122
24.	CAMBOURNE - S/6292/05/F	123 - 126
25.	OAKINGTON - S/0817/05/O	127 - 132
26.	GIRTON - S/0756/05/PNA	133 - 136
	APPEALS, STATISTICS AND UNDETERMINED APPLICATIONS	
27.	APPEALS AGAINST PLANNING DECISIONS AND ENFORCEMENT ACTION	137 - 148
28.	PERFORMANCE CRITERIA	149 - 150
29.	GRAPHICAL INFORMATION	
30.	UNDETERMINED APPLICATIONS OVER 13 WEEKS (HARD COPY ONLY)	
	TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS	
31.	TO CONSIDER THE CONFIRMATION OF TPO NO. 05/05/SC AT WOODSIDE, LONGSTANTON	151 - 154

Appendices 2 and 3 are available only as hard copy.

TRAVELLERS

- 32. TO RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT AND CONSERVATION CONTROL SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 10TH MAY 2005. 155 - 158**
- 33. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**
The Committee is requested to consider the exclusion of the Press and public during the consideration of the following item number 34 in accordance with Section 100(A) (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that, if present, there would be disclosure to them of exempt information as defined in paragraph 10, 11, 12 and 13 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.
- 34. TO CONSIDER EXEMPT INFORMATION ARISING FROM THE MEETING OF THE DEVELOPMENT AND CONSERVATION CONTROL SUB-COMMITTEE HELD ON 10TH MAY 2005 159 - 162**

EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

The following statement must be proposed, seconded and voted upon. The officer presenting to report will provide the paragraph number(s).

“I propose that the Press and public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the following item number in accordance with Section 100(A) (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that, if present, there would be disclosure to them of exempt information as defined in paragraph of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.”

PLEASE NOTE!

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

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation
Control Committee

1 June 2005

AUTHOR/S: Development Services Director

TRAVELLER ISSUES AND PLANNING ENFORCEMENT

Purpose

1. To invite Members' views on the terms of reference, membership and name of the re-established Sub-Committee on planning enforcement matters at traveller sites.

Effect on Corporate Objectives

2.	Quality, Accessible Services	Traveller Issues have implications for all four corporate objectives. In particular, the Council's commitment to firm, fair and consistent planning enforcement is central to maintaining Quality Village Life and treating all sections of the community equitably. This is also reflected in the Council's Policy on Traveller Issues, which was agreed in July 2004.
	Village Life	
	Sustainability	
	Partnership	

Background

3. Proposed decision-making arrangements for planning enforcement matters at traveller sites were reported to this Committee's meeting on 6 April 2005. The Committee deferred the proposals and resolved to re-establish, with immediate effect and as an interim measure, the Development and Conservation Control (Direct Action) Sub-Committee that had been in place last autumn. It was also agreed that the terms of reference, membership and name of the Sub-Committee should be reviewed by this Committee.
4. Since then, the Cabinet met on 28 April 2005 to consider the development of a Council Strategy on Traveller Issues throughout the District. The Cabinet signalled its support for injunctive legal action in cases of continuing non-compliance with enforcement notices at traveller sites. Preparations for a Strategy continue.
5. The Sub-Committee met on 10 May 2005 and considered options open to the Council in relation to unauthorised traveller plots at Pine View, Smithy Fen. Members discussed different scenarios and possible courses of action, whilst recognising that it would be premature for the Council to make any specific decisions until after the 11 June deadline for the travellers to leave. Arrangements are being made for a further meeting of the Sub-Committee in the week commencing 13 June, followed by a report to this Committee.
6. This current report is a necessary part of the process for making sure that decisions on Traveller Issues are properly authorised. More important, however, are the on-going efforts being made to:
 - continue negotiations with travellers, local communities, the Commission for Racial Equality and others; and
 - develop plans for possible enforcement action, which could apply to any unauthorised traveller site in the District.

Considerations

7. The following section reflects on the current arrangements and a number of questions that have arisen in recent months. This builds on the hard work and progress that has been made so far as part of the Council's approach to Traveller Issues.
8. **Terms of Reference:** The Sub-Committee's original terms of reference, agreed by this Committee on 1 September 2004, were "to authorise, project plan and – subject to approved resources and relevant human rights considerations - carry through direct enforcement action in relation to Travellers".
9. At this Committee's meeting on 6 April, some Members questioned whether a Sub-Committee was still necessary, since this Committee could make decisions on planning enforcement issues relating to unauthorised traveller sites, and given the Cabinet's role in developing the Strategy on Traveller Issues. However, at the Sub-Committee meeting on 10 May, local Members for Cottenham emphasised the value of having the opportunity to consider the detail of the Council's preparations for any possible enforcement action that may be necessary at Smithy Fen.
10. The Strategic Officer Group advised the Sub-Committee on 10 May that any formal regulatory decision to go down the legal injunctive route should be made by the full Development and Conservation Control Committee in terms of regulatory matters, and be agreed by the Council in terms of making the necessary funding available.
11. The regulatory role of this Committee on Traveller Issues needs to be placed in the context of the executive role, taken on by the Cabinet last December, for overseeing the Council's strategy on Traveller Issues and ensuring a consistent approach to all traveller sites. This Committee may wish to consider what should be the extent of the regulatory role. Clearly, it is about identifying whether a breach of planning control has occurred and what subsequent action would be appropriate. The question is whether responsibility for overseeing any subsequent action should be with the regulatory committee or with the Cabinet as a whole.
12. **Membership of the Sub-Committee:** In September 2004, the Committee agreed that the Sub-Committee's membership should comprise Councillors Dr Bard, Roberts, Spink, and local Members on the Development Control and Conservation Committee (D&3C) in relation to the area under consideration. Any other local Members not on the Committee, and the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee, were invited to attend, as appropriate, but not as members of the sub-committee.
13. Some Cabinet Members with specific responsibilities under the Council's Policy on Traveller Issues (namely the Leader and the portfolio-holders for Planning Policy and Community Development) have served on the Sub-Committee because they are also members of this Committee.
 - As the membership of the Cabinet, and the roles of some existing portfolio-holders, are likely to change following the Annual Council Meeting on 26 May, this Committee may wish to consider whether this needs to have any bearing on the Sub-Committee's membership.
 - Allied to this, the Committee may also wish to consider how best to continue to make use of current members of the Sub-Committee who have built up considerable knowledge and experience on Traveller Issues.

14. At this Committee's meeting on 6 April, various Members supported the suggestion that the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of this Committee should be made full voting members of the Sub-Committee.
15. So far, meetings of the Sub-Committee have focused on matters relating to Smithy Fen and have involved Cottenham Members. Specific agenda items relating to other traveller sites elsewhere in the district, which would involve other Members from other wards, have not yet arisen on the same Sub-Committee agendas. If this did happen in future, there is currently some ambiguity about which ward councillors attending (if also Members of the D&3C Committee) would be entitled to vote on which agenda items. That is, could voting rights change during the course of a meeting? Alternatively, does it mean that a ward councillor could vote on an issue not relating to his/her own ward if more than one locality was featured on the same Sub-Committee agenda?
16. There is a separate concern that relevant local Members may not always get the opportunity to contribute to discussions which have a bearing on traveller issues in their wards. It is possible that a Sub-Committee meeting, held to discuss traveller matters in one locality, could bring forward proposals for dealing with issues that might apply equally to sites in other parts of the district. If Members from those other wards do not attend because they do not expect that the discussions will relate to their particular communities, they could miss out.
17. **Name of the Sub-Committee:** Clearly, the name is a secondary concern to the primary objectives of working towards a fair and realistic solution to Traveller Issues in the District. Even so, it is worth considering, given that feedback received from partner organisations last autumn suggested that the term "direct action" was perceived to have negative and aggressive connotations, with which some agencies were reluctant to be associated. Alternative names, such as the "Planning Enforcement Sub-Committee (Traveller Sites)" have been suggested, though Members may wish to keep it simple and refer to it as the "D&3C Sub-Committee".

Options

The Committee is invited to consider a number of key questions.

18. Do Members wish the Sub-Committee to continue or should these matters be considered by the Development & Conservation Control Committee as a whole? (see paragraph 9).
19. Should the Sub-Committee's role be to authorise planning enforcement action against unauthorised traveller encampments itself or to advise the Development & Conservation Control Committee on decisions to be made by the full Committee?
20. How should the role of the Development & Conservation Control Committee and the Sub-Committee relate to the strategic role of the Cabinet? (see paragraph 11 above). Who does what?
21. Who should be voting members of the Sub-Committee? (see paragraphs 12-14). Who should be invited to attend? How might the potential ambiguities and anomalies, set out in paragraphs 15-16, be avoided?
22. What should be the name of the Sub-Committee? (see paragraph 17).

Financial, Legal, Staffing and Risk Management Implications

23. There are no specific financial implications arising from this report.

24. There are no specific legal implications arising from this report. The Commission for Racial Equality states that "Gypsies and Irish Travellers are recognised ethnic groups for the purposes of the Race Relations Act (1976), identified as having a shared culture, language and beliefs".
25. The Strategic Officer Group is keen to make sure that the roles of the Cabinet and regulatory committees are clear, in order to be able to focus effort on developing the Strategy on Traveller Issues, negotiations with travellers and others, and plans for possible enforcement action.
26. Traveller Issues are highlighted as one of the key corporate risks facing the organisation (currently rated 'very high likelihood' / 'critical impact') on the Council's Risk Register. The management action plan was included in the report to Cabinet on 12 May 2005 on Strategic Risk Management.

Consultations

27. Comments on a draft version of this report were invited from the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of this Committee, and Councillors Spink, Bard and Roberts.

Recommendations

28. Members' views are invited on the questions set out in paragraphs 18 – 22, in order to clarify the terms of reference, membership and name of the Sub-Committee.

Background Papers:

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

- Council's Policy on Traveller Issues, SCDC, July 2004.
- Report to Development and Conservation Control Committee, 6 April 2005.
- Report to Development and Conservation Control Committee, 1 September 2004.
- Reports to Cabinet, 28 April 2005
- Report to Cabinet on Strategic Risk Management, 12 May 2005.
- "Gypsies and Travellers: the facts", Commission for Racial Equality website, May 2005 (http://www.cre.gov.uk/gdpract/g_and_t_facts.html)

Contact Officer: Strategic Officer Group on Traveller Issues
e-mail: traveller.project@scambs.gov.uk
Telephone: (01954) 713297

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation Control Committee 1st June 2005
AUTHOR/S: Director of Development Services

**S/0669/05/F - Little Eversden
Extensions and Alterations, 8 Bucks Lane for Mr and Mrs Astin**

Recommendation: Refusal

Site and Proposal

1. The site is located outside of the village framework and in the Green Belt. The site is approximately 0.4 acres in size, some of which is not included in the residential curtilage of this dwelling. The dwelling house is located in the south western corner of the plot. Under permitted development a garage building has been constructed perpendicular to the east of the dwelling house. There is a large shingle driveway with turning space that can adequately accommodate a large number of vehicles off road to the north east of the dwelling house. There are various trees screening on all of the boundaries. The OS plan shows two outbuildings on the site, of which the one closest to the road has been removed. The newly erected building built under permitted development is located much closer to the dwelling house.
2. The full application received 8th April 2005 is for the erection of a two-storey rear extension creating a lounge at ground floor and a double bedroom with en suite on the first floor.

Planning History

3. **S/0361/03/O** – Outline Application for one dwelling. The application was refused and later dismissed at appeal. The application proposed a nearly equal sub-division of the plot for an additional dwelling. The Inspector dismissed the appeal based on the adverse affect it would have on the character of the countryside, harmful to the function and purpose of the Green Belt and the lack of special circumstances to overcome the presumption against such development.

Planning Policy

4. Local Plan 2004 **Policy GB2 The boundaries of the Green Belt** states that planning permission will not be granted for inappropriate development in the Green Belt unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated. It also states that development is 'inappropriate' unless, amongst others, it comprises the extensions to dwellings provided the criteria in Policy HG13 are met and that the overall impact of any extension does not result in the dwelling having a materially greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt.
5. Structure Plan **Policy P9/2a Green Belt**, precludes development other than that required for agriculture and other uses appropriate to a rural area.

6. Local Plan **HG13 Extensions to dwellings in the countryside** states, in part, that extensions to dwellings in the Countryside will be permitted where the extension does not lead to a 50% increase or more in volume or gross internal floor area of the original dwelling house and the proposed extension is in scale and character with the existing dwelling and would not materially change the impact of the dwelling on its surroundings.
7. Structure Plan **Policy P1/3 Sustainable design in Built Development**, requires a high standard of design for all new development.
Consultation
8. Little Eversden Parish Council recommends approval. Comments state that "the previous design was criticised by the local as in the wrong direction and withdrawn. The present design has general approval from the Locals as having addressed the problem"

Representations

9. None received

Planning Comments – Key Issues

10. The key issues to consider is the impact the proposed extension has on the Green belt and the surrounding countryside
11. **Impact on the Green Belt and the surrounding Countryside**
The proposed extension is located to the rear of the property and is not prominent from the front elevation. The garden area is mostly located to the side of the dwelling house. The building that has been built under permitted development is a large structure, with a double bay garage, internal storage space and a wood store area. It has a ridged roof, and predominately made from timber and slate.
12. The proposed two-storey extension increases the floor area over 50% of the original dwelling house of which HG13 aims to resist. Cumulatively the increase of the dwelling house and the structure built under permitted development will have a material impact on the openness of the Green Belt of which Policy GB2 aims to resist. The existing development on this site and the proposed extension to the rear increases the bulk of the built environment on this site. I am of the view that two storey rear extension should be reduced to meet the criteria of Policy HG13 and hence Policy GB2.
13. Policy HG13 goes on to say why extensions to dwelling outside the frameworks need careful control. It states the important need to impose some limitation on the permissible proportionate increase in dwelling sizes with the aim of preventing a gradual reduction in the stock of smaller and medium sized dwellings in the Countryside. Paragraph 4.35 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 states that limited extension or alteration of existing buildings in the Green Belt is regarded as appropriate provided the development does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the original building. Policy GB2 enforces this matter. This part of the Local Plan goes on to say extensions should not dominate the original dwelling in terms of height or scale and should not materially change the impact of the dwelling on the Green Belt. Extensions either individually or cumulatively should not lead to an increase of more than 50% volume over the original dwelling.

14. The calculations of the original dwelling house exclude the two single storey elements of 8 Bucks Lane which appear to have added after 1948. On that basis the percentage increase of the extension would be approximately 75%. However the applicant assures me these were part of the original dwelling house. He claims he has evidence to prove this. I shall report verbally if and when provided. If indeed this is the case, the extension would represent approximately a 55% increase in floorspace.

Recommendation

Refusal

15. No 8 Bucks Lane is a small detached, rendered property located outside of the village framework. It lies within the Cambridge Green Belt. The floorspace of the proposed extension would represent an increase of over 50% of the original dwelling house and would significantly alter the character of this site. The cumulative bulk of development and change of character would significantly alter the impact of the dwelling on its surroundings and thus harm the visual qualities of the countryside and the openness of the Green Belt. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies HG13 and GB2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 and Policy P9/2a of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report: S/0669/05/F

South Cambridge Local Plan 2004
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
Planning Application File Ref: S/0669/05/F

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

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation Control Committee 1st June 2005**AUTHOR/S:** Director of Development Services

S/0754/05/F - Histon**Erection of Seven Houses and Garage for Existing Dwelling at 53 Cottenham Road for The Land Partnership Ltd.****Recommendation: Delegated Approval****Date for Determination: 10th June 2005****Site and Proposal**

1. 53 Cottenham Road is a residential property with large gardens to the front, west and rear. The site measures 0.232 hectares. The existing house on the site is a fine 19th century villa built in Cambridgeshire gault bricks with a shallow hipped slate roof, however it is not Listed. There is a brick outbuilding attached to the house and a barn-like outbuilding to the west of it. The site contains a number of trees, including a row of pollarded limes to the frontage.
2. The site is within the village framework, forming a spur of land surrounded on three sides by open countryside. To the east there is a pair of thatched cottages at 59 and 61 Cottenham Road, which date from the 17th century and are Grade II Listed. 90 metres to the southwest is Guns Lane, a historic road that is now designated as a bridleway.
3. This full planning application proposes to retain the existing house. The attached outbuilding is to be demolished and a single garage with lean-to roof constructed to serve the house. In addition, seven new dwellings are proposed with integral garages, these will be sited to form a courtyard. A mix of unit sizes are proposed ie two 2-bed; two 3-bed; two 4-bed; and one 5-bed houses, and development will be at a density of 34.5 dwellings per hectare. The access will utilise the existing crossover. The gateway will be widened to provide a 5 metre wide road, of which approximately 20 metres back from the public highway will be adoptable, with a private drive serving the remainder of the site.

Planning History

4. **S/1982/02/O** granted outline planning permission for two single storey dwellings on the site. The existing dwelling was to be retained within this scheme.
5. **S/2044/04/F** sought planning permission for eight dwellings following the demolition of the existing dwelling. This application was withdrawn prior to refusal, as issues regarding the impact on the village edge, Green Belt and adjacent Listed Buildings had been raised in addition to concerns relating to access, car parking, layout and design.
6. Planning application **S/0075/05/F** for the erection of seven dwellings and a garage to serve the existing dwelling was withdrawn pending refusal on grounds of the impact on the village edge and Green Belt, design, layout and failure to provide an appropriate mix of dwelling sizes.

Planning Policy

7. **Policy SE2 ‘Rural Growth Settlements’** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 (“Local Plan”) defines Histon 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.
8. **Policy SE9 ‘Village Edges’** of the Local Plan requires development on the edge of villages to be sympathetically designed and landscaped to minimise the impact upon the countryside and to ensure that harmony with the prevailing landscape character is achieved.
9. **Policy HG10 ‘Housing Mix and Design’** 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.
10. **HG12 Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings within Frameworks** of the Local Plan sets out the requirements that must be met in order for proposals to extend or alter dwellings within village frameworks to be considered for approval.
11. **Policy TP1 ‘Planning for More Sustainable Travel’** of the Local Plan seeks to promote sustainable travel and as such planning permission will only be granted where small-scale increases in travel demands will result, unless satisfactory measures to increase accessibility are included. Standards for maximum car parking levels and requirements for cycle storage are found in Appendices 7/1 and 7/2.
12. **Policy EN15 ‘Development Affecting Ancient Monuments or Other Archaeological Sites’** of the Local Plan seeks to protect, preserve and enhance known and suspected sites and features of archaeological importance and their settings by requiring investigations and refusing planning permission where damage would result.
13. **Policy EN28 ‘Development Within the Curtilage or Setting of a Listed Building’** of the Local Plan requires proposals that affect the setting of Listed Buildings to not dominate, damage the setting, well-being, attractiveness of the building, or its visual relationship with the surroundings, or damage archaeological remains.
14. **Policy P1/2 ‘Environmental Restrictions on Development’** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 (“Structure Plan”) restricts development where it could damage areas that should be retained for their biodiversity, historic, archaeological, architectural and recreational value.
15. **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.
16. **Policy P7/6 ‘Historic Built Environment’** of the Structure Plan requires Local Authorities to protect and enhance the historic environment, including designated conservation areas.

Consultations

17. **Histon Parish Council** recommend refusal. It comments:

“Traffic from multiple dwellings onto this dangerous corner remains a real concern. Whilst the Committee are pleased that the plans have been altered to retain the existing house, which is regarded as essential, the proposal for seven additional houses, and the number of bedrooms involved, is too many, and likely to give rise to inefficient parking. The houses are out of keeping with the existing property on the site and with the general housing all the way from Guns Lane. The design is therefore not sympathetic to the surrounding environment. The Committee comment **additionally** that this high density proposal is in the wrong location in view of traffic issues and would give a hard edge to the village on this Green Belt boundary.”

18. The **Conservation Manager** does not object and notes “the revised site layout contained in the current application will mean that the proposals will not adversely affect the setting of the Listed Buildings at 59 and 61 Cottenham Road. I am pleased to see a scheme that retains the existing dwelling at no. 53 and its front boundary wall”.
19. The **Landscape Design Officer** comments that:

“Whilst there is practical space for planting to the western boundary, I am concerned particularly with plot 5, that there will be pressure to limit the planting height and density to achieve light, as much of the garden is north facing and the south side is shaded by plot 4. This planting will be required to fully establish to reduce the impact of this large dwelling on the countryside.”
20. The comments of the **Trees and Landscape Officer** will be reported verbally.
21. The **Local Highways Authority** comments:

“The parking provision is above the maximum for this size of development (calculated at 13, with 16 being provided). Although no cycle parking is shown it is requested, that given the village location of development, that the provision of at least one cycle parking space for each dwelling unit be investigated, to provide an alternative method of transport, for short distance journeys and thus reduce dependence on the private motor car. The proposed access road does not conform with the adoptable standards and will serve no highway function, therefore, the road shall remain private, with no addition to the adopted public highway.”
22. **The Environment Agency** advises that the application site falls within a Zone 1 flood risk area. The Council is required to respond on its behalf in respect of flood risk and surface water drainage.
23. **The Old West Internal Drainage Board** states that the site is outside of its area, however surface water will drain into its district. Its surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased run-off from newly created impermeable areas. Provided surface water is disposed of to soakaways it does not object to the proposals.
24. The **County Archaeology Officer** advises that the site lies in an area of uncertain archaeological potential and it is possible that archaeological deposits survive on the site, which could be destroyed or damaged by the proposed development. The plot lies on the on the edge of the village, to the north of the historic core and site of St Etheldreda’s Church. Crop marks indicative of Prehistoric or Roman settlement and the remains of a possible Bronze Age barrow are known to the west of the site. A negative condition in accordance with PPG16, requiring a programme of archaeological investigation at the developer’s expense, is recommended.

25. **Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service** does not require additional water supplies for fire fighting to be provided.

Representations

26. One letter of objection has been received commenting that the existing dwelling should be retained, along with the pollarded trees to the frontage. The number of dwellings proposed is out of keeping with the layout of properties on this side of the road and will create an imbalance on the village edge. It is desirable to maintain a lower density on the village edge.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

27. **Highways**

The car parking proposed is considered by the Local Highways Authority to be an over provision of two spaces. It is reasonable to provide an appropriate level of car parking, provided that it will not result in over-provision, in order to encourage travel by non-car modes. The over-provision is due to three spaces for visitors, sited adjacent to the proposed garden boundary to the existing dwelling. Amendments reducing this area can be sought, and could allow increased space for landscaping.

The traffic generated by the development will not lead to highway safety issues, as there is good visibility in both directions along Cottenham Road due to the access being sited on a bend.

Cycle storage can be provided within the layout and could be dealt with by condition or amended drawings.

28. **Layout and design**

The development proposed does not closely reflect the existing built form, however the site layout proposed is designed to reflect a farmyard or stable-like development. The density is not unduly high, being just 34.5 dwellings per hectare. Buildings are proposed to be constructed using traditional materials, including slate and weatherboarding in order to provide a high quality appearance to the development.

29. **Landscaping**

The site is on the edge of the village and adjacent to the Green Belt. Due to the extent of development proposed, particularly to the western boundary, which is clearly visible from Guns Lane, and in light of the concerns raised by the Landscape Design Officer amendments to the landscaping scheme, and potentially the design of plot 5 are being sought. These amendments will seek to provide a solution that ensures that reasonable landscaping and usable private garden area to the plot can be achieved without undue pressure to remove planting being placed in the future.

A tree survey has been submitted with the application, any comments of the Trees and Landscape Officer will be required to be addressed prior to planning permission being given, again in order to ensure that the site is appropriately landscaped and that where possible existing trees are retained as features of the site.

30. **Others**

Surface water drainage and archaeology conditions will be placed should planning permission be granted.

Recommendation

Subject to no objections being received from the Trees and Landscape Officer and amended details for car parking and landscaping (to address issues relating to plot 5), delegated powers are sought to approve the application, subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard Condition A – Time limited permission (Reason A);
2. Sc5a – Details of materials for external walls and roofs (Rc5aii);
Sc5b - Surface water drainage details (Sc5b);
Sc5c - Foul water drainage details (Sc5c);
Sc5d – Refuse storage accommodation (Rc5d);
Sc5f – Details of materials to be used for hard surfaced areas within the site including roads, driveways and car parking areas (Reason – To minimise disturbance to adjoining residents);
Sc5j – car parking provision (Rc5j)
Sc5 – worded cycle storage provision – Reason: To provide an alternative method of transport, for short distance journeys and thus reduce dependence on the private motorcar.
Sc5h – Underground services (Rc5h)
3. Sc51 – Landscaping (Rc51);
4. Sc52 – Implementation of landscaping (Rc52);
5. Sc60 – Details of boundary treatment (Rc60);
6. Sc66 – Archaeology (Rc66)
7. Sc21a and b – Removal of permitted development (Rc21a and b);
8. Sc44 – Garage (Rc44);
9. The permanent space to be reserved on the site for:
 - a) turning
 - b) parking
 - c) loading and unloadingshall be provided before the use commences and thereafter maintained.
10. Restriction of hours of use of power operated machinery;

Informatives

1. See attached Environment Agency advice regarding soakaways.

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: Policies P1/2 'Environmental Restrictions on Development', P1/3 'Sustainable Design in Built Development' and P7/6 'Historic Built Environment'.

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004: Policies SE2 'Rural Growth Settlements', SE9 'Village Edges', HG10 'Housing Mix and Design', HG12 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings within Frameworks', TP1 'Planning for More Sustainable Travel', EN15 'Development Affecting Ancient Monuments or Other Archaeological Sites' and EN28 'Development Within the Curtilage or Setting of a Listed Building'.

2. The development is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations which have been raised during the consultation exercise:

- Highway safety
- Car parking
- Cycle storage
- Visual impact on the locality and village edge
- Trees
- Impact upon setting of adjacent Listed Buildings
- Archaeology
- Surface water drainage

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/0754/05/F

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

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation Control Committee 1st June 2005
AUTHOR/S: Director of Development Services

S/0141/05/F - Linton
Erection of 20 Affordable Dwellings at Phase 2, Chalklands for Hundred Houses Society

Recommendation: Delegated Approval
Determination Date: 27th April 2005 - (Major Application)

Members of Committee will visit the site on Tuesday 31st May 2005

Site and Proposal

1. The application site is a 0.72 hectare (1.78 acre) piece of agricultural land lying outside the Linton village framework and within the countryside. Directly to the south is housing within Chalklands whilst to the west is a scheme of affordable dwellings known as Payne's Meadow. A public footpath and bridleway lies to the east of the site beyond a substantial hedge.
2. The full application, submitted on 26th January 2005 and amended on 28th April 2005, seeks to erect 20 affordable dwellings on the site. The proposed mix of dwellings is as follows:
 - 6 x 1-bedroom flats;
 - 6 x 2-bedroom flats;
 - 4 x 2-bedroom houses;
 - 3 x 3-bedroom houses;
 - 1 x disabled person's bungalow.
3. Vehicular access to the site would be via the existing affordable housing scheme to the west.
4. The scheme proposes a substantial amount of public open space (approx 0.13 ha) along the eastern side of the site and it is proposed to create a footpath link from the southern end of the proposed recreation ground onto Chalklands to enable existing residents to enjoy this area.
5. Save for the bungalow, the properties would be two storeys high. The houses and bungalow would comprise red brick walls and tiled roofs whilst the flats would be constructed using buff bricks and red tiles.
6. A covering letter submitted by Hundred Houses Society explains that the scheme provides 10 homes for social renting, 9 homes for shared ownership purchase and 1 bungalow designed for a disabled user, which will be transferred to the ownership of Papworth Trust.

Planning History

7. There is no planning history relating to the application site itself. The scheme of 19 affordable dwellings to the west was approved in March 2000 (Ref: S/0339/99/F).

Planning Policy

8. **Policy P1/2** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan states that development in the countryside will be resisted unless the proposals can be demonstrated to be essential in a particular rural location.
9. **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.
10. **Policies P5/4 and P5/5** encourage housing which meets, amongst others, affordable housing.
11. **Policy HG8** of the 2004 Local Plan states that, as an exception to the normal operation of the policies of the Plan, planning permission may be granted for schemes of 100% affordable housing designed to meet identified local housing needs on sites within or adjoining villages providing the following criteria are all met:
- The proposal includes secure arrangements for ensuring that all the dwellings within the scheme provide affordable housing in perpetuity for those in 'housing need' as defined in Policy HG7;
 - The number, size, design, mix and tenure of the dwellings are all confined to, and appropriate to, the strict extent of the identified local need;
 - The site of the proposal is well related to the built-up area of the settlement and the scale of the scheme is appropriate to the size and character of the village;
 - The development does not damage the character of the village or the rural landscape.

Consultations

12. **Linton Parish Council** recommends approval of the application but makes the following comments:
- “Councillors are in support of this application overall and are pleased to see more affordable housing being built in the village, with a mix of properties that reflects the current housing needs of the village. Councillors had one concern, however, with regard the proposed 'new' entrance through the protected hedgerow forming the boundary with Rivey Lane. Councillors would wish to see this omitted from the plan. Councillors also considered that this new 'gap' would be of concern to parents in an area designed for children to play safely. Councillors would wish a condition on any permission with regard to protecting the hedgerow on the eastern boundary.”
13. The comments of the Parish Council in respect of the amended plans will be reported verbally at the Committee meeting.
14. **The Environment Agency** advises that any consent should be conditional upon the provision of foul and surface water drainage details.
15. **The Landscape Design Officer** does not wish to see the original opening in the hedge along Rivey Lane gapped up as it is likely another point would be pushed

through. It is explained that new hedge/tree planting is required along the northern boundary to assist in the assimilation of development in the landscape. The protective fencing shown should be post and wire or chain link and not solid. The details of any hedge definition along the rear/southern boundary of the site would need to be agreed on site prior to work being implemented. Details of any new fencing envisaged along this boundary would also be required. It is queried what would be written into the legal agreement with the tenant to ensure this protection. Full landscaping details including tree pit details should be conditioned as part of any planning consent.

16. **The Local Highways Authority** stated that the layout plan should be comprehensively dimensioned to give carriageway, footway and footpath widths together with junction and turning head radii. In addition, all junction visibility splays and pedestrian visibility splays should be given. Parking spaces adjacent the carriageway, without footway in front, should be a minimum of 6 metres in length. The turning head adjacent Block A should comprise radii of 6 metres and retain a carriageway width of 5 metres on each spur whilst parking off the turning head should be avoided. The comments of the LHA in respect of the revised plan will be reported verbally at the Committee meeting.
17. **The Police Architectural Liaison Officer** states that the development includes a high proportion of properties with exposed elevations or exposed side or rear garden fences. Only Blocks F and G avoid such difficulties. Play areas should benefit from natural surveillance with properties fronting onto them. Block D provides such surveillance but Block C presents a rear elevation and Block E a side elevation over the adjacent grassed recreational area. Permeability makes crime easier to commit by giving offenders escape routes – the ability to walk all round Block C and the footpath to the side of Block E are cases in point. Car parking spaces should be located where they can easily be supervised. The parking court between Blocks A and D has little effective natural surveillance from Block D. Any planting associated with parking courts should be a maximum of 0.9 metres high and a thorny species.
18. The parking courts and other public areas should be lit by column mounted white downlighters. There are several dwellings that could benefit from areas of clearly identifiable defensible space to provide protection against damage or dispute arising over conflicting uses of public space. (eg – ground floor flats of Blocks A and B). Rear garden fences should be at least 1.8 metres high where they adjoin paths or other public places. The 0.9 metre high rear fences for Blocks A, B, C and D are inadequate. The gated access to the rear garden of the middle dwelling of Block D should be level with the side fence of the end dwelling. Dwelling frontages should be open to view and door recesses more than 600mm avoided. In addition, there should be some means of preventing unauthorised vehicular access to the areas of open space and this may be an attractive area to dump abandoned vehicles. Concern is also expressed about the security of bicycles stored outside Blocks A, B and C and the need for secure forms of bin storage.
19. **The Chief Environmental Health Officer** expresses concern on the grounds that problems could arise from noise and suggests that a condition be applied to any planning consent to restrict the hours of use of power operated machinery during the construction period.
20. **The Ramblers Association** raises no objections subject to Rivey Lane not being used for the storage of materials. The provision of official routes through from the development onto Rivey Lane is welcomed.

21. **The Council's Ecology Officer** raises no objections, stating that no ground nesting birds are likely to occur due to the current level of disturbance and the relatively enclosed site. A scheme of nest boxes and bat boxes on larger trees within the hedgerow would be desirable as would the inclusion of native ground flora amongst the hedge and grass fringes to the site.
22. **The Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service** requests that adequate provision be made for fire hydrants.
23. **The County Footpaths Officer** requests that an access to Rivey Lane be provided at both the northern and southern end of the recreation area, and that the northern access by the fenced play area be made up with a semi-hard surface. A tarmacked 2 metre wide path should be provided from the southern end of the recreation area running south along Rivey Lane to join up with the section that is already tarmacked. It is requested that Rivey Lane remain open and unobstructed at all times and informatives reminding the applicants of legislation affecting the right of way should be attached to any planning consent.
24. **The Environment Operations Manager** states that each leg of the turning head needs to be 11 metres long. Also, refuse storage details should be provided for the properties at Blocks D, E, F and G. In the amended plans, the revisions to the hammerhead by Block A are not sufficient to meet the needs of the collection vehicle. This could be accommodated by extending northwards the adoptable section of road into the parking area.
25. **The Council's Arts Development Officer** states that, in respect of the public art policy, a number of possibilities present themselves namely:
 - The commissioning of an artist to design and oversee the installation of the play area;
 - A trail or landmark (could be inlaid into pavia or roads and related to street furniture) scheme connecting 'old' Chalklands to Payne's Meadow;
 - A celebratory series of events, again co-ordinated by an artist in residence, that relates the new development with the original housing scheme of 1955.
26. **Affordable Housing Panel** supported the application subject to the comment at paragraph 36 below.

Representations

27. No. 65 Back Road objects as Rivey Hill is an area of best landscape and the houses will be built near Rivey Wood which has a brook running through it which, if disturbed, could result in flooding. There are many animals and birds that need the wood. If building starts in the next few months it could disturb breeding birds.
28. No. 99 Chalklands states that, if it is intended to replace the fence along the boundary of the site, this will cause considerable damage to the retaining wall when trying to put new posts into the ground. Any new boundary fence should be on their side of the hedgerow as has been erected on phase 1. No. 99 wishes to have the same privacy and buffer of the hedge and tree line between their property and the new houses.
29. If the hedge/trees are included in the garden, they could be cut down by residents. The plans do not make it clear what is intended here.

Representation by the applicant's agent

30. The applicant's agent has responded in writing to comments raised by the Landscape Design Officer and No. 99 Chalklands. Firstly, it is confirmed that with regard to new hedge planting, it is the Society's policy to erect a protective fence for ten years and thereafter the tenant/shared owner will be responsible for its upkeep. The hedge to the rear of Blocks E, F and G will be maintained by the tenants/shared occupiers of these properties and it should not be assumed that this will result in the loss/decimation of the hedge. If further definition/repair of the boundary is required then it will be carried out, as best as possible, without decimating the hedge to the existing line of the boundary. No.99 Chalklands' retaining wall will not be damaged.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

31. The key issues to consider in the determination of this application are:
- The need for the development;
 - The impact of the development upon the character of the area;
 - The layout of the scheme including highways, landscaping and security issues;
 - Residential amenity;
 - Impact upon the adjacent footpath/bridleway;

The need for the development

32. The site lies outside but adjoining the Linton village framework and within the countryside. The erection of housing on such sites contravenes general planning policies relating to development in the countryside. However, this proposal has been put forward in response to a defined local need for low-cost housing (as confirmed by this Authority's Development Manager) and therefore needs to be considered in terms of the rural exceptions policy for housing. (HG8 of the Local Plan).
33. All 20 houses on the site would be affordable dwellings and this would be secured by a Section 106 Legal Agreement. This Council's Development Manager has confirmed that the number, size, design, mix and tenure of the properties proposed is appropriate to the extent of the identified local need.

Impact upon the character of the area

34. Policy HG8 of the Local Plan requires affordable housing schemes to be well related to, rather than isolated from, the built up part of the village to which they relate. The proposed site lies directly to the north of the existing Chalklands estate and directly to the east of an existing scheme of affordable housing (Paynes Meadow). It does not extend any further northwards than the Paynes Meadow development and is well screened by a high hedge along the eastern boundary with Rivey Lane. Subject to satisfactory landscaping and detailing of the development as well as to the protection/retention of the hedge along Rivey Lane (as requested by the Parish Council), I am satisfied that the erection of housing on this site would not result in undue harm to the character of the area.
35. The site is also well related to the services and facilities within the centre of Linton, with the shops and services in the High Street, the post office on Balsham Road and the health centre in Coles Lane all being within walking distance of the development.

General layout issues

36. The scheme incorporates a good mix of 1, 2 and 3 bedroom properties which, as stated above, has been drawn up following extensive discussions with this Authority's Development Manager, in response to local need. The relationship between the dwellings in terms of window-window distances and privacy of amenity areas is acceptable. The density of the scheme equates to 27 dwellings/hectare. Whilst a minimum density of 30 dwellings/hectare would normally be required by policy on sites located within the village framework, this site is being considered as an exception to normal policy and therefore is not required to meet this standard. Nevertheless, the scheme manages to achieve a reasonable density of development that is in keeping with the character of the surrounding area and which also manages to provide a large amount of open/recreational land for the enjoyment of residents of the proposed development as well as existing residents within Chalklands and Paynes Meadow.
37. The proposal involves the provision of a link through from Chalklands to the recreation area by opening a gap in the hedge along the southern part of the site. In my view, this link is essential given the intended end users of the recreation space. This Council's Landscape Design Officer has not raised any objections to the formation of this new opening but considers that the existing opening onto Rivey Lane in the south-eastern corner of the site should be utilised instead. This issue was discussed at the Affordable Housing Panel meeting where the Parish Council and District Councillors for Linton stated that they wished to see this existing gap filled in. Apparently, it is not a historic gap, having been created since the completion of the Payne's Meadow development and the Parish Council is keen for the hedge to be restored to its previous line. In addition, the Parish has strong concerns about the security implications of a direct opening from a secluded footpath onto the recreation ground.
38. The Local Highways Authority raised a number of concerns in respect of the carriageway width, junction radii and parking space lengths shown on the original plans. The applicant's agents have sought to address these issues within the amended plans and I am still awaiting the response of the Local Highways Authority in respect of these changes.
39. The Environment Operations Manager, who has considered the application in terms of the space required by refuse collection vehicles, has commented, in respect of the amended plans, that the adoptable section of road needs to be extended northwards into the parking area in order to achieve the required 11 metre deep hammerhead. It has since been clarified that the 11 metres required does not have to be provided on adopted roads but that the construction does have to be to adoptable standard. This concern could be overcome by a condition requiring details of the method of construction of this area. The requested refuse storage details can also be conditioned as part of any planning consent.
40. The Police Architectural Liaison Officer has raised numerous concerns about the security implications of the layout and design of the development. The scheme has been amended to overcome some concerns expressed in respect of the original submission through the introduction of first floor windows overlooking parking areas in order to provide natural surveillance of these areas. Many of the other changes requested I consider to be inappropriate for a variety of reasons. Firstly, the introduction of 2 metre high fencing to define the garden area of

Block C would be clearly visible and prominent across the open space and would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the area.

41. Reorienting this block so that it faces the open space would result in it backing directly onto the road which would have a similarly detrimental impact upon the appearance of the development. In addition, the pathway to the rear of Block D is needed in order to provide access to the rear of the property for refuse collection purposes. The request for some means of preventing vehicular access onto the open space could easily be incorporated into the design of the scheme through, for instance, the introduction of a few bollards on the grassed area adjacent to the easternmost hammerhead. The applicant's agent has confirmed verbally that the developers would be willing to do this and I would therefore recommend that a condition requiring the submission and agreement of a scheme be attached to any planning consent.
42. The Council's Ecologist has not raised any specific objections or concerns in respect of the letter received from No.65 Back Road relating to the impact of the development upon areas considered to be of local wildlife importance. Comments relating to installing bat and bird boxes on trees in the existing hedgerow and to the use of native ground flora can be forwarded on to the applicants through informatives of any planning consent.
43. The comments of the Arts Development Officer can be added as informatives to any planning consent.

Residential Amenity

44. The proposed layout would not result in serious harm to the amenities of adjoining residents within Paynes Meadow and Chalklands by reason of overlooking, overshadowing etc. A condition should be attached to any consent preventing the insertion of first floor windows in the west elevation of Blocks A and B in order to protect the amenities of adjoining residents to the west.
45. Through landscaping/boundary treatment conditions, the retention of existing hedges/trees can be secured in order to ensure that the outlook and privacies of nearby residents are not unduly harmed by the development. The concerns raised by No.99 Chalklands have been relayed to the applicant's agent who has confirmed in writing that No.99's retaining wall would not be damaged.
46. In addition, a condition should be added to any consent to protect nearby residents from noise disturbance during the construction period as recommended by the Environmental Health Officer.
47. Any permission should be subject to a legal agreement specifying arrangements and responsibilities for the ongoing maintenance of the open space, recreation areas and hedge bounding Rivey Lane. The Parish Council has indicated that it would be willing to maintain the open spaces but, as far as I am aware, there has not been any discussion to date regarding whether a commuted sum would be payable in this instance and, if so, the amount/duration of any monies payable. I have encouraged the applicants to discuss this matter further with the Parish Council and will update Members verbally at the Committee meeting.

Footpath Issues

48. The County Footpaths Officer and Ramblers Association have expressed a strong preference for a link directly from the site through the hedge onto Rivey Lane and, indeed, were strongly supportive of the original proposal which sought to create a new link towards the northern end of the site. As stated, above, however, such a link is not supported by the Parish Council and District Councillors. There is an existing narrow pathway that connects the cul-de-sac between Nos. 90 & 99 Chalklands to Rivey Lane. Given that it is proposed to create a link from the development onto this cul-de-sac, there would therefore be an easily accessible route to the public footpath/bridleway.
49. The County Footpaths Officer's request for the footpath to be tarmacked from the southern edge of the site to meet up with the existing section of tarmac has been forwarded onto the applicant's agent. Although this is not a planning issue, the agent has stressed that there are a number of issues affecting this site that are contributing towards greater than average development costs. Firstly, topsoil needs to be imported to the site in connection with the large amount of open space proposed. In addition, there are severe drainage problems on the site resulting in the need for expensive rainwater collection systems. As such, the requested footpath improvements could only be carried out if there is sufficient money left in the budget. Given that the development, in terms of the housing and open space provided, is designed to benefit the village, I would not wish to impose such a requirement by condition given that it could potentially prevent the site coming forward. I would therefore suggest that an informative to cover this issue be added to any consent.

Recommendation

50. Subject to no objections being raised by the Parish Council and Local Highways Authority in respect of the amended plans and to the prior signing of a Section 106 Legal Agreement to (a) ensure that the housing is only occupied by qualifying persons and secured in perpetuity for that purpose, and (b) secure arrangements for the ongoing maintenance of the open spaces, approve the application, as amended by drawings date stamped 28th April 2005, subject to the following conditions:
1. Standard Condition A – Time Limited Permission (Reason A);
 2. Sc5a – Details of materials to be used for external walls and roofs (Rc5a);
 3. Sc51 – Landscaping, including tree pit details, (Rc51);
 4. Sc52 – Implementation of Landscaping (Rc52);
 5. Sc60 – Details of treatment to all site boundaries (Rc60);
 6. The existing hedge/trees on the eastern boundary of the site shall be retained unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority; and any trees or shrubs within it which, within a period of five years from the completion of the development or the occupation of the buildings, whichever is the sooner, 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. (Rc58);

7. Sc22 – No windows at first floor level in the west elevation of Blocks A and B (Rc22);
8. Prior to the commencement of development a scheme for the provision and location of fire hydrants to serve the development to a standard recommended by the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority; no development shall take place otherwise than in accordance with the approved scheme (Reason – To secure the provision of fire hydrants for the benefit of future occupiers of the development hereby permitted);
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. Sc5b - Details of surface water drainage (Rc5b);
11. Sc5c – Details of foul water drainage (Rc5c);
12. Sc5 – Details of the method of construction for the parking area at the northernmost end of the site between Blocks A and D (Reason – To ensure that this parking area is built to an adoptable standard to enable refuse collection vehicles to turn);
13. Sc5 – Details of the bicycle and refuse storage areas (Reason – To ensure that the design of the bicycle and necessary refuse storage areas would not detract from the character of the development and to ensure that the storage areas are sufficiently secure to avoid the potential for rubbish fires and lower level forms of nuisance);
14. A means of preventing unauthorised vehicular access to the areas of open space shall be provided on the grassed area at the end of the easternmost spur road in accordance with a scheme that shall previously have been submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority (Reason –In the interests of the security of residents of the development and users of the open space and in the interests of the visual appearance of the area).

Informatives

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);P5/4 (Meeting Locally Identified Housing Needs) and P5/5 (Homes in Rural Areas).
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:** HG8 (Exceptions policy for affordable housing)

2. The development is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations which have been raised during the consultation exercise:
 - Residential amenity;
 - Highway safety;
 - Visual impact on the locality;
 - Impact on footpath;
 - Flood risk;
 - Security/crime prevention

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 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. The adjacent footpath/bridleway must remain open and unobstructed at all times. Building materials must not be stored on this section of the bridleway and, contractors vehicles must not be parked on it and it must not be used for access to the site (it is an offence under Section 137 of the Highways Act 1980 to obstruct a public bridleway and an offence under Section 34 of the Road Traffic Act 1988 to drive on a public bridleway without lawful authority)
4. No alteration to the surface of the footpath is permitted without the consent of Cambridgeshire County Council (it is an offence to damage the surface of a public right of way under Section 1 of the Criminal Damage Act 1971)
5. The applicant is advised to liaise with Cambridgeshire County Council regarding the possibility of tarmacking Rivey Lane from the southern edge of the site to join up with the existing tarmacked section of the bridleway further south.
6. The County Council as Highways Authority is only responsible for the maintenance of the surface up to bridleway standard, for the purposes of legitimate use by members of the public in relation to that status; damage to the surface caused by non-public bridleway use is repairable by those private users.
7. The Council's Ecology Officer has advised that a scheme of nest boxes and bat boxes on larger trees within the hedgerow would be desirable as would the inclusion of native ground flora amongst the hedge and grass fringes to the site.
8. If soakaways are proposed for the disposal of uncontaminated surface water, percolation tests should be undertaken, and soakaways designed and constructed in accordance with BRE Digest 365 (or CIRIA Report 156) and to the satisfaction of the Local Authority. The maximum acceptable depth for

soakaways is 2 metres below existing ground level. If, after tests, it is found that soakaways do not work satisfactorily, alternative proposals must be submitted.

9. Surface water from roads and impermeable vehicle parking areas shall be discharged via trapped gullies.
10. The applicant should ensure that there is sufficient residual capacity within any recipient surface water system/watercourse to accept a discharge from the development without either causing or exacerbating flooding.
11. A copy of the Environment Agency's general surface water drainage information is attached.
12. The Council's Arts Development Officer has advised that the following would be desirable:
 - a. The commissioning of an artist to design and oversee the installation of the play area;
 - b. A trail or landmark (could be inlaid into pavia or roads and related to street furniture) scheme connecting 'old' Chalklands to Payne's Meadow;
 - c. A celebratory series of events, again co-ordinated by an artist in residence, that relates the new development with the original housing scheme of 1955.
13. With regards to Condition 15 of the permission, a few low bollards should prove sufficient to meet the aims of this condition.
14. With respect to the landscaping conditions, the Council's Landscape Design Officer has advised that protective fencing should be post and wire or chain link and not a solid fence. With regards to the hedge to the rear of Blocks E, F and G, the detail of any 'definition' will need to be agreed on site prior to work being implemented. If fencing is envisaged, what type of fencing is it and along which line would it be sited?

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 ref: S/0141/05/F and S/0339/99/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	1 st June 2005
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

**S/0637/05/F - Melbourn
Erection of Dwelling, Adjacent 16 Hale Close
For Mr P Grange**

**Recommendation: Approval
Date for determination: 1st June 2005**

Site and proposal

1. The .028ha site is the side garden to 16 Hale Close and occupies a corner position in the estate layout. It has a maximum width of 15.4m and a maximum depth of 23m. The road frontage is screened by a conifer hedge approximately 2m high, and there are a number of small ornamental garden trees within the site. The south-eastern boundary to 17 Hale Close is screened by a 1.8m high wooden fence, which reduces in height to 1m adjacent to Hale Close.
2. 16 Hale Close is a semi-detached property with a flat roofed garage facing the site. 17 Hale Close is set back from the road and the site abuts its front garden.
3. The full application, received on 6 April 2005, proposes the erection of a 2-storey 4 bedroom house on the site with a ridge height of 6.7m. The element closest to the corner would be single storey, accommodating the dining room and lounge. The house has an integral garage and two parking spaces are proposed in the front garden of the property, at the furthest extremity from the corner. The remaining conifer hedge on the road frontage would be reduced to 1.2m in height. The small ornamental trees on the site would be removed. The density equates to 28 dwelling per ha.

Planning History

4. A number of applications have been approved to extend 16 Hale Close. In 1977 planning permission was refused to erect a 1.8m fence around the outer treed boundary of the application site on the grounds it would be unduly prominent.

Planning Policy

5. The site is within the framework of Melbourn. Structure Plan 2003 **Policy P1/3** requires a high standard of design and sustainability for all new development. Development should respond to the local character of the built environment.
6. **Policy P5/3** states densities of less than 30 dwellings per ha will not be acceptable for new housing developments.
7. **Policy P5/5** states small scale housing developments will be permitted in villages, taking into account the character of the village and its setting.

8. Local Plan 2004 **Policy SE2** designates Melbourn a Rural Growth Village where residential development will be permitted on unallocated land within village frameworks provided; inter alia;
 - (1) the retention of the site in its present form is not essential to the character of the village;
 - (2) the development would be sensitive to the character of the village.
9. Minimum densities of 30 dwellings per ha, should be achieved unless there are strong design grounds for not doing so.
10. **Policy SE8** states there will be a general presumption in favour of residential development within village frameworks.

Consultations

11. **Melbourn Parish Council** recommends refusal “Intensive development on a prominent corner plot”.
12. **Chief Environmental Health Officer** has no objections subject to restrictions on the use of power-operated machinery, the use of driven pile foundations and the lighting of bonfires.

Representations

13. None received.

Planning Comments

14. The key issues are:
 - The impact of the proposal on the street scene and the overall character of the estate.
 - Overlooking of neighbouring properties.
15. Hale Close is part of a 1960's estate development. The corner site in question is the side garden to a semi-detached property and would at one time have been quite open, in keeping with the “open-plan” character of the estate. However, the road frontage of the site is now completely screened by a mature conifer hedge approximately 2m high, planted to improve privacy to the garden.
16. The dimensions of the application site are not dissimilar from surrounding plots and leaves 16 Hale Close with an adequate rear garden.
17. Overlooking from the proposed dwelling will be limited as the aspect to the rear will be over the front gardens of neighbouring properties.
18. The footprint of the proposed house is similar to 16 Hale Close and other properties on the estate. Its ridge height, 6.7m also reflects the scale of the estate.

19. I consider the erection of the proposed house on the site will be in keeping with the character of the estate and it could be argued that a greater sense of enclosure on this prominent corner site will improve the street scene.
20. At the equivalent of 28 dwellings per ha, the proposal is slightly below the 30 dwelling per ha threshold in the Development Plan, but nevertheless it is entirely appropriate given the character of the estate.

Recommendation

21. Approval.
 1. Standard condition A - RCA.
 2. No development shall commence until precise details of the following 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:
 - 1) the materials to be used for the external walls and roof;
 - 2) the windows and doors.

(RC to ensure the building visually accords with neighbouring buildings/the window and door details shown on the approved plans are insufficiently detailed.)
 3. Details of the front boundary treatment to Hale Close shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The work shall be completed in accordance with the approved details before the house is occupied. (RC To ensure that the appearance of the site does not detract from the character of the area.)
 4. 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.

Informatives

Reasons for approval

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

(a) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003

Policy P1/3 – Sustainable Design in Built Development

Policy P5/3 – Density

Policy P5/5 – Homes in Rural Areas

(b) South Cambs Local Plan 2004

Policy SE2 – Rural Growth Settlements
Policy SE8 – Village Frameworks

2. The proposal is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material considerations, which have been raised during the consultation exercise:
- the impact of the proposal on the street scene and the overall character of the estate.
 - overlooking of neighbouring properties.

General

1. The Chief Environmental Health Officer states:
- (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.
2. The Environment Agency standing advice will be attached to the decision.

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/0637/05/F

Contact Officer: Bob Morgan – Planning Officer
Telephone: (01223) 713395

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation Control Committee 1st June 2005
AUTHOR/S: Director of Development Services

S/0739/05/F - Melbourn

**Demolish Existing Garage/Workshop and Replace with New Garage/Home Office,
 Replace Drive, Gates and Section of Fencing at Grove House, 43 High Street,
 Melbourn for Mr and Mrs May-Gillings**

Recommendation: Refusal
Date for determination: 9th June 2005

Conservation Area**Site and Proposal**

1. The site is located in the centre of Melbourn in the High Street within the designated Conservation Area. The dwelling house is a Grade II Listed Building, which forms one of three terraced dwellings, all of which are listed. The dwelling house has a large front garden that is well screened by tall trees and hedges. The existing access has two mature trees located on either side and the existing entrance is small and discreet with metal rail fencing, most of which is hidden in the boundary screening. The area beyond the rail fencing is currently being used for parking, however no hard standing has been laid and there is no formal parking or turning. The boundary that faces northeast is a brick wall, over two metres in height. This wall is the dividing wall between the application site and the local car park in Melbourn. No neighbours are overlooked by this development. At the bottom of the site in the most southeasterly corner is a single width garage which is accessed between No. 49 and 47 High Street.
2. The full planning application received 14th April 2005 proposes the demolition of the existing garage at the rear of the property and the erection of a 1½-storey garage/workshop located in front of the existing building line in the most northerly corner of the site and the erection of new fencing and gates.

Planning History

3. S/0138/03/F – Extension - Refused

Planning Policy

4. **Policy P1/3 ‘Sustainable Design in Built Development’** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 (“Structure Plan”) states that a high standard of design and sustainability should be adopted for all new forms of development, responding to the local character of the built environment.
5. **Policy P7/6 ‘Historic Built Environment’** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 (Structure Plan) states that Local Planning Authorities will protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the historic built environment.

6. **Policy HG12 Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings within Frameworks** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 seeks to resist extensions to dwellings that would harm the residential amenities of neighbouring properties or have an unacceptable visual impact upon the street scene.
7. **Policy EN28 Development within the curtilage or Setting of a Listed Building** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 amongst other criteria seeks to resist applications, which would dominate the Listed Building or its curtilage buildings in scale, form, massing or appearance.
8. **Policy EN30 Development in Conservation Areas** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 will refuse permission for schemes, which do not specify traditional local materials and details and which do not fit comfortably into their context. Proposals are expected to preserve or enhance the special character of Conservation Areas.

Consultation

9. **Melbourn Parish Council** recommends approval
10. **Conservation Manager** objects to the proposed new fencing and gates and the proposed garage. Comments are as follows,

“Replacement of fence and gates on front boundary

11. The existing gates and chain link fencing on the front boundary are of no historic interest but the railings, although of a simple design and probably not original, are traditional and appropriate as a means of enclosure for a historic building of this period.
12. The proposed close-boarded fence and gates are not considered appropriate as they close the view of the listed building from the High Street by forming a solid structure which detracts from the setting of the listed building. In addition the proposed gates and fence, by virtue of their design and materials have a negative impact on the street scene and would neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Proposed fence and gates between dwelling and side boundary

13. No objection as they are set back from the main elevation and are necessary to provide privacy to the rear garden.

Proposed Garage

14. The scale and massing, which is disproportionate to the listed building, the form and appearance of the proposed garage are considered to dominate the front elevation of the listed building and detract from its special character and appearance. In addition the location of the garage in close proximity to the dwelling will damage the setting, well-being and attractiveness of the listed building.
15. The design is considered to be unacceptable and untraditional in that it introduces detailing which is not appropriate for an ancillary building within the curtilage of a listed building. In particular the glazed gable and the external stair dominate the building creating a separate focus, which detracts from the special character of the listed building.

16. By virtue of its scale, massing and materials the proposed garage would not fit comfortably in its context and would neither preserve nor enhance the character of the wider Conservation Area.
17. **Recommendation:** Refuse; the proposal fails to meet the tests in Policies EN28 and EN30.”

Representations

18. One letter of objection has been received from the occupier of No. 47 High Street who raises concern with regards to the vehicular access for the site, which is actually located to the rear of the property via a shared access and not to the front. Another concern raised is that the proposed building is totally out of keeping with the surrounding buildings and the development of this kind would have an adverse impact on the Conservation Area.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

19. The key issues to consider are the affect the proposed garage/workshop will have on the listed building and the Conservation Area.

20. Impact on the Listed Building

The proposed garage/workshop will be located approximately 4.8 metres from the dwelling house and located in the high most northerly corner of the plot. The proposed building is approximately 5.7 metres high to the ridge and 3.8 metres to the eaves line. Ground floor is proposed to accommodate 2 cars, and an external staircase that runs up the southeast elevation leads to a first floor office area with a shower room and store. The design, scale, forms and massing of this proposal is totally out of character with the existing listed building. It detracts from the appearance of the building by dominating the dwelling house and adversely affecting its surroundings.

21. Impact on the Conservation Area

The siting of the garage/workshop in this forward position sits close to the road front and would sit close to the wall of the neighbouring car park. The views of the Conservation Area would be significantly altered by this development particularly in the winter months when the thick screening is less dense. The proposed development does not preserve or enhance the special character of the Conservation Area and the design, material and form of the proposal does not compliment what exists. The proposed gates and fencing to the front boundary also detract from the setting of the listed building and the appearance of the Conservation Area, by virtue of its design and materials

Recommendation

Refusal

1. The proposed front boundary gates, fence and garage dominate the Listed Building and is out of keeping with the context and form of the Listed Building and its surroundings. The proposal damages the setting, well-being and attractiveness of the Listed building by virtue of its size, scale, design and siting and therefore would be contrary to the requirements of Policies EN28 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 and P7/6 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003.

2. The proposed garage/workshop and front boundary gates and fence do not preserve or enhance the character of the wider Conservation Area by virtue of its scale, design and materials and is therefore contrary to Policy EN30 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 and Policy P7/6 of the Structure Plan 2003.

Background Papers: S/0739/05/F

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003

Contact Officer:

Saffron Garner – Planning Assistant

Telephone: (01954) 713162

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation Control Committee 1st June 2005
AUTHOR: Director of Development Services

**S/0611/05/F - Elsworth
Erection of 12 Metre High Telecommunications Pole 0.3 Metre Microwave Dish for
Broadband Services**

**Recommendation: Approve
Date for Determination: 27th May 2005**

Site and Proposal

1. This is an application, received on 1st April 2005, for full planning consent for the erection of a proposed telecommunications mast to be located to the south west of the main school buildings at Elsworth Primary School, Broad End, Elsworth.
2. The proposal comprises a 12 metre high tubular mast with a diameter of 273 mm at its base and 89 mm at its apex, constructed of galvanized steel, with a consequent grey finish. It would carry a single "dish" measuring 300 mm in diameter and finished in white enamel paint.
3. The supporting documentation included information from Cambridgeshire County Council confirming that the proposed mast and associated equipment forms part of the Cambridge Community Network designed to enable schools to receive broadband. It was also accompanied by a health and safety risk assessment which states that the County Council is satisfied that the proposed sites for the installation of the point-to-point wireless connection are not a source of harm to its employees, school pupils or other service recipients, visitors to the premises or the community at large.

Planning History

4. The only relevant planning history consists of an application (**S/0117/05/PNT**) submitted under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, to determine whether the prior approval of the Local Planning Authority was required in respect of the siting and appearance of the mast. The developer was advised in February 2005 that prior consent was required.

Planning Policy

5. **Policy CS8: Telecommunications** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 advises as follows:

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.

6. **Policy P6/5 -Telecommunications** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 encourages the growth of new and existing telecommunications systems.
7. **Planning Policy Guidance Note 8: Telecommunications** is also relevant to this application.

Consultations

8. **Elsworth Parish Council** draws attention to the points made in respect of the previous submission (reproduced below) and suggests that the mast should be situated to the rear of the school.

“Strong objection to the siting of the mast in line of sight from the kitchen window of the neighbouring dwelling at No. 15 Broad End. It was suggested that the mast be sited to the rear of the school. This would not intrude on the visibility of residents and would not affect the purpose of the mast. In addition, the Parish Council wished the mast to be painted green in order to blend in with the surrounding foliage.”

9. **Chief Environmental Health Officer:** Concern expressed regarding safety issues, encouraging a precautionary approach and suggesting that the siting should minimise potential exposure to local residents by avoiding residential developments and school grounds.
10. **Conservation Manager:** The siting of this particular dish is just outside the boundaries of the Conservation Area, but will be more prominent than some and will be visible from within the Conservation Area, though I accept that it will be partially screened by the adjacent trees. Whilst not necessarily supporting the current proposal, I do not wish to object to this application.

Representations

11. No representations have been received from local residents in respect of this application for planning consent. Given that the development now proposed corresponds to that which was previously subject to the prior notification, and the

potential for local residents not to recognise that this is a separate application, the representations previously received are reproduced below.

12. Four letters of objection were thus received from the residents of Lordship Farmhouse, Broad End, Ivyfold, Broad End, 8 Fardell's Lane and Elm Lodge, Meadow Drift, with the latter correspondence endorsed by a resident of No. 15 Broad End. These letters variously comment as follows:
- Aesthetic concerns (unspecified).
 - Known health issues associated with such equipment, including childhood leukaemia.
 - These reasons were referred to in the recent application at Alphabet Nursery in Whittesley and upheld.
 - A school should not be exploited for commercial purposes.
 - There must be more suitable sites in the area.
 - Interference to television, radio and mobile phone reception.
 - Limited consultation period.
 - Lack of information.
 - Parish Council unable to assist.
 - Detailed technical questions remain unanswered.
 - Request for a local meeting.

Planning Comments

13. Section 54A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 requires that applications for planning consent be determined in accordance with the provisions of the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In that context, it is suggested that Policy CS8 of the Local Plan, reproduced above, is most directly applicable to this application.
14. The supporting information provided by the applicants relating to the intended use of the mast effectively precludes the possibility of mast sharing. Furthermore, the required height of the proposed mast effectively precludes the possibility of erecting the equipment on an existing building or other structure. The proposal dish would be mounted on a mast, rather than on an existing structure. The remaining policy requirement is, therefore, that the siting and external appearance of apparatus should be designed to minimise the impact of such apparatus on amenity, while respecting operational efficiency.
15. Against the above background it is noted that the proposed mast would be sited on a grassed area within the school grounds, currently used for car parking, approximately 3.7 metres and 5.5 metres from a Silver Birch and a Sycamore tree respectively. It would be located approximately 11 metres west of the boundary of the Elsworth Conservation Area but would be visible from various locations within that Conservation Area. It would be located approximately 7.7 metres north of the nearest part of the school buildings which rise to a maximum of 7.5 metres in height. The school building would therefore provide a partial backdrop to the proposed 12 metre high mast in relation to some views from within the Conservation Area. Additional screening would be provided by the above trees.

16. Elsworth Parish Council has suggested that the mast should be sited to the rear of the school buildings. The supporting information referred to above states that other sites within the school grounds have been considered but that these would necessitate a mast of 15 or 18 metres in height. Subject to the details of any such alternative siting, it is possible that the lower half of the mast could be completely screened from views within the Conservation Area. Nevertheless, the above comments suggest that any such revised siting would result in the upper half, or potentially more, of the proposed mast being visible above the roof of the main school building.
17. With regard to the Parish Council's comments concerning the impact upon views from the kitchen window of Number 15 Broad End, it is questioned whether the proposed mast, with a maximum diameter of 300 mm located approximately twenty metres away from the window, would have any significant impact upon the standards of amenity that might reasonably be expected to be enjoyed by the occupiers of that dwelling. Moreover dependant upon its precise siting, an existing well-established shrub would be likely to effectively screen the lower portion of the mast when viewed from the window in question.
18. With regard to the comments concerning the colour finish, it is suggested that whatever shade of green might be selected this would be likely to clash with the leaves of some of the nearby trees which would, of course, partly obscure the mast. Given that the two neighbouring trees are deciduous, for much of the year there would be no leaves for the mast to "blend in" with. Rather, the grey galvanised finish may well be the most appropriate means of minimising the visual impact against the backdrop of autumn and winter skies.
19. The concerns of local residents and the Chief Environmental Health Officer regarding safety issues, and their significance for the siting of the proposed mast, have been addressed by the Local Education Authority. It is also understood that the proposed siting, having been agreed with the Local Education Authority as landlord and client, addresses any potential concerns relating to pedestrian safety.
20. The procedural issues raised by one local resident related specifically to the previous prior notification, the processing of which was subject to a limited timescale. The availability, or otherwise, of information via the Parish Council is not considered to be directly relevant. Comprehensive details were supplied to the Local Planning Authority and have been made available for public inspection and to the Parish Council in connection with their consultation.
21. One resident raised concern in relation to the potential for interference to television, radio or mobile phone signals. Annexe 2 of PPG8 states where "...potential interference is causing genuine local concern, one or other of the parties may wish to seek the help of experts to assess the likelihood and degree of interference, but authorities should not seek out such problems for critical examination unnecessarily." In the latter context, no information has been provided on this matter beyond the above comments. Annexe 2 continues "It is unlikely that refusal of planning permission would be justified on the grounds of radio interference from a transmitter or non-radio equipment alone except in extreme cases."
22. Other matters raised by local residents are largely addressed by the above comments.

23. In summary, it is concluded that the proposed development would not have an unacceptable visual impact on the urban or rural landscape. Moreover, the potential alternative sites that might be available, having regard to the proposed use of the mast, are likely to have a greater impact upon the appearance and character of the locality including the adjoining Conservation Area.
24. Having regard to the above comments and all other material considerations it is recommended that consent be granted for the development proposed subject to the conditions outlined below.

Recommendation

25. Approval, subject to the following conditions:
 1. Standard Condition A -Time limited permission (Reason A);
 2. The mast and associated equipment hereby approved shall not be used other than for the provision of broadband services to Elsworth Primary School. (Reason -The information provided by the developer to the Local Planning Authority relates to the provision of broadband services to Elsworth Primary School. Any additional or alternative use of the mast hereby approved would involve an assessment of other material considerations in accordance with Policy CS8 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.)
 3. Within one month of the development hereby approved ceasing to be used the Local Planning Authority shall be notified accordingly in writing. Within four months of such notification all apparatus including the mast and any associated equipment, fencing and hard surfacing shall be removed from the land; and the land shall be restored in accordance with a scheme submitted to and approved in writing by Local Planning Authority. (Reason -To ensure 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.)

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:**
P6/5 (Telecommunications)
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:**
CS8 (Telecommunications).
2. The development 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 on the locality
 - Impact upon setting of adjacent Conservation Area

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/0611/05/F and S/0117/05/PNT

Contact Officer: Steve Anderson
Telephone: (01954) 713165

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation Control Committee 1st June 2005
AUTHOR/S: Director of Development Services

S/0710/05/F - Sawston
Erection of Building for Business Use (Classes B1a (Offices), B1b (Research & Development) and B1c (Light Industry)) at South Cambridge Business Park (Part of Dales Manor Business Park), Babraham Road for H B Sawston No.3 Ltd

Recommendation: Approval
Date for determination: 7th June 2005

Site and Proposal

1. The application relates to part of a 2.2 hectares/5.5 acres site on the Dales Manor Business Park. It was previously occupied by office, workshop and storage buildings plus a bungalow but, with the exception of Sindall House, they have now been cleared and the B1 development approved under planning references S/0095/99/O and S/1711/03/RM is under construction. Many of the units are now complete. The site is bounded by Babraham Road with dwellings on the opposite side of the road to the south, the Business Park to the north, Public Footpath 10, Babraham and fields beyond to the east and residential properties in Resbury Close beyond Grove Road to the west. The southern and eastern boundaries are marked by a 3-4 metre high hedge.
2. This full application, registered on the 12th April 2005, proposes the erection of a 889 square metre terrace of five 9.5 metres high two-storey business units in place of the previously approved two detached buildings (4 units totalling 618 square metres) in the same position.

Relevant Planning History

3. Outline planning permission for B1 development on the site was granted in August 2000 (**S/0945/99/O**). The permission included a condition stating that development shall not exceed 8000m² gross external floor area. The reason for this condition is "To define the scale of development in relation to the traffic impact report." The site is subject to a Travel to Work Plan (a 'Green Transport Plan') dated 9th August 2000.
4. An application to vary condition 2 of planning permission S/0945/99/O to introduce separate individual phased development was approved in November 2000 (reference **S/1764/00/F**).
5. An application to renew permission S/0945/99/O as amended by permission S/1764/00/F is yet to be determined (reference **S/0701/03/O**).
6. A reserved matters application for B1 development on a large part of the site was approved in 2004 (**S/1711/03/RM**).
7. An application to vary condition 5 of permission S/0945/99/O to allow B1c (light industrial) use of the buildings for a period of ten years from the time of first occupation of each new building was approved in December 2004 (**S/1961/04/F**).

Planning Policy

8. Structure Plan 2003 **Policy P2/2** relates to the general location of employment.
9. The site is within the village framework. Local Plan 2004 **Policy EM6** states that, within village frameworks, planning permission will be granted for small-scale development in classes B1-B8 provided that: there would be no adverse impact on residential amenity, traffic conditions, village character and other environmental factors; and the development would contribute to a greater range of employment opportunities, especially for the semi-skilled and unskilled, or where initial development is dependent on the use of locally-based skills and expertise.
10. Local Plan 2004 **Policy EM3** sets out the 'local user' limitations on the occupancy of new premises in the District.

Consultation

11. **Sawston Parish Council** recommends approval subject to operational time restrictions of Monday to Friday 0800-1800 hours, Saturdays 0800-1200 and closed on Sundays.
12. **Landscape Design Officer** has no objections.
13. **Environment Agency** recommends a condition relating to pollution control, including foul and surface water drainage, is attached to any permission and Anglian Water is consulted.
14. **Cambs Fire & Rescue Service** asks that adequate provision be made for fire hydrants by way of Section 106 Agreement or planning condition.
15. **Anglian Water** and **County Archaeology** have been consulted. No comments had been received at the time this report was compiled. Any comments received will be reported verbally at the meeting.

Representations

16. None received.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

17. The key issues in relation to this application are:
 - Traffic; and
 - The character and appearance of the area.
18. Outline planning permission was granted for 8000m² gross external floor area of B1 development under reference S/0945/99/O. The reason permission was restricted to 8000m² was to define the scale of development in relation to the traffic impact report. Reserved matters consent was subsequently granted for approximately 7660m² of floor space under reference S/1711/03/RM, including two buildings (4 units) on the application site.
The replacement of these buildings with a single building providing a total additional floor area 270m² still ensures that the development remains within the 8000m² limit previously considered to be acceptable.

19. The proposed building would be in keeping with the design and appearance of the newly constructed adjacent buildings and would not detract from the character or appearance of the area.
20. It is considered that conditions attached to other permissions for development on the South Cambridge Business Park should be attached to any approval. There are no conditions restricting operational times and it would not be reasonable to attach such a condition to any approval, particularly as these units are further away from residential properties than many of the other units on the South Cambridge Business Park.

Recommendations

21. Approval
 1. Standard time condition A (Reason – A).
 2. Standard matching materials condition 19 (replace 'existing building' with 'Units A – F on drawing no. 1536 12') (Reason – 5ai);
 3. Standard landscaping condition 51. (Reason – 51).
 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 provisions of Article 3 and Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking or re-enacting that order with or without modification) - for a period of ten years from the time of first occupation of this Class B1 building (as defined by the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that order) shall be used and occupied only for one or more of the following purposes subject to the respective limitations:
 - (a) Offices [Use class B1 (a)]
 - (i) without limit of size, comprising a local or sub-regional service or administrative facility principally for persons resident or organisations situated in the Cambridge area excluding national or regional headquarters offices: or otherwise;
 - (ii) to a maximum floorspace of 300 square metres;
 - and/or
 - (b) Research and Development [Use class B1(b)]

(i) occupied by one or more high technology research and development firms, or organisations which can show a special need to be closely related to the Universities, or other established facilities or associated services in the Cambridge area;

and/or

(c) Light Industry [Use class B1(c)]

(i) to a maximum planning unit size of 1,850 square metres of floorspace.

(Reason - To safeguard the policies of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 2003 and the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004, Policy EM3 in particular, which limit employment development in the Cambridge area to uses that need to be located close to Cambridge; and to reduce the movement of HGVs on the local road network.)

6. The building hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the associated car parking areas shown upon drawing no. 1536 12 have been laid out, drained and surfaced in accordance with details to be approved and those areas shall not thereafter be used for any purpose other than the parking of vehicles (Reason - To ensure the provision of appropriate level of car parking in the interests of highway safety.)
7. No parking of vehicles shall take place on the application site other than on, and following the completion of, the designated car parking areas approved in accordance with Condition 6 of this Decision Notice (Reason - To achieve a balance between car parking provision and encouraging the use of alternative means of transport.)
8. The secure and covered cycle parking accommodation shown upon drawing no. 1536 12 shall be provided in accordance with details which shall previously have been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the building is occupied, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the facilities shall be retained unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority (Reason - To ensure appropriate provision for the secure and covered parking of cycles.)
9. Details of the location, type, noise characteristics and attenuation proposals for any power driven plant or equipment including equipment for heating, ventilation and for the control or extraction of any odour, dust or fumes from the buildings but excluding office equipment and vehicles and the location of the outlet from the buildings of such plant or equipment shall be submitted to 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 restriction. (Reason - To ensure that plant and equipment is not visually intrusive and to protect the amenities of residential properties.)
10. Except with the prior written agreement of the Local Planning Authority, no construction work or demolition shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 08.00 to 18.00 Monday to Friday, 08.00 to

13.00 on Saturdays and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.
(Reason - To protect the amenities of residential properties.)

11. Visibility splays shall be provided on both sides of the access to Babraham Road and shall be maintained free from any obstruction over a height of 600mm within an area of 4.5m x 90.0m measured from and along respectively the highway boundary (Reason - In the interests of highway safety.)
12. The junction of the proposed access road to Babraham Road with the existing road shall be laid with 7.5 metre radius kerbs. (Reason - In the interests of highway safety.)
13. No deliveries shall be taken at or dispatched from any light industrial units (B1(c) units as defined by the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that order) on the site outside the hours of 07.30 to 19.30 Mondays to Saturdays. (Reason - To protect the amenity of local residents in respect to noise and disturbance.)
14. Prior to the commencement of any development, a scheme for the provision and implementation of pollution control, which shall include foul and 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. (Reason – To ensure a satisfactory method of foul and surface water drainage and to prevent the increased risk of pollution to the water environment.)
15. Standard fire hydrant condition and reason.

Reasons for Approval

1. The development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:
 - a) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003: P2/2 (**General Location of Employment**);
 - b) South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004: **EM3 (Limitations on the Occupancy of New Premises in South Cambridgeshire) and EM6 (New Employment at Rural Growth Settlements)**.
2. The development is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations, which have been raised during the consultation exercise: **Operational time restrictions**.

Informative

A Travel for Work Plan has been secured by means of an agreement dated 9th August 2000 under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

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/0945/99/O, S/1764/00/F, S/0701/03/O, S/1711/03/RM, S/1961/04/F and S/0710/05/F

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

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation Control Committee 1st June 2005
AUTHOR/S: Director of Development Services

S/2579/04/F - Sawston
Erection of 30 Affordable Dwellings (22 Houses and 8 Flats) at Land off Lynton Way for Kelsey Housing Association

Recommendation: Delegated Approval
Determination Due Date: 5th April 2005 - (Major Application)

Members of Committee will visit the site on Tuesday 31st May 2005

Site and Proposal

1. The application site is a 1.12 hectare (2.77 acre) piece of agricultural land lying outside the Sawston village framework and within the Cambridge Green Belt. Directly to the north is a recently constructed development of 36 affordable dwellings, for which planning permission was granted in September 2003, whilst to the west is the Icknield County Primary School and dwellings within Lynton Way. On the south side of the site is a public footpath.
2. The full application, submitted on 22nd December 2004 and amended on 19th April and 10th May 2005, seeks to erect 30 affordable dwellings on the site. The proposed mix of dwellings is as follows:
 - 8 x 1-bedroom flats;
 - 11 x 2-bedroom houses;
 - 11 x 3-bedroom houses.
3. The proposed dwellings/flats would be two storey, approximately 7.7 metre high properties. Although final details of materials are to be agreed, the drawings show that the majority of the dwellings would be constructed of brick and tile whilst two of the properties would comprise rendered walls. The density of the development equates to 27 dwellings/hectare.
4. The proposal also shows an additional parking area on the east side of the Icknield Primary School (for the school's use) together with the provision of additional garden land at the rear of Nos. 33-43 Lynton Way.
5. Vehicular access to the site would be via the existing affordable housing scheme to the north which, itself, is accessed off Lynton Way.
6. A covering letter submitted with the application states that Kelsey Housing Society is proposing that all 30 units be offered for sale on an equity share basis. The Parish Council is in favour of such an approach because of the high need for such accommodation within the village. As with the first phase of housing, it is proposed to offer additional garden land to existing residents in Lynton Way who back onto the development. This would enable on-plot parking within enlarged rear gardens for these residents to help reduce on-street parking in Lynton Way.

Due to the traffic congestion caused twice a day by children arriving at/leaving the primary school, it is also proposed to make additional parking available to the school.

Planning History

7. There is no planning history relating to the application site itself. The scheme to the north was approved in September 2003 (Ref: S/0602/03/F).

Planning Policy

8. **Policy P1/2** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan states that development in the countryside will be resisted unless the proposals can be demonstrated to be essential in a particular rural location.
9. **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.
10. **Policies P5/4 and P5/5** encourage housing which meets, amongst others, affordable housing.
11. **Policy P9/2a** sets out the proposes of the Green Belt and the limitations on development within it.
12. **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) affordable housing in accordance with the 'exceptions policy' where no suitable sites are available outside the Green Belt.
13. **Policy HG8** of the 2004 Local Plan states that, as an exception to the normal operation of the policies of the Plan, planning permission may be granted for schemes of 100% affordable housing designed to meet identified local housing needs on sites within or adjoining villages providing the following criteria are all met:
 - The proposal includes secure arrangements for ensuring that all the dwellings within the scheme provide affordable housing in perpetuity for those in 'housing need' as defined in Policy HG7;
 - The number, size, design, mix and tenure of the dwellings are all confined to, and appropriate to, the strict extent of the identified local need;
 - The site of the proposal is well related to the built-up area of the settlement and the scale of the scheme is appropriate to the size and character of the village;
 - The development does not damage the character of the village or the rural landscape.

Consultation

14. **Sawston Parish Council** recommends approval of the application but makes the following comments:
 1. "The Parish Council support this application but would like speed checks etc to take place between 08.30 – 09.00 hours and 15.15 – 15.45 hours when children/parents are accessing Icknield CP School.

Perhaps when the garden land from Phase 1 for the residents is completed yellow lines would be useful on one side of Lynton Way. This would allow better access for larger vehicles such as fire engines etc.”

15. Following a meeting with local residents, the Parish Council has withdrawn its request for speed checks to be carried out/double yellow lines to be established on one side of Lynton Way. However, it would like to see give way lines introduced on Stanley Webb Close (Phase 1 of the affordable housing scheme) at its junction with Lynton Way as apparently at present vehicles turning right from Stanley Webb Close into Lynton Way are presuming that they have priority.
16. **The Development Manager** has confirmed verbally that the proposal, in terms of the number and mix of houses, does meet defined housing needs for Sawston.
17. **The Environment Agency** standing advice relating to sites between 1 and 5 hectares recommends the submission of a Flood Risk Assessment. However, in light of the fact that the site is only marginally over 1 hectare, the Environment Agency has advised verbally that its concern could be overcome by applying standard conditions requiring foul and surface water drainage details to any consent.
18. **The Landscape Design Officer** raises no objections subject to the imposition of standard landscape conditions.
19. **The Local Highways Authority** states, in respect of the amended layout plans dated 19th April and 10th May 2005, that the plan is appropriately dimensioned, although the carriageway could be reduced in width from 5.5 metres to 5 metres if desired. It is noted that most of the accesses have been moved from the junction radii. One remains associated with plot 30 but this is accepted in this instance.
20. With respect to the Parish Council original request for speed checks, the LHA queries what location they would be undertaken in and for what purpose. If within Lynton Way, the LHA can see no merit in such a check being undertaken and would not wish to incur the County Council in associated expense. It is stressed that a pedestrian crossing would not be necessary within Lynton Way. The issue of waiting restrictions within Lynton Way would need to be raised with the Traffic Engineer for the area. It is not an issue that need or should be linked to any planning permission granted for the development scheme.
21. **The Police Architectural Liaison Officer** raises no objections to the scheme as amended. It is suggested that the planting zone on the south and east boundaries be used as a means of enhanced security for rear gardens by the incorporation of defensive thorny species such as berberis or pyracanthus. Planting adjacent to parking areas should be low growing and thorny to prevent the creation of hiding places. The roads throughout the development should be lit according to BS 5489 code of practice for outdoor lighting while the parking court for the flats should be provided with lighting by means of a column mounted white downlighter.
22. **The Chief Environmental Health Officer** comments that problems could arise during construction from noise and suggests that a condition be applied to any planning consent to restrict the hours of use of power operated machinery.
23. **The Ramblers Association** raises no objections subject to the surface of the footpath remaining undisturbed by increased traffic and materials etc during building work. In addition, it is recommended that an official exit be created from the development onto the footpath.

24. **The Council's Ecology Officer** raises no objections in principle although comments that scope for ecological enhancement exists by means of erecting a variety of specialist bird boxes and bat boxes upon dwellings and cycle stores and the existing tree boundary. Wire fencing on the outer side of the boundary planting is not welcomed as it will prevent small animals such as hedgehogs and badgers from utilising the planting area in future – unless the wire is a requirement of landscape planting.
25. **The Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service** requests that adequate provision be made for fire hydrants.
26. **The County Footpaths Officer** states that the development will change the character of the adjacent public footpath, which is a rural cross-field path, and is likely to result in increased use. A two metre wide link should therefore be provided from the dead end at the southern end of the site on to the footpath to give access for residents of the site to the countryside. In addition, the surface of the footpath should be semi-hardened to a minimum width of two metres where it runs along the boundary of the site to cope with the increased usage and the needs of less-abled users and those with pushchairs. The centre point of the boundary hedge should be two metres away from the edge of the path to allow for future growth. It is also stressed that the footpath must remain open and unobstructed at all times and informatives should be added to any consent reminding the applicants of this.

Representations

27. The occupiers of 74 Plantation Road objects on the grounds that Plots 21 and 22 would be obtrusive in the outlook from their property and also overlook their garden area. It is requested that these plots be brought back in line with Plots 19 and 20. There should be screening along the side of Plot 22. In addition, there should be a reasonable distance between the proposed houses and the adjacent footpath which is heavily used and enjoyed by the village. The occupiers of this property also consider the access to the site through the existing Phase 1 development to be totally inadequate and unsafe for construction traffic to pass through as the houses are all occupied with families with young children.
28. The Strategic Project Manager at the County Council states that the development of the access road to the new car park is on land owned by the County Council. The County has not entered into any formal arrangements with the applicant either to use County owned land or concerning the possible transfer of the car park once developed. The applicant has written to the County identifying that the land should be transferred at open market value. This principle is not agreed and the County sees no community benefit in doing so.

Representation by the applicant's agent

29. The applicant's agent has responded in writing to a number of comments made during the course of the application. With regards to the Parish Council comments, it is pointed out that the first phase of development had a condition requiring the provision of traffic calming measures in Lynton Way. This condition was successfully discharged following detailed negotiations between the Parish Council, County Council and residents. The applicants are also trying to assist the perceived traffic problems in Lynton Way by offering land to create further parking for the school.

30. It is pointed out that neither phase of development could have had access taken from Babraham Road as no land owned by the vendor abuts the highway verge. This possibility was explored and discounted at an early stage in the development of proposals for the first phase. The Housing Association intends to utilise the agricultural access adjoining No.86 Babraham Road to serve construction traffic for the second phase in the same way as was agreed for phase one.
31. Kelsey Housing Association is not keen to establish a link from the site to the existing footpath as this would compromise Secured by Design principles in that it would provide a pedestrian escape route from the site for criminals.
32. It is confirmed that the new estate roads will be built to adoptable standards but will remain as private roads.
33. With regards to the points raised by the Strategic Project Officer at the County Council, it is confirmed that no land included within the application site area is owned by the County Council. The parking area would be accessed from the school grounds which is in County Council ownership. It is hoped that the matter of the sale value of the parking area land to the school would not become part of any planning condition although Kelsey would not offer the land at open market value. It would be offered to the County Council at its lowest practical price. Should it be unable to afford the terms of any freehold offer, rental or leasing options could be explored. For this reason, Kelsey would not wish to have this disposal enshrined in any planning conditions.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

34. The key issues in relation to this application are:
 - The need for the development having regard to the Green Belt location;
 - Impact upon the character of the area;
 - Impact upon residential amenity;
 - Highway safety
35. The site lies outside the Sawston village framework and within the Cambridge Green Belt. The erection of housing on the land therefore contravenes general planning policies relating to development in the countryside/Green Belt. However, this proposal has been put forward in response to a defined local need for low-cost housing (as confirmed by this Authority's Development Manager) and therefore needs to be considered in terms of the rural exceptions policy for housing. (HG8 of the Local Plan). In Green Belt locations, planning policies state that affordable housing schemes can only be considered where it can be demonstrated that no alternative sites are available. Sawston is entirely surrounded by Green Belt land and it is therefore clearly not possible to extend the village to provide housing development of this scale without encroaching upon areas of Green Belt land elsewhere. Given that the only scope for meeting the identified local affordable housing need for Sawston, save for sporadic infilling within the framework itself, unavoidably involves the use of Green Belt land, the suitability of the site itself needs to be considered further. No sites within the village framework capable of accommodating this number of affordable dwellings have come forward. Therefore I consider that the proposal accords with Policy GB2 (5) of the Local Plan.

36. The site lies directly to the east of properties within Lynton Way and the Icknield Primary School and to the south of a recently constructed scheme of 36 affordable dwellings. It is therefore closely related to the built-up area of the village in accordance with criteria 3 of Policy HG8 of the Local Plan. The design of the proposed dwellings reflects the character and density of dwellings in the surrounding area whilst the layout of the housing is acceptable in terms of back-to-back distances, garden depths, parking provision and landscaping.
37. The number, size and mix of dwellings proposed is determined by the local need and has been drawn up following extensive pre-application discussions between the applicants and this Authority's Housing Department. Any planning permission must be subject to a Section 106 Legal agreement, as set out within Policy HG8 of the Local Plan, to ensure that all the dwellings within the scheme provide affordable housing in perpetuity for those in 'housing need'.
38. Concerns have been raised by No.74 Plantation Road, a property located to the south-west of the site, to the impact of the development on its privacies. The two plots referred to (Plots 21 and 22) are sited 40 metres away from No.74's boundary and 45 metres away from the rear of the dwelling itself. This distance is sufficient to avoid any serious loss of amenity to the occupiers of No.74 Plantation Road and I am therefore satisfied that there is not a need to resite these dwellings further to the north.
39. Sawston Parish Council, whilst always recommending approval of the application, initially requested that speed checks be carried out within Lynton Way, with a view to further traffic calming measures (eg – double yellow lines, pedestrian crossing) being implemented within the road. The Local Highways Authority was advised of the Parish Council's comments and requested to carry out the speed checks. However, the LHA advised that it could not see the merit in such a check being undertaken (presumably due to the very slow existing speeds within Lynton Way arising from the combination of traffic humps and on street parking) and therefore could not justify the expense involved. In addition, it was considered that a pedestrian crossing was not necessary within Lynton Way. In light of this advice and the outcome of a recent local residents meeting, in which Lynton Way residents felt that double yellow lines along the street would not be appropriate, the Parish Council has withdrawn its request. A request has been made, however, for give way lines on Stanley Webb Close at its junction with Lynton Way. This cannot be conditioned as part of any planning consent given that it relates to off site highway works and given that the LHA does not consider such works to be necessary for highway safety reasons. However, the applicants have confirmed verbally that they would be willing to carry out these works, which would need to be the subject of discussions between the developers and the Highways Authority's traffic engineers. The LHA Traffic Engineers have confirmed verbally that they would not be likely to object in principle to such works being implemented. I am satisfied that this matter could be dealt with as an informative of the planning consent.
40. Some concerns have been raised by the Local Highways Authority in respect of the siting of parking spaces in relation to junction radii. The plan has been amended accordingly and I am awaiting the further comments of the LHA.
42. With regards to the highway safety implications of using Lynton Way and the existing Phase 1 development to access the site (including during the construction period), no specific objections have been raised by the LHA. However, the applicants agent has indicated that it is intended, if possible, to utilise the access off Babraham Road for construction vehicles as per the Phase 1 development.

43. The Ramblers Association and County Footpaths Officer have stated a preference for a link to be provided from the development onto the adjacent footpath. However, as pointed out by the applicant's agent, this would be at odds with the requirements of the Police Architectural Liaison Officer as this could provide an easy escape route from the site for criminals. Whilst I appreciate that such a link would be desirable, the footpath is reasonably accessible from the site, either via Plantation Road or via Babraham Road. Furthermore, if a link were provided from the site onto the footpath, there would be a requirement for the footpath to be increased in width and its surface upgraded in order to accommodate the likely increased usage. At present, this footpath is a narrow, informal dirt track across a field and I am concerned that the upgrading works required would be detrimental to the character of the countryside.
44. Whilst the extra parking shown for the school is to be welcomed, it is not an essential requirement arising from the proposed development and its provision cannot therefore be conditioned as part of any planning consent. If the applicants and County Council are unable to come to an agreement regarding the sale of this land, the plans indicate that further dwellings would be constructed on the site. This would require a new planning application and any consent should make it clear that there is no implied approval for dwellings on this land.

Recommendation

45. Subject to the Local Highways Authority raising no objections to the latest amended layout plan and to the prior signing of a Section 106 Legal Agreement to ensure that the housing is only occupied by qualifying persons and secured in perpetuity for that purpose, approve the application subject to the following conditions:
1. Standard A – Time Limited Permission (Reason A);
 2. Sc5a – Details of materials to be used for external walls and roofs (Rc5a);
 3. Sc51 – Landscaping (Rc51);
 4. Sc52 – Implementation of Landscaping (Rc52);
 5. Sc60 – Details of treatment to all site boundaries (Rc60);
 6. Prior to the commencement of development a scheme for the provision and location of fire hydrants to serve the development to a standard recommended by the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority; no development shall take place otherwise than in accordance with the approved scheme (Reason – To secure the provision of fire hydrants for the benefit of future occupiers of the development hereby permitted);
 7. 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);
 8. Sc5b - Details of surface water drainage (Rc5b);
 9. Sc5c – Details of foul water drainage (Rc5c);
 10. Para C2 - Details of construction traffic (Rc10);
 11. Prior to the occupation of any of the dwellings, hereby approved, the parking/garden extensions to the rear of Nos. 33-43 Lynton Way (odd numbers only) shall be fenced in accordance with a scheme to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority (Reason – To ensure that this aspect of the proposed development is completed in a harmonious manner and does not detract from the visual amenity of the estate).

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); P5/4 (meeting locally identified housing needs) and P5/5 (Homes in Rural Areas);
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:** HG8 (Exceptions policy for affordable housing) and GB2 (Development in the Green Belt)
2. The development is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations which have been raised during the consultation exercise:
 - Residential amenity;
 - Highway safety;
 - Visual impact on the locality;
 - Impact on footpath;
 - Flood risk;
 - Security/crime prevention

General

1. The Police Architectural Liaison Officer has suggested that the planting zone on the south and east boundaries could be used as a means of enhanced security for rear gardens by the incorporation of defensive thorny species such as berberis or pyracanthus. Planting adjacent to parking areas should be low growing and thorny to prevent the creation of hiding places. The roads throughout the development should be lit according to BS 5489 code of practice for outdoor lighting while the parking court for the flats should be provided with lighting by means of a column mounted white downlighter.
2. The provision of Give-Way markings at the junction of Stanley Webb Close with Lynton Way should be explored with the Traffic Engineer at the Local Highways Authority.
3. If soakaways are proposed for the disposal of uncontaminated surface water, percolation tests should be undertaken, and soakaways designed and constructed in accordance with BRE Digest 365 (or CIRIA Report 156) and to the satisfaction of the Local Authority. The maximum acceptable depth for soakaways is 2 metres below existing ground level. If, after tests, it is found that soakaways do not work satisfactorily, alternative proposals must be submitted.
4. Only clean uncontaminated surface water, should be discharged to any soakaway, watercourse or surface water sewer.
5. Surface water from roads and impermeable vehicle parking areas shall be discharged via trapped gullies.
6. 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.

7. 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.
8. The adjacent footpath must remain open and unobstructed at all times. Building materials must not be stored on this section of the footpath and, contractors vehicles must not be parked on it and it must not be used for access to the site (it is an offence under Section 137 of the Highways Act 1980 to obstruct a public footpath and an offence under Section 34 of the Road Traffic Act 1988 to drive on a public footpath)
9. No alteration to the surface of the footpath is permitted without the consent of Cambridgeshire County Council (it is an offence to damage the surface of a public footpath under Section 1 of the Criminal Damage Act 1971)
10. Any planting along the southern boundary of the site must be planted at least 2 metres away from the edge of the footpath to allow for future growth.
11. Careful consideration should be given to the safety of pedestrians using the footpath during construction and whether a temporary closure of the path is necessary. For further information, please contact Gary Wesley, Streetworks Co-Ordination Manager on 01354 753814.
12. Consideration should be given to ecological enhancement measures such as erecting bird boxes and bat boxes on dwellings and cycle stores and within the existing tree boundary.
13. A new planning application would be required should it be intended to erect dwellings on the proposed extension to the school parking area.

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 refs: S/2579/04/F and S/0602/03/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 Committee1st June 2005**AUTHOR/S:** Director of Development Services

S/0743/05/F - Great Shelford**Extension and Conversion of Agricultural Buildings into Education Tutorial Centre and
Erection of Lawnmower Garage at Caius Farm, Shelford Bottom for Beechwood
Education Trust****Recommendation: Approval****Date for determination: 14th July 2005 (Major Application)**

Departure application

Site and Proposal

1. The application relates to a clunch and brick barn with a corrugated sheeting roof and a brick lean-to element to the rear which sits in a 1.1 hectare (2.7 acres) approximately site which currently forms part of the Brethren Gospel Hall site at Shelford Bottom. The building is currently vacant. The Babraham Road Park and Ride site lies beyond the Gospel Hall site to the north and west. Dwellings and farm buildings with Cherry Hinton Road beyond bound the site to the east. Babraham Road is to the south.
2. This full application, registered on the 14th April 2005, proposes to erect a 17m x 4.7m two-storey lean-to extension to replace the existing 10.2m x 4m single storey lean-to extension and to use the resulting building as a school. The existing corrugated sheeting room would be replaced by slates. It is also proposed to erect a 5.4m x 4.4m x 4m high boarding and pitched slate roof lawnmower store. 11 parking spaces are proposed. The remainder of the site would be used as a playground and playing field. The existing access to the Gospel Hall would be moved to the north, requiring works to the belt of planting to the north of the existing access, and a parallel access to serve the school would be provided adjacent and to the south.
3. The school is currently being run from temporary accommodation in Whittlesford. Additional information submitted at the time of application S/2472/04/F stated that the Beechwood School has been established for the secondary education of children of the Exclusive Brethren from Cambridge and Thaxted. The school day would be 0820-1500 Monday to Friday and there would be no after school activities on the site. Physical education would be held two afternoons a week from 1330 to 1500, often using specialised facilities at other venues. A plan shows that the students generally live in clusters in South Cambridge, Cherry Hinton, Fulbourn, Teversham, Great Shelford, Stapleford and Thaxted. A letter explained that The Mowbray Trust holds the land at present to provide a place of worship of God according to the principles held by the Brethren and, whilst it fully supports the School, as a secular concern it holds that it should be kept separate from a place of worship. It thereby requires the Hall and School sites to be wholly separate, including having separate roadways.

Planning History

4. A previous application for extension and conversion of the building into education tutorial centre and erection of lawnmower garage was withdrawn (**S/2472/04/F**).
5. Permission was granted in 1993 for retention and extension of hardstanding around barn (**S/1480/93/F**).
6. Full planning permission was granted in 1992 for a meeting hall for religious purposes including access road, car park, security fence, entrance gates and fence and septic tank (**S/1154/92/F**).
7. An application for full planning permission was refused in 1992 for a meeting hall for religious purposes including access road, car park, meter house, security fence, gates, railings and septic tank/cesspool (**S/0751/92/F**).
8. Outline permission for a religious meeting room and car park was granted in 1992 (**S/1591/91/O**).

Planning Policy

9. 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.
10. Structure Plan 2003 **Policy P9/2a** states that within the Green Belt, new development, including change of use, will be limited to that required for agriculture and forestry, outdoor sport, cemeteries, or other uses appropriate to a rural area.
11. Local Plan 2004 **Policy GB2** states that planning permission will not be granted for inappropriate development in the Green Belt unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated. It also states that development is 'inappropriate' unless, amongst others, it comprises the re-use of buildings provided the development does not result in a materially greater impact on the openness and purpose of the Green Belt; strict control is exercised over any proposed extensions and associated uses of surrounding land; the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction and capable of conversion without major or complete reconstruction; and the form, bulk and general design of the buildings are in keeping with their surroundings.
12. Local Plan 2004 **Policy EN3** states that, in those cases where new development is permitted in the countryside, the Council will require that the scale, design and layout of the scheme, the materials used and the landscaping works are all appropriate to the particular Landscape Character Area (the East Anglian Chalk Landscape Character Area in this instance) and reinforce local distinctiveness wherever possible.

Consultation

13. At the time this report was compiled, the comments of **Great Shelford Parish Council**, the **Conservation Manager** and the **Trees & Landscape Officer** were awaited.

Representations

14. None received at the time this report was compiled. Any comments received will be reported verbally. The statutory consultation period expires 31st May 2005.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

15. The key issues in relation to this application are:
 - Whether the development constitutes ‘inappropriate development’ in the Green Belt and, if so, whether there are any very special circumstances which demonstrate that it should still be approved;
 - The impact of the extension, lawnmower store, resulting building and accesses on the openness and rural character of the countryside and Green Belt;
 - Whether this is a suitable location for the proposed use; and
 - Impact on neighbours.

16. Local Plan Policy GB2 states that the re-use of buildings is not inappropriate development in the Green Belt provided the development does not result in a materially greater impact on the openness and purpose of the Green Belt and strict control is exercised over any proposed extensions and associated uses of surrounding land. As it involves the erection of a lawnmower store and a larger extension than I might normally want to encourage in the Green Belt, the proposal constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt. However, it relates to an important traditional building for which I consider it is important to find an appropriate use. I am also satisfied that the scale of development proposed is no more than is necessary to secure the future of this important traditional building. I consider that this constitutes very special circumstances to support the application.

17. I do not consider that the extension, lawnmower store or the resulting building would result in the site having a materially greater impact on the openness or rural character of the countryside and Green Belt. I do however consider that the scheme should reflect any revisions to the fenestration recommended by the Conservation Manager. A separate roadway is proposed to serve the school. Whilst, in terms of minimising the visual impact of the development, it would be desirable for the Gospel Hall and School to share the same roadway, the applicant has explained why a separate access is proposed (see paragraph 3 above). The creation of two accesses would involve works to the belt of planting along the site’s northern boundary. However, subject to no objections being raised by the Trees & Landscape Officer, I consider that separate accesses would be acceptable in this instance. Significant planting has recently been undertaken within the Park and Ride Site to the north. The submitted plans are inconsistent in terms of the position of the accesses. My recommendation is therefore subject to the receipt of consistent plans.

18. Whilst I would not normally consider that a countryside location was an appropriate location for a school in terms of reducing travel distances and dependence on the car, having regard to the importance of finding a new use for the building and the location of student’s homes, this location would seem appropriate. With students’ homes generally being grouped together, there is an opportunity for those who do intend to travel by car to car share.

19. Subject to a condition restricting the times when the playground and playing field can be used, I do not consider the proposed use would seriously harm the amenity of neighbours through noise or disturbance.

20. Visibility from the access on to Cherry Hinton Road is good.
21. Approval of the scheme would not significantly prejudice the implementation of the development plan’s policies and proposals. If Members are minded to approve the application, it would not therefore be necessary to refer it to the Secretary of State.

Recommendation

22. Subject to the receipt of consistent plans of the accesses to which the Trees & Landscape Officer raises no objections and to any amendments to the fenestration recommended by the Conservation Manager, delegated approval subject to the following conditions:
1. Standard Condition A – Time limited permission (Reason A);
 2. SC5 a and f – Details of materials for external walls, roofs and hard surfacing, including roads (RC To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development);
 3. SC51 – Landscaping (RC51);
 4. SC52 – Implementation of landscaping (RC52);
 5. SC40 (an Education Tutorial Centre by the Beechwood Education Trust) (D1) – Restriction on the use of the building (RC This may not be an appropriate location for other uses within Class D1 in terms of reducing the need to travel, travel distances and dependence on the car);
 6. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the playgrounds and playing field shown upon drawing no. (to be inserted when consistent plans received) shall not be used other than between the hours of 0820 – 1500 hours Monday to Friday (RC To protect the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, and the occupiers of Arbor Grange in particular, with respect to noise and disturbance).
 7. No development shall commence until a schedule of proposed works detailing all those elements of the building involved in the conversion to be repaired, replaced, renewed, rebuilt or newly constructed, including below ground features and specifications of materials to be used, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any material variations considered necessary as work progresses shall also be so approved (Reason: To ensure that the scheme extensively involves only the conversion of the building by ensuring that the Local Planning Authority retains control over the extent of any rebuilding)

Informatives

Reasons for Approval

1. Although the development is not in accordance with Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 Policy P9/2a and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 Policy GB2, it is considered to be acceptable as a departure from the development plan for the following reason: the proposal represents a suitable new use for this important traditional building and thereby ensure its future.
2. The 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: EN3** (Landscaping and Design Standards for New Development in the Countryside)

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/0743/05/F, S/2472/04/F, S/1480/93/F, S/1154/92/F, S/0751/92/F and S/1591/91/O.

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

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation Control Committee 1st June 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: 3rd June 2005

Members of Committee will visit the site on Tuesday 31st May 2005.

Background

1. This application was deferred at the Committee Meeting held on 13th May 2005 item 22) to enable Members to visit the site prior to making a decision.
2. No further comments have been received since the May Committee Meeting.
3. As confirmed at Committee, in response to concerns raised by Members, should any damage be caused to the Adopted Highway, the County Council, as Local Highways Authority, will need to seek redress from the applicants. It is not a material planning consideration.

Recommendation

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) and **P7/6** (Historic Built Environment);
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004: Policy SE2**
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

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) 713 253

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation Control Committee 1st June 2005

AUTHOR/S: Director of Development Services

**S/0659/05/O - Waterbeach
Dwelling at Land Rear of 9-11 Way Lane
for D. Shipp**

**Recommendation: Refusal
Date for Determination: 2nd June 2005**

Site and Proposal

1. The site comprises an L-shaped area of garden land measuring 0.067 hectares. The land is situated to the rear of two detached bungalows on the western side of Way Lane. The site wraps around the garden boundaries to the southwest and northwest (10 Greenside) and adjoins the boundary with 13 Way Lane to the north. Access to the site is via an existing driveway serving 11 Way Lane. This leads to a garage in its rear garden and runs adjacent to the boundary with 13 Way Lane.
2. This outline planning application, received 7th April 2005, proposes to erect a dwelling on this area of garden land. While only access is to be determined at this stage, indicative details submitted suggest that a 4-bedroom chalet bungalow and detached garage, accessed by extending the existing drive would be sought at the reserved matters stage. The density of development proposed is 14.9 dwellings per hectare.

Planning History

3. **S/0906/02/F** planning permission refused for electronics workshop and private garage to the rear of 11 Way Lane. It was refused on grounds of unacceptable impact upon the quiet and peaceful environment and noise and disturbance to 9 Way Lane and other adjacent properties through the use of the access, in particular by commercial vehicles.
4. **S/0363/03/F** planning permission granted for extensions to a garage at the rear of 11 Way Lane. These works are underway.
5. **S/0944/04/F** planning permission granted for a garage in the front garden to serve 11 Way Lane. It is sited adjacent to the side boundary with 9 Way Lane.

Planning Policy

6. **Policy SE2 'Rural Growth Settlements'** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 ("Local Plan") 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.
7. **Policy HG10 'Housing Mix and Design'** 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. A high quality of design and distinctiveness and energy efficiency should also be achieved.

8. **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.
9. **Policy TP1 'Planning for More Sustainable Travel'** of the Local Plan seeks to promote sustainable travel and as such planning permission will only be granted where small-scale increases in travel demands will result, unless satisfactory measures to increase accessibility are included. Standards for maximum car parking levels and requirements for cycle storage are found in Appendices 7/1 and 7/2.
10. **Policy P1/3 'Sustainable Design in Built Development'** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan, 2003 states that a high standard of design and sustainability should be adopted for all new forms of development.

Consultations

11. **Waterbeach Parish Council** recommends approval. It comments that attention should be given to the visibility on exiting the property.
12. **Waterbeach Internal Drainage Board** has no comments.
13. **The Chief Environmental Health Officer** recommends conditions relating to the use of power machinery during construction, pile foundations and an informative relating to bonfires.

Representations

14. One letter objecting to the proposal has been received from the occupier of 13 Way Lane. Issues raised in this letter include:
 - Noise and disturbance to them through the increased use of the access and provision of car parking, which is exacerbated by the proposed surfacing with gravel and its siting, which is within 3 metres of their bedroom window;
 - Surface water drainage;
 - Privacy to gardens.

If approved the following planning points should be addressed:

- This should be a single story house only, built in a style sympathetic to the houses in the surrounding area.
- There should be a maximum of 2 bedrooms with absolutely no further development allowed, including commercial or business use.
- A very large fence between 6 to 8 foot high, along the boundary up until the forward edge of no. 13 should be required in order to lessen the impact of noise.

- The gravel drive should also be changed to driveway block or tarmac, which would also lessen the noise of traffic along the shared drive.
- The fence and drive should be completed before any house construction is started, to lessen the impact of noise and ensure this fundamental work is carried out in a timely fashion.
- Access hours to the site should be between the hours of 09.00 hours and 17.00 hours.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

15. The key issues relating to this proposal are visibility, impact of the access on neighbours and impact upon residential amenities.

Visibility

16. The existing access point at 11 Way Lane is to also serve the proposed dwelling. This access point has severely restricted visibility to the north by virtue of the front boundary hedge at 13 Way Lane. This land is outside of the applicants control and therefore provision of a visibility splay in this direction cannot be conditioned. Visibility to the south may be achieved over the front gardens of 9 and 11 Way Lane, though the application does not demonstrate that the necessary visibility splays can be achieved on land within the site or within the control of the applicant.

Access

17. The proposal will increase the use of the existing access. 13 Way Lane has a number of windows serving habitable rooms that face the side boundary with this drive. Due to the proximity of the drive to these windows noise and disturbance to the neighbours will significantly increase. Similarly, the extension of the drive to provide access to a proposed garage and car parking/turning area will introduce vehicle movements along the majority of the length of the private garden serving 13 Way Lane. This parking/turning area will also impact upon the amenities of 10 Greenside, although potentially the garage will screen some of the resulting noise.

Residential amenities

18. The site is an awkward L-shape, which will largely dictate the siting of any proposed dwelling and associated access, turning and garaging. The siting indicated on drawings submitted with the application illustrate that the site cannot be reasonably developed without resulting in an overbearing impact when viewed from habitable rooms and the garden of 10 Greenside. If developed with a chalet style house, the dwelling would result in overlooking of the neighbouring properties and their associated private garden areas from its first floor windows. Some overshadowing of the private garden and habitable rooms serving 10 Greenside would also result in the mornings, as the proposed dwelling could only be sited to the east of it.
19. In light of the above considerations, I consider that the proposal fails to meet the criteria set out in policy HG11 for backland developments.

Recommendation

Refusal:

1. The site is formed from an L-shaped area of garden land to the rear of bungalows at nos. 9-11 Way lane, Waterbeach. It adjoins residential properties. Access to the site is proposed to be via an existing drive serving 11 Way Lane, that runs adjacent to the boundary with 13 Way Lane.
 - (a) The proposal will increase the use of the existing access and will extend the driveway adjacent to the private garden area serving 13 Way Lane. Due to the proximity of habitable windows and adjacent private gardens areas, the additional use of the driveway, including turning and manoeuvring, will significantly increase noise and disturbance to the detriment of neighbouring residential amenities.
 - (b) Due to the awkward L-shape of the site, which will largely dictate the siting of any proposed dwelling and associated access, turning and garaging/car parking, a dwelling could not be reasonably developed without resulting in being visually overbearing and overshadowing of the private garden and habitable rooms serving 10 Greenside in the mornings, as the proposed dwelling would be sited to the east of it. In addition, overlooking of the neighbouring properties and their associated private garden areas would result, particularly if development included first floor accommodation.

In light of the above considerations, the proposal fails to meet the criteria set out in policy HG11 for backland developments of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, 2004.

2. The length of frontage available to the north of the site is insufficient to enable safe exit from the site due to poor visibility and as such will be harmful to highway safety. Moreover the application does not demonstrate that visibility can be achieved in a southerly direction on land either within the site or on land within the control of the applicant.

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/0659/05/O, S/0944/04/F, S/0363/03/F and S/0906/02/F

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

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation Control Committee1st June 2005**AUTHOR/S:** Director of Development Services

S/0713/05/O - Thriplow**Residential Development, Land at Lodge Road, for Thriplow Farms Ltd.****Recommendation: Refusal****Date for Determination: 12th July 2005 - (Major Application)****Departure****Adjacent Conservation Area****Site and Proposal**

1. The 1.388 ha site is located on the South-west corner of the Fowlmere Road/Lodge Road junction, and consists of a collection of large agricultural buildings, silos, and hardstandings all dating from the post-war period and serving a large local farm. The one exception is the southern most building on the Lodge Road frontage which is used as a commercial repair garage.
2. To the west is arable farmland and one modern agricultural barn, which is excluded from the application site; to the east, across Lodge Road, is the village cricket ground; to the south is The Lodge, a house in extensive grounds; and to the north, across Fowlmere Road is further arable land. The site boundary to Fowlmere Road is screened by a deciduous hedge; the Lodge Road frontage is predominantly open, and dominated by a large concrete apron to the farm buildings, which are set back about 20m from the road.
3. The outline application, received on the 12th April 2005, proposes the redevelopment of the site for residential purposes, with an estimate of 25-30 dwellings. All matters are reserved.

Supporting Letter

4. In a covering letter the applicant's agent states:

"The buildings are large, high and obvious. They are utilitarian and in appearance are more akin to industrial buildings rather than traditional agricultural buildings. They are prominent both from the approach from Fowlmere and from Lodge Road itself, sitting as they do in a concreted servicing area.
5. Thriplow is designated in the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan as an infill only village. That designation is related both to the level of services found in the village and to the consideration of its existing character. Services include a Post Office/shop, a public house, a village hall, a primary school and a recreation ground. In recognising the open nature of the village, the adopted local plan is concerned not to allow any development beyond infill, which would destroy that village character. In Thriplow, some latitude is introduced in policy terms in the adopted local plan (at paragraph 91.16).

There is recognition that *in very exceptional cases, a slightly larger development may be permitted if this would lead to the sustainable recycling of a brownfield site, bringing positive overall benefit to the village.*

6. The village sits within the approved Cambridge Green Belt. The grain store site is not included within the green belt. The western boundary of the application site is a common boundary with the green belt, which embraces land to the west and north.
7. The proposal is for the demolition of all the existing buildings and for the redevelopment of the site for housing. Although an outline application, consideration of advice in the local plan, in PPG3 on housing and of the site generally suggests that on this site of approaching 1.4 hectares, between 25 and 35 dwellings might be accommodated. The exact number, layout and design would be the subject of a reserved matters application.
8. However, in suggesting redevelopment for housing, certain policy requirements help inform the nature of the housing likely to be built. There is a policy requirement that 50% of the housing be affordable.
9. The adopted local plan also gives guidance on housing mix and design in Policy HG10. Housing will be required to contain a mix of units, providing a range of types, sizes (including one and two-bedroomed dwellings) and affordability, making the best use of the site and promoting a sense of community which reflects local needs. Design and layout is to be informed by local context and the wider character of the village. The supporting text of the policy also gives looser guidance on the matter of density, pointing to the requirements set out in PPG3 indicating densities generally of the order of 30—50 dwellings per hectare. That supporting text also indicates that average housing density in South Cambridgeshire (and nationally) is around 25 dwellings per hectare.
10. Consideration of that policy and information suggests that this regular shaped site might accommodate between 25 and 35 dwellings to a layout and design which would enhance the quality of the immediate area, both in its own right and by replacing buildings, which despite being largely agricultural in use, are industrial in appearance.
11. The layout and style of the redevelopment site can be informed by the immediate context. The site is on the edge of Thriplow (albeit outside the designated framework). In the near vicinity is the housing estate on the north side of Fowlmere Road. The cricket ground is opposite and to the south and east, lower density, older individual homes are set along Lodge Road and the network of lanes beyond. Design and layout will need to reflect both the importance of the site on the approaches to Thriplow from Fowlmere as well as picking up on the distinctive characters of the immediate vicinity. Housing will generally be of two storeys although attic accommodation in roof spaces, with traditional dormers, may be appropriate. The housing can comprise a mixture of detached, semi-detached and limited terraces. That mix of accommodation will help achieve a physically pleasing layout as well as offering the mix of accommodation that will help the needs both in terms of affordable and open market housing.
12. The layout and design of housing on the site (which are reserved matters) need to respect its important location both on the approach along the Fowlmere Road as well as the more immediate relationship with Lodge Road. Access may be taken in two, if not three locations, along Lodge Road, each to serve a group of housing.

On that basis, phasing of the development could be achieved if that was felt appropriate. In securing the provision of affordable housing, much depends on available funding to Registered Social Landlords. That may necessitate phasing, which, in turn, would facilitate the meeting of local needs as opposed to needs drawn on a wider basis.

14. The opportunity can be taken to sensitively consider landscaping. Again, there are two aspects. Firstly, the edge of the built development could be softened by planting, both within the site and on the adjacent agricultural land, which is in the same ownership. That landscaping may not necessarily offer complete screening but rather create the opportunity for interplay between new built form and new tree/hedge planting, or both. Redevelopment of the farm buildings will secure a significant lowering in the height of the buildings which are currently on site. In some cases, those are between 12 and 13 metres high. Lower buildings will have less impact, both on the approach to the village and on Lodge Road itself. Landscaping along Lodge Road can help achieve a softer more rural context than is currently presented by the existing grain store. Landscaping can help reinforce informality, which is the hallmark of much of the roadways in Thriplow.
15. Redevelopment of the site for housing can secure significant benefits, including a range of house types and tenure with affordable housing for local needs achieving, if possible, priority being given to Thriplow-generated needs. The replacement of the prominent and sizeable agricultural buildings will secure significant environmental benefits in both visual and noise terms.”

Planning History

16. A 1998 application to crush concrete on site was refused. In the same year an application to change the use of one agricultural building at the southern end of the site to a vehicle workshop/MOT station was approved.

Planning Policy

17. The site lies outside, but adjacent to the village framework and the Conservation Area. The western site boundary abuts the Green Belt, but the site itself is excluded from it. Thriplow is within the Area of Restraint south of Cambridge.
18. The following policies are relevant:

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
Policy P1/2 Environmental Restrictions on Development
Policy P2/6 Rural Economy
Policy P5/3 Density
Policy P5/5 Homes in Rural Areas
Policy P7/6 Historic Built Environment
Policy P9/2a Green Belt

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 – infill village
Policy SE5 Infill Villages
Policy SE6 Area of Restraint
Policy SE8 Village Frameworks
Policy GB1 Boundaries of the Green Belt
Policy GB2 Green Belt – General Principles
Policy HG8 Exceptions Policy for affordable housing
Policy EN30 Development in Conservation Areas

Consultation

19. **Thriplow Parish Council** approves the application.
20. “**Thriplow Parish Council** supports, in principle, the proposal for residential development on this site provided that Parish Council views are taken seriously at the detailed planning stage. Parish Councillors make the following comments:
21. The eventual style, character and density of any development on this site should be sympathetic with the whole village and the parish council should be included in discussions relating to design, density, landscaping etc.
22. Landscaping on this site is important. There should be a landscaping belt to the west of the site and the applicant’s suggestion that landscaping could extend into adjacent agricultural land is welcomed.
23. It is hoped that there could be some ‘affordable’ houses for sale that are not held by a Housing Association and that they really should be affordable and not small houses at inflated prices.
24. The suggested density of 25-30 houses on this site is too high and would also result in more extra cars than the village can cope with. Village roads are narrow and not suitable for overflow parking, the public transport service provided to Thriplow is poor and therefore, bearing in mind that most houses now have two cars, sufficient parking spaces must be provided on site.
25. Exits from the development should encourage traffic to use Fowlmere Road and Middle Street to access the A505 rather than Lodge Road and Farm Lane which are narrow, winding roads. There is also very poor visibility when exiting Farm Lane at the cross-roads at its eastern end.
26. The construction of Lodge Road should be investigated to ascertain whether it is suitable to take the increased traffic this development would bring or whether the road needs upgrading.
27. Eventual design should respect the privacy of residents at The Lodge in Lodge Road.
28. Extra pressure would be put on the primary school and consideration should be given to the implementation of a Section 106 Agreement to provide extra funding for the school and also for recreational facilities.”
29. **The Local Highway Authority** comments will be reported verbally.
30. **The Environment Agency** has no objection subject to standard conditions requiring the prior approval of surface water/foul water details and a ground contamination investigation.
31. **The Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service** requires the provision of fire hydrants to serve the development.
32. **The Conservation Manager’s** comments will be reported verbally.

33. **The Chief Environmental Health Officer** has no objections subject to conditions controlling the use of power operated machinery during the construction phase, and a contamination survey. Informatives are suggested covering the use of driven pile foundations, bonfires and the requirement for a Demolition Notice.
34. **The Housing Officer** comments there is no affordable housing currently in Thriplow. A survey in 2001 revealed a need for 40 houses. The situation today is likely to be similar.
35. **Councillor Quinlan** strongly supports the application. He states:
36. "The development of the Grain store site has been supported by the Parish Council now on two separate occasions most recently on 14 March. This view was unanimous including the Chairman. My own inquiries of the people living in the very near vicinity of the site reveals that most welcome the redevelopment for housing and the removal of the existing ugly buildings, the noise from the grain drying equipment and the heavy lorries which visit the site especially during harvest. On the latter point I understand that changes in the structure of grain marketing will mean that this traffic will now extend over 24 hours during the peak season.
37. The overarching planning policy for Thriplow is for "infill and a number of allocations for housing at Heathfield. The majority of the rest of the village is surrounded by Green Belt and this permeates the structure of the settlement notably at Pecks Close and along School Lane. Green Belt designation conveys very restrictive presumption against development other than certain exception such development required for agriculture. Unlike these other areas the Grain Store site is not within the Green Belt and is not therefore covered by these restrictive policies. The adopted Local Plan accepts that in all villages there are previously developed sites which come forward unexpectedly and the development of these "brownfield" sites for housing is generally supported by national planning policy guidance.
38. I believe housing should be restricted to part of the site only. I believe that a significant area of open space should be incorporated probably at the southern end related to the existing ponds providing a buffer to the house to the south. Affordable housing should be provided but only to meet needs generated by existing residents of Thriplow as the Parish has made its contribution to wider requirements at the various developments at Heathfield.
39. If the scheme is approved I shall be looking for first rate architectural and landscape design, the creation of a lime or chestnut formal avenue along Lodge Road (continuing the avenue along the Drive to Bury), a significant area of open space/wildlife habit, significant planting along the west and north boundaries, a "permeable" layout which will allow views out of the village towards Fowlmere Church from the cricket field."

Representations

40. One objection has been received for the occupiers of The Lodge, the dwelling adjoining the southern boundary of the site
 - the site is outside the village envelope;
 - proximity of proposed estate development will reduce its amenities because of increase noise and disturbance;
 - Lodge Road is an unsuitable access – not properly surfaced, no pedestrian paths, unlit;

- the local road network is inadequate for a large housing development;
 - the development will increase the risk of flooding.
41. Two letters have been received from local residents expressing concern whilst generally supporting the application
- not enough information to judge;
 - can water supply and sewage system cope with additional houses?
 - site outside village envelope but brown field site of little charm or utility;
 - more affordable houses should be provided;
 - is Lodge Road capable of carrying additional traffic;
 - impact of proposal on neighbouring house to the south (The Lodge).

Planning Comments – Key Issues

- departure from the Development Plan;
 - site and buildings not generally redundant if redeveloped alternative site in the countryside would have to be found;
 - impact on Conservation Area and Green Belt;
 - loss of existing garage business.
42. Thriplow is designated an infill village in the Local Plan and is in the Area of Restraint south of Cambridge, in which housing allocations outside the built up area of villages will not be made.
43. The proposal is to redevelop the 1.38 ha farmyard site with 25-35 dwellings, up to 50% of which would be affordable. As the site is outside the framework of the village defined in the Local Plan, there are fundamental conflicts with planning policy.
44. First, whilst Local Plan Exceptions Policy HG8 allows 100% affordable housing schemes outside village frameworks subject to certain criteria, this is not the case here with the prospect of over 20 market houses in the countryside, designated an Area of Restraint and on the outskirts of an “infill only” village. Policy HG8 does not support a mix of market and affordable housing outside but adjoining villages.
45. Secondly, the site is not redundant for agriculture and serves a large farm enterprise. The application makes no reference to where the current extensive complex would be resited, but it is likely to be on a Green Belt site close to Thriplow. Although buildings for agriculture are defined as “appropriate” in the Green Belt, clearly there would be an avoidable negative impact on rural character and the openness of the Green Belt.
46. Thirdly, the existing garage business operating from one of the barns would be displaced, leading to a loss of local employment. There is no indication in the application that the business would be relocated elsewhere in the local area.
47. Fourthly, the argument that the existing site is visually unattractive is not a material consideration. With judicious demolition, recladding and landscaping the appearance of the site could be vastly improved.
48. Fifthly, the scale of development significantly exceeds infill development and it would not lead to the sustainable recycling of a brownfield site (as provided for in very exceptional cases in the Local Plan). Planning Policy Guidance 3, “Housing”, makes it clear that the definition of previously - developed land excludes land and buildings that are currently in use for agriculture.

49. It is considered the redevelopment of the site itself would be unlikely to adversely affect the setting of the Conservation Area or the openness of the Green Belt. The visual amenities of the adjoining Green Belt could safeguard by appropriate landscaping.

Recommendation

Refusal

50. The site is adjoining, but outside the village framework, consisting of an assemblage of post-war farm buildings partly used by the applicants for agricultural purposes. One building is used as a vehicle repair workshop by others.
1. The redevelopment of the site for residential purposes including market housing would be contrary to the following policies which seek to protect the countryside from inappropriate development and which, exceptionally, provide for schemes of 100% affordable housing designed to meet identified local housing needs on sites within or adjoining villages.
 1. Policy P1/2 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2005
 2. Policy SE5 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
 3. Policy SE8 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
 4. Policy HG8 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
 5. Policy SE6 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004

The site is not previously developed land in the context of Planning Policy Guidance 3 "Housing" and the proposal does not bring forward 100% affordable housing.

2. Notwithstanding the above, the redevelopment of the site currently predominantly used in connection with an extensive local farm, would create the need for new replacement buildings in the Green Belt, detracting from its openness and character and therefore contrary Policy GB2 of South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.
3. The redevelopment of the site would displace the existing garage repair business located in the barn complex, contrary to Policy P2/6 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 which seeks to encourage small businesses in rural areas.

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

- Planning Policy Guidance 3: "Housing".
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2004
- Planning File ref: S/0713/05/O

Contact Officer: Bob Morgan – Senior Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713395

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation Control Committee 1st June 2005
AUTHOR/S: Director of Development Services

S/0959/04/O - Over**Erection of a Dwelling, Land Rear of 47 The Lanes, for Mr and Mrs G Sore**

Recommendation: Approval
Date for determination: 5th July 2004

Site and Proposal

1. The application relates to an existing residential area served by The Lanes, a narrow road without pedestrian pavements for much of its length. No.47 is an attractive detached Edwardian villa with rear garden depth of some 50m. The front garden has a depth of 12m. The driveway to the property leads to the rear garden area past a blank gable to a parking area. The frontage is marked by railings and brick piers, with trees behind. There is no pavement immediately adjoining the frontage, but the existing pavement runs up to it from the south.
2. To the north and north west, the site is adjoined by a bungalow at No.39. Habitable rooms in this dwelling are located approximately 4m from the boundary and driveway. Remaining dwellings to the north are all have frontages onto The Lanes. To the south and south east, the site is bounded by 49 and 51 The Lanes, behind which are detached houses in Cottenham Close, a cul-de-sac of five units that forms development in depth. To the north east lie the buildings and grounds of the village primary school.
3. This application, received 10th May 2004, is in outline but with details of means of access included. The proposal is to subdivide the rear garden to create a plot for a single-storey dwelling. The plot is shown to have a depth of between 21 and 28 metres, and a width of 19 metres, providing a site area of 0.05ha. The submitted illustrative drawing shows a new dwelling with integral garaging, and a remaining garden depth of 12m. The existing house will be provided with a garden depth of 25.7m. The parking for the existing dwelling is to be accommodated at the front of the house, possibly in a new double garage, but this does not form part of the current application. Pedestrian visibility splays are to be provided at the front entrance, and an extension to the public pavement along the frontage, following advice received from the Highway Authority. This will require the existing railings and brick piers to be dismantled and rebuilt set further back.
4. The development represents a density of 20 dwellings per hectare.

Planning History

5. Planning permission for an extension to the house was granted in 1980 (**S/1590/80/F**).

Planning Policy

6. Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003:

Policy P1/3 (Sustainable Design in Built Development) A high standard of design and sustainability for all new development will be required which achieves compact forms of development through the promotion of higher densities, and which responds to the local character of the built environment.

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.

7. South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:

Policy SE3 (Limited Rural Growth Settlements)- development up to a maximum scheme size of 30 dwellings will be permitted within the village framework provided that:

- i) The retention of the site in its present form is not essential to the character of the village;
- ii) The development would be sensitive to the character of the village, local features of landscape or ecological importance, and the amenities of neighbours;
- iii) The village has the necessary infrastructure capacity; and
- iv) Residential development would not conflict with another policy of the plan, particularly policy EM8.

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.

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.

Consultations

8. **Over Parish Council** - objects to the development because:

- Overdevelopment of the site;
- Run- off water from the new development exacerbating an existing problem;
- Garage at the front out of keeping with existing dwelling;
- The Lanes is very narrow and has no footway. Concerns over turning - possibly dangerous access;
- Shared driveway is inappropriate;

- In summary, the site is too small for such development and is out of character with the existing dwelling. Is this contrary to policy P1/3 of the Structure Plan?

Representations

9. Two letters of objection have been received from neighbours at Nos. 1 and 2 Cottenham Close that border onto the site. The concerns are:
- Overdevelopment;
 - Noise from use of the driveway by vehicles;
 - Noise and dirt during the construction period disturbing their young family;
 - Potential for even more dwellings on the site;
 - Narrow driveway with insufficient room to turn;
 - Possibility of an office development at the rear of No.47;
 - Overlooking from windows if a two-storey dwelling were to be built;
 - Resultant garden area for No.47 too small and out of keeping with the character of the area;
 - Frontage garage to existing house out of keeping with the rest of The Lanes.

Agent's Comments

10. The agent has put forward the following comments in support of the proposal:
- The size of the dwelling can be reduced to avoid overdevelopment of the site. At present it represents a 36% site coverage.
 - Surface water will probably be taken to soakaways, subject to Building Control approval.
 - The future double garage in front of the existing house is no further forward than the adjacent pair of dwellings at nos. 49 and 51, and so does not exceed the established building line.
 - There will only be a limited length of shared driveway, as vehicles passing the gable end of the house will be for the new house. The volume of traffic on this length will be no more than existing.
 - The dwellings at nos. 3 and 4 Cottenham Close are just as far back from The Lanes as the proposed dwelling.
 - The proposal does not contravene Policy HG11.
 - There are several examples of 'backland' development that have been allowed elsewhere in the village.

Planning Comments

Backland development

11. The application site is sufficiently large to accommodate a small bungalow, together with a reasonable garden area and room to park and turn up to 2 cars, in my opinion. The use of the driveway is not likely to increase significantly as the parking for the existing house will be relocated to the front, resulting in no more disturbance to the occupiers of no.39 than at present. The bungalow, if sited carefully, will not be conspicuous when viewed from The Lanes, so preserving the impression of frontage development at this point. The pattern of existing development here is mixed, in any case, adjacent to Cottenham Close. The application includes provision of a length of pavement and in my opinion will be adequate in highway safety terms. Although in a backland position, I believe that the proposal complies with the criteria set out in Policy HG11.

Representations

12. I have considered the representations received from the Parish Council and neighbouring occupiers carefully. For the reasons set above, I believe that the principle of siting a very modestly sized bungalow on this site is acceptable. The density does not comply with the requirements of SE3, but because of the potential for disturbance to neighbouring properties, any additional dwelling on this site would be inappropriate. Subject to conditions restricting the hours of operation of powered machinery during construction and suitable remaining reserved matters, I consider that the scheme can be supported.

Recommendation

13. Approve the application subject to the following conditions:
1. Standard Condition B - Time limited permission (Reason B);
 2. Standard Condition 1 - Reserved matters - siting, design and appearance, landscaping.(Reason RC1);
 3. The development hereby permitted shall be limited to single storey accommodation only, which shall not contain rooms in the roofspace. (Reason - To safeguard adjoining residential amenity);
 4. Sc52 - Implementation of landscaping (Rc52);
 5. Sc60 - Details of boundary treatments (Rc60);
 6. Sc5f - Details of materials to be used for hard surfaced areas within the site including roads, driveways and car parking areas (Reason - To minimise disturbance to adjoining residents);
 7. Pedestrian visibility splays to be provided and retained. (Reason - In the interest of highway safety);
 8. Turning and parking space within the site for two cars to be provided and retained. (Reason - In the interest of highway safety);
 9. Provision of frontage pavement to agreed specification to be provided prior to first occupation of the dwelling. (Reason - In the interest of highway safety);

10. Removal of permitted development rights in respect of extensions and roof alterations. (Reason - To maintain a small unit of accommodation).

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)
P5/5 (Homes in Rural Areas)
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:**
SE3 (Limited Rural Growth Settlements)
HG11 (Backland Development).
2. The development 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

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/0959/04/O

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 Committee1st June 2005**AUTHOR/S:** Director of Development Services

S/0549/05/F - Bar Hill**Insertion of Lift Shaft and Stairwell, Including Associated Roof Alterations
Tesco Stores, 15 - 18 Viking Way, for Tesco Stores Ltd****Recommendation: Approval
Date for Determination: 16/5/05****Site and Proposal**

1. The site consists of a large, metal clad superstore building, an adjacent shopping mall and associated car parking and infrastructure. Immediately adjacent to the application site is located a number of industrial and office buildings to the north and west along with their associated car parking facilities. A petrol filling station is also located adjacent to the north east of the site.

This full application, registered on 21st March 2004, seeks permission to insert a lift shaft and stairwell within the existing associated offices to the rear of the store and features a small external roof alteration to allow for the full operational height of the lift shaft and stairwell. The applicants describe the development as being sought to enable easier access to service and storage levels within the store.

Planning History

2. Planning permission was granted under reference **S/1617/98/F** for the provision of a new food superstore, mall, a site for a public house, parking and landscaping. These works involved the demolition of the previous supermarket, mall and public house that existed on the site.
3. In the early part of 2005 Tesco Stores Ltd commenced a scheme of work to erect a mezzanine floor within the existing supermarket structure. The scheme involved creating a temporary sales area to the front of the supermarket. These works did not require planning permission.

Planning Policy

4. The Tesco Stores site is located within the village framework for Bar Hill.
5. **Policy SH5** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 states that proposals for the development of new shops, redevelopment or extension of existing shops or the change of use of buildings to top up shops within a village framework will be permitted provided the development would not have an adverse impact on the amenity of nearby residential or other development.
6. **Policy SH9** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 states that the District Council will permit extensions to village shops if the proposal is sympathetic to the general environment in terms of siting, design, layout, materials and parking standards.

Consultation

7. **Bar Hill Parish Council** recommends that the application is refused and states “we object on the grounds that they had not put in [a] planning application for the mezzanine flooring knowing full well that this extension would be needed”.

Representations

8. None

Planning Comments - Key Issues

9. The key issues to consider in the determination of this application relate to:
 - The impact of the development upon the amenity of nearby development; and
 - The visual impact of the development upon the character of the area.
10. Although it is accepted that the mezzanine will lead to a significant increase in the retail floor space available within the superstore, there is currently no provision for it to require the submission of a planning application under current planning legislation. As such, the relative merits of the insertion of the mezzanine floor cannot be considered as part of this application.
11. In the documentation submitted with the application the applicant has stated that the proposal is being sought to enable easier access to service and storage levels within the store. It is further stated that the proposal will result in no extra floor space being created. This was borne out at the time of the officer’s site visit, which confirmed that the lift shaft and stairwell are to be created within the offices/ staff area to the rear of the superstore currently serving as male cloak/toilet facilities.
12. Externally the changes are minimal. The proposal will result in a small roof extension, measuring approximately 1.6 metres high, which would be largely hidden from view at ground floor level. The main roof of the superstore, which covers the retail floor space, is approximately 1.4m taller than the proposed roof and will serve to completely obscure views of it from the public car park that serves the superstore and mall. Partial views would be afforded from the adjacent petrol station and office/industrial units, but these are likely to be minimal given the scale of the proposal in conjunction with its location and form. The applicant is proposing to clad the external structure using the same materials as the existing superstore. As such, combined with the limited views afforded it would difficult to argue that the proposal would have a detrimental visual impact on the character of the area.
13. With regard to the impact of the development upon the amenity of nearby development it would again be difficult to foresee any significant detrimental impact. The lift shaft and associated machinery would be largely contained within the confines of the existing structure. Furthermore the proposal is located some distance from any residential development. As mentioned, the nearest neighbours that could be affected by the development are office/industrial units and in that context such development would not be uncommon.

Recommendation

14. Approval

1. Standard time condition A - Reason A;
2. The external materials of construction for the building works hereby permitted shall be identical to those used for the existing building unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. (Reason - to ensure that the appearance of the development blends in with the existing building).

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:**
P1/2 (Environmental Restrictions on Development)
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:**
SH5 (New Retail Development)
SH9 (Extensions to Shops)

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/0549/05/F; S/1617/98/F

Contact Officer: Michael Osbourn - Assistant Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713379

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation Control Committee

1st June 2005

AUTHOR/S: Director of Development Services

S/0821/05/F - Bar Hill

**Alterations to Front and Rear Elevations and Erection of 3 Bollards
Units 10-11, The Mall, for Tesco Stores Ltd**

Recommendation: Approval

Date for Determination: 21/6/05

Site and Proposal

1. The site consists of two units located within a row of units collectively known as The Mall, sited at a right angle to the large Tesco superstore and adjacent to the associated car parking and infrastructure. The units in The Mall have frontages consisting largely of full height glazing with a ribbon of signage located above the entrances that serve the various units. Units 10-11 are currently occupied as a single retail sales area operated by a company called *More* and a Post Office is located within part of Unit 11.

This full application, registered on 21st April 2004, seeks permission to alter the front and rear elevations of Units 10 and 11, including the insertion of a set of doors in the front and rear elevations of Unit 10, and the erection of 3 free standing bollards located to the rear of Unit 10 in line with similar at the rear of Units 11, 12 and 13.

Planning History

2. Planning permission was granted under reference **S/1617/98/F** for the provision of a new food superstore, mall, a site for a public house, parking and landscaping. These works involved the demolition of the previous supermarket, mall and public house that existed on the site.
3. Planning permission was later granted under reference **S/1836/04/F** for the change of the use of Unit 10 from A1 (Retail) to A2 (Financial/Professional Service) on behalf of Cambridge Building Society. The permitted use of Unit 11 was unaffected by this application and remains as A1 (Retail). At the time of this application officers consulted with the applicants who confirmed that this change of use did not have a direct effect on the Post Office in Unit 11.

Planning Policy

4. **Policy SH8** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 states that the District Council will not grant planning permission for new shop fronts and alterations to existing shop fronts which create a fascia and shop windows which is out of character with the building itself and the street scene.
5. **Policy CS1** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 states that the Council will seek to negotiate planning obligations (or in appropriate cases to impose Grampian-style planning conditions) to ensure the provision of any matters that are necessary for planning purposes and so directly related to the proposed development and to the

use of land after its completion, that permission ought not otherwise to be granted. The subject matter of the obligation will be reasonably related to the proposed development in scale and kind.

6. **Policy CS9** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 states that planning permission will be refused for proposals which would result in the loss of a village service or recreational facility, including village pubs, where such loss would cause a significant reduction in the level of community or service provision in the locality. The following matters will be considered in determining the significance of the loss: the established use of the premises and its existing and potential contribution to the social amenity of the local population.

Consultation

7. **Bar Hill Parish Council** recommends approval of the application and makes no further comment.

Representations

8. **Cllr Roger Hall** has expressed concern that *More*, the current occupants of both Units 10-11 will close at the end of July. As a result Cllr Hall is concerned that the Post Office, which is located in Unit 11, might also close unless an alternative location is found or a new tenant agrees that it should remain *in situ*. Cllr Hall, citing Local Plan policy CS9, has stated that an important village facility may be lost and that the “planning application should not be approved unless provision for the Post Office in one of the two new units, or provision for its re-location elsewhere has been received from Tesco Stores in writing.”

Planning Comments - Key Issues

9. The key issues to consider in the determination of this application relate to:
 - The impact of the development upon the Post Office located within Unit 11
 - The visual impact of the development upon the character and setting of the building and street scene

Impact upon the Post Office in Unit 11

10. Units 10 and 11 are currently occupied as one single unit by a company called *More*. Part of the retail floor space within Unit 11 is occupied by a Post Office. The current application is for the alteration of the front and rear elevations of the two units in question and the erection of 3 bollards to the rear of Unit 10. It does not involve or propose any material change of use.
11. Planning permission has previously been granted for the change of use of Unit 10 to Class A2 (Financial/Professional Services) from A1 (Retail) for Cambridge Building Society under application S/1836/04/F, which was approved on the 27th October 2004. This did not have a direct effect on the Post Office in Unit 11. The subdivision of the combined Units 10/11 into two separate units does not in itself require planning permission, as it does not constitute development as defined by planning legislation.
12. In planning terms, a Post Office falls within Use Class A1 (shops). This means that if a Post Office closes and reverts to retail floorspace, no material change of use

requiring planning permission will have occurred. The Planning Authority would not be in a position to resist the change.

13. The Council, as outlined in Local Plan Policy CS1, can impose conditions of consent that meet the tests of DOE Circular 11/95, including being necessary for planning purposes and being related to the proposed development. As such the Authority would not be able to impose a condition which required the provision of the Post Office either within Units 10/11 or for its relocation to an alternative site as it would not reasonably relate to the proposed development. The use of the unit and the issue of the Post Office is not a material consideration in the determination of this current application.

Visual Impact

14. With regard to the visual impact of the development upon the character and setting of the building and street scene all of the existing units are similar in appearance. Each unit comprises of a largely glazed frontage, with a continuous ribbon of advertisements located at a height of approximately 2.4 metres above ground level. The existing entrances to the various units comprise of glazed doors, similar in appearance to those proposed. Furthermore, a number of units currently have service doors, louvres and security bollards located to the rear of the units designed in a similar appearance to those proposed.

Recommendation

15. Approval
 1. Standard time condition A - Reason A

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:**
P1/2 (Environmental Restrictions on Development)
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:**
SH8 (Shop Fronts);

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/0821/05/F; S/1836/04/F; S/1617/98/F

Contact Officer: Michael Osbourn - Assistant Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713379

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation Control Committee 1st June 2005
AUTHOR/S: Director of Development Services

S/0660/05/F - Dry Drayton
Erection of Dwelling and Annexe at Trinity Collage, 42 Oakington Road, Dry Drayton
for Mr and Mrs Jenkinson-Dix

Recommendation: Approval
Date for Determination: 3 June 2005

Members will visit this site on 31st May 2005.

Site and Proposal

1. The approximately 0.015 hectare (0.37 acre) site contains a render and tiled detached bungalow with timber outbuilding situated on the eastern side of Oakington Road, adjacent (but just within) the north-east boundary of the village framework of Dry Drayton. The site has a road frontage of approximately 26.5m with a frontage hedge approximately 1m in height. The site is bordered by a field to the west, stable block along the road frontage to the north east with fields behind, paddock to the rear (south east) and 2-storey detached dwelling with front double garage to the south west (Courtlands). Adjacent land to the west, north-east and east, as well as land to the rear of the adjacent stable block and Courtlands is within the Cambridge Green Belt.
2. The full application received 7th April 2005 is for a two-storey detached dwelling with self-contained annexe, following the demolition of the existing dwelling. The proposal represents an alternative design to a 2-storey detached replacement dwelling approved under planning application S/1168/02/F. The annexe has the same means of access and siting as S/0828/04/O. The replacement 4-bedroom dwelling has an eaves and ridge height of 4.3m and 7.5m respectively and length of 15.4m. The dwelling is setback 5.5m from the front property boundary, with the annexe setback approximately 7.5m behind the front elevation of the dwelling. The proposed 2-bedroom annexe with lounge, kitchen/dining, water closet, bathroom and hall will have an eaves and ridge height of 2.7m and 6.1m respectively. The proposal equates to a density of 13.3 dwellings per hectare.
3. The specified materials for the dwelling and annexe are brick plinths, rendered walls and timber cladding with tiled roofing materials. The elevation plans indicate that rendering is not intended to be used on the annexe. An amended site-layout plan was received on 13th May 2005 which illustrated three on-site car parking spaces with turning.
4. The applicant has stated in a letter dated 18th March 2004 submitted for planning application S/0828/04/O that the annexe is for their elderly parents, who "currently live some considerable distance from us and my brother. Such an annexe would allow my parents to retain their independence as long as possible and will ensure that both my brother and I are close at hand should either fall ill or need more intensive care or support." They add that existing outbuildings on the property were not

suitable for conversion for this purpose. A letter was received on behalf of the applicant on 9th May 2005, which confirms that the need for the annexe is as per their earlier letter.

Planning History

5. Full planning permission was given in July 2002 for a replacement dwelling with detached garage and temporary siting of caravan (**Ref: S/1168/02/F**). The approved replacement dwelling has 4 bedrooms, an eaves and ridge height of 4.4m and 7.3m respectively, with a length of 15.2m.
6. On 21st April 2004 an outline planning application for an annexe was submitted (**Ref: S/0828/04/O**). This planning application is the subject of the preceding item on the agenda.
7. On 18th April 2005, a Section 106 legal agreement was signed, which restricted the use of the annexe to members of the family occupying the dwelling or their employees or former employees.

Planning Policy

8. **Policy P1/3** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 ("The County Structure Plan") requires a high standard of design for all new development that responds to the local character of the built environment.
9. **Policy SE4** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan ("The Local Plan") identifies Dry Drayton as a Group Village and states that residential development will be permitted within the village framework of Group Villages providing 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, particularly policy **EM8**".
10. **Policy SE9** of the Local Plan states that development on the village edges should be designed and landscaped to minimise the impact of development on the countryside.

Consultation

11. **Dry Drayton Parish Council** - Recommendation of Approval of original application. Any comments raised in relation to the amended site layout plan will be verbally reported at Committee
12. **Local Highways Authority** - In response to the original application, has commented that the "proposal allows for only one car parking space for each dwelling unit. Given that these are multi-bed units I would prefer to see this increased to at least three and for preference four, while retaining the turning area". It also requests that the

applicant shows the required visibility splays on the adopted public highway and the 2m by 2m internal pedestrian splay.

13. Any comments received in response to the amended site layout will be verbally reported at Committee.

Representations

14. **Councillor Roger Hall** - No comments made on merits of application, but has requested that this application and S/0828/04/O are determined at Committee, following a site visit by Councillors.

Planning Comments - Key Issues

15. The key issues for consideration in the assessment of this application are whether the proposed replacement house and annexe would have an acceptable visual impact on the streetscene and adjacent Countryside/Green Belt, whether the proposal would result in a loss of highway safety and whether the proposal would seriously harm the amenities of adjacent properties.

Visual Impact on Streetscene and adjacent Green Belt

16. I am of the view that the proposed replacement dwelling with self-contained annexe does not significantly increase the visual impact of the proposal on the streetscene and adjacent countryside/Green Belt than the approved planning application S/1168/02/F for a replacement dwelling and detached double garage. The size of the proposed dwelling is very similar to that previously approved.
17. The proposed single storey annexe positioned in the north-east corner of the site has a significantly lower ridge and eaves height to the main dwelling, and will appear subservient to the main dwelling. It is noted that the annexe is to be predominantly sited on the footprint of former outbuildings.

Highway Safety

18. I am of the view that the proposed means of access and available on-site car parking (3 spaces) and turning is appropriate for the proposed dwelling and annexe.
19. The required pedestrian visibility splay can be required by condition, as was the case for planning application S/1168/02/F.

Impact on Residential Amenity of Adjacent Property

20. The proposed dwelling with annexe has no first floor windows on the south west elevation and is sufficiently setback from the adjacent property, Courtlands, to prevent serious harm to the residential amenities of this property.

Recommendation

21. Approve as amended by Drawing No. 05/02:001A franked 13th May 2005.

Conditions of Consent

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 5 years from the date of this permission.

(Reason - To ensure that consideration of any future application for development in the area will not be prejudiced by permissions for development which have not been acted upon.)

2. No development shall commence until details of a) the materials to be used for the external walls and roofs; b) materials to be used for hard surfaced areas within the site including roads, driveways and car parking areas; and c) boundary treatments 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 the satisfactory appearance of the development.)
3. No first floor windows or openings of any kind shall be inserted in the southwest elevations of the dwelling and annexe, 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 property.)
4. If gates are to be provided to the vehicular access they should be set back 5.0 metres from the edge of the carriageway.
(Reason - In the interests of highway safety.)
5. The permanent space reserved on the site for turning and parking, illustrated in Drawing No. 05/02 001A dated 13 May 2005, shall be provided before the occupation of the dwelling or annexe (whichever is the sooner) and thereafter maintained.
(Reason - In the interests of highway safety.)
6. Visibility splays shall be provided on both sides of the access and shall be maintained free from any obstruction over a height of 600mm within an area of 2m by 2m, measured from and along respectively the back of the footway.
(Reason - In the interests of pedestrian safety.)

Informatives

The occupancy of the annexe is the subject of a Section 106 Legal Agreement signed 18 April 2005.

For clarification purposes, land outlined in blue on the submitted location plan has a lawful land use of agriculture and planning permission would be required for any material change of use of this land.

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:**
SE4 (Group Villages)
SE9 (Village Edges)

Environment Agency Informatives

1. Surface water run-off should be controlled as near to its source as possible through a sustainable drainage approach to surface water management. This approach involves using a range of techniques including soakaways, infiltration trenches, permeable pavements, grassed swales, ponds and wetlands to reduce flood risk by attenuating the rate and quantity of surface water run-off from a site. This approach can also offer other benefits in terms of promoting groundwater recharge, water quality improvement and amenity enhancements. Approved Document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 sets out a hierarchy for surface water disposal which encourages a SUDs approach.
2. In accordance with Approved Document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000, the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of sustainable drainage methods (SUDS) which limit flows through infiltration e.g. soakaways or infiltration trenches, subject to establishing that these are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries ground water pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under BRE Digest 365.
3. Flow balancing SUDS methods which involve the retention and controlled release of surface water from a site may be an option for some developments at this scale where uncontrolled surface water flows would otherwise exceed the local greenfield run off rate. Flow balancing should seek to achieve water quality and amenity benefits as well as managing flood risk
4. Further information on SUDS can be found in PPG25 paragraphs 40-42, PPG25 appendix E, in the CIRIA C522 document Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems-design manual for England and Wales and the Interim Code of Practice for Sustainable Drainage Systems. The Interim Code of Practice provides advice on design, adoption and maintenance issues and a full overview of other technical guidance on SUDs. The Interim Code of Practice will be made available electronically on both the Environment Agency's web site at: Environment Agency's website and CIRIA's web site at: CIRIA's website
5. Where it is intended that disposal be made to public sewer, the Water Company or its agents should confirm that there is adequate spare capacity in the existing system taking future development requirements into account
6. Development which involves a culvert or an obstruction to flow on an Ordinary Watercourse will require Agency consent under the Land Drainage Act 1991. An Ordinary Watercourse is defined as any watercourse not identified as a Main River on maps held by the Environment Agency and DEFRA. For further information see LDA 1991 - Consent Ordinary Watercourses and Land Drainage Act Consent etc.

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; and

- Planning File Refs: S/1168/02/F, S/0828/04/O and S/0660/05/F

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

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation Control Committee 1st June 2005
AUTHOR/S: Director of Development Services

S/0828/04/O - Dry Drayton
Erection of Annexe at Trinity Collage, 42 Oakington Road, Dry Drayton for
Mr and Mrs Jenkinson-Dix

Recommendation: Approval
Date for Determination: 16 June 2004

Members will visit this site on 31st May 2005.

Site and Proposal

1. Trinity Collage is a render and tiled detached bungalow with timber outbuilding situated on the eastern side of Oakington Road, adjacent (but just within) the north-east boundary of the village framework of Dry Drayton. The site has a road frontage of approximately 26m with a frontage hedge approximately 1m in height. The site is bordered by a field to the west, stable block along the road frontage to the north east with fields behind, paddock to the rear ((south east) and 2-storey detached dwelling with front double garage to the south west (Courtlands). Adjacent land to the west, north-east and east, as well as land to the rear of the adjacent stable block and Courtlands is within the Cambridge Green Belt.
2. The outline application received on 21st April 2004 is for an annexe with siting and means of access to be considered at this outline stage. Design and landscaping are reserved matters. The annexe measuring 6.5m in width and 11m in length is proposed to be sited in the north-east corner of the site, and centred on the footprint of a garage/stable, since demolished. The annexe is to be accessed using the existing vehicular access to the site. The annexe is to be sited adjacent, but just within the village framework boundary for Dry Drayton.
3. The applicant has stated in a letter dated 18th March 2004 that the annexe is for their elderly parents, who "currently live some considerable distance from us and my brother. Such an annexe would allow my parents to retain their independence as long as possible and will ensure that both my brother and I are close at hand should either fall ill or need more intensive care or support." They add that existing outbuildings on the property were not suitable for conversion for this purpose. A letter was received on behalf of the applicant on 9 May 2005, which confirms that the need for the annexe is as per their earlier letter.

Planning History

4. Full planning permission was given in July 2002 for a replacement dwelling with detached garage and temporary siting of caravan (**Ref: S/1168/02/F**). This permission has not been implemented.
5. On 18th April 2005, a Section 106 legal agreement was signed, which restricted the use of the annexe to members of the family occupying the dwelling or their

employees or former employees. Planning officers were not willing to support this planning application, in the absence of a signed legal agreement.

6. A full planning application for a dwelling and annexe, following the demolition of the existing dwelling was submitted on 7th April 2005 (**Ref: S/0660/05/F**). This planning application is under consideration (see following report).

Planning Policy

7. **Policy P1/3** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 ("The County Structure Plan") requires a high standard of design for all new development that responds to the local character of the built environment.
8. **Policy HG12** 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. This policy states that proposals which would seriously harm 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 will not be permitted. This policy is relevant due to the siting of the annexe within 5 metres of the approved replacement dwelling.
9. **Policy SE9** of the Local Plan states that development on the village edges should be designed and landscaped to minimise the impact of development on the countryside.

Consultation

10. **Dry Drayton Parish Council** - Recommendation of Approval. No other comments made.

Representations

11. **Councillor Roger Hall** - No comments made on merits of application, but has requested that this application and S/0660/05/F are determined at Committee, following a site visit by Councillors.

Planning Comments - Key Issues

12. The key issues for consideration in the assessment of this application are whether the proposed siting and means of access of the annexe would be harmful to the visual amenities of the streetscene and/or adjacent Green Belt or not, or would result in a loss of highway safety.

Visual Impact on Streetscene and adjacent Green Belt

13. I am of the view that an annexe in this position adjacent the existing dwelling, replacement dwelling as approved in S/1168/02/F or replacement dwelling as proposed in S/0660/05/F would have an acceptable visual impact on the streetscene and the adjacent Countryside/Green Belt. It is noted that the annexe is to be predominantly sited on the footprint of former outbuildings.

Highway Safety

14. I am of the view that the proposed means of access to the annexe is appropriate and would not lead to a loss of highway safety. I am satisfied that there is scope to create

three on-site car parking spaces to adequately cater for the parking needs of the existing dwelling (or replacement dwelling) plus annexe.

Impact on Residential Amenity of Adjacent Property

15. I am satisfied that an annexe of this size and siting could be positioned on the site without seriously harming the residential amenity of the adjacent property, Courtlands.

Recommendation

16. Approve

Conditions of Consent

1. Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.

The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the:

expiration of 5 years from the date of this permission, or

before the expiration of 2 years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved, whichever is the later.

(Reason - To ensure that consideration of any future application for development in the area will not be prejudiced by permissions for development which have not been acted upon.)

2. No development shall commence until full details of the following reserved matters have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:-
a) Design and external appearance of the building;
b) The landscaping of the site.
(Reason - The application is for outline permission only and gives insufficient details of the proposed development.)

3. No development shall commence until details of a) the materials to be used for the external walls and roof and b) boundary treatment along the north east and south east boundaries of the site 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 the satisfactory appearance of the Development and ensure detailing appropriate to the rural character of the site and adjacent land.)

4. No development shall commence until details of the siting and layout of the space to be provided on the site for the parking of three cars is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority; the parking spaces shall be provided in accordance with the agreed details before the annexe is occupied, and that area shall not thereafter be used for any purpose other than the parking of cars.
(Reason - In the interests of highway safety.)

5. If gates are to be provided to the vehicular access they should be set back 5.0 metres from the edge of the carriageway.
(Reason - In the interests of highway safety.)
6. Visibility splays shall be provided on both sides of the access and shall be maintained free from any obstruction over a height of 600mmm within an area of 2m by 2m, measured from and along respectively the back of the footway.
(Reason - In the interests of pedestrian safety.)

Informatives

The occupancy of the annexe is the subject of a Section 106 Legal Agreement signed 18th April 2005.

For clarification purposes, land outlined in blue on the submitted location plan has a lawful land use of agriculture and planning permission would be required for any material change of use of this land.

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:**
SE9 (Village Edges)
HG12 (Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings within Village Frameworks)

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; and
- Planning File Refs: S/1168/02/F, S/0828/04/F and S/0660/05/F

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

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation Control Committee 1st June 2005
AUTHOR/S: Director of Development Services

S/0416/05F, S/0417/05/O, S/0418/05/F - Bourn

(1) Demolition of Barns 1 and 2 and Erection of Two Storey Artists Studio Block (Including 2 Work/Live Units). Erection of Reception Building, Addition of Canopy to Existing Studio Building, Alterations to Existing Access and Enlargement of Car Park - Phase 1.

(2) Erection of Studio Block Including 4 Artists Work/Live Units, a 2 Artists Studios, Extension to Existing Gallery Including Open Access Studio, Erection of Orientation Pavilion and Associated Landscaping - Phase 2.

(3) Erection of Single Storey Building to Provide Artists Studios and Gardeners' Store. Fox Road for Wysing Arts

Recommendation: Approval
Date of Determination: 28th April 2005

Departure Applications and Applications affecting the setting of a Listed Building

Site and Proposal

1. Wysing Arts is situated on the southern side of the B1046 approximately ½ mile from Bourn. The 4.45ha (11acres) site consists of a Grade 2 listed former farmhouse used for residential accommodation, a group of agricultural buildings converted to studios, a reception, an educational room, a café and a purpose built gallery. There is a car park to the south-west of the main building complex, an outdoor kiln and ceramics area, and to the rear of the site a sculpture studio in a former tractor shed. The former composting scheme at the rear of the site has now ceased.
2. The two full applications, received on 3rd March 2005, concern the first phase of the redevelopment of the site. This involves the demolition of the two large barns on the frontage of the site and their replacement with a two storey purpose built studio block including two live/work units, measuring 25m x 11m. The flat roofed building is under 1.0m higher than the existing barns (ie 7.5m) and set back a further 12m from the front of the listed house, allowing it a more spacious setting and creating a new outdoor display area at the front of the site. The building would be clad in timber with timber windows. Access to the studios is via a hardwood deck structure on the southern elevation.
3. A new single storey reception building, again with timber clad walls and a black profiled metal roof is proposed at 40° to the gallery, south-west of the studios, measuring 12.8m x 9.4m with a ridge height of 5.4m. A 3m wide open canopy projects to the front of the building. In addition to a reception area, the building contains an office, kitchen, store and toilets.
4. The existing stables building which currently houses the reception, café, meeting room and studios will be refurbished to create more studios and education,

administration and ceramics open access studio rooms. This will also involve an open canopy being added to three sides of the building.

5. As part of the Phase 1 works the existing car park and its access would be remodelled to provide an access with a lower gradient and car parking for 50 cars. The main site access would also be slightly modified to improve visibility. A coach drop-off point and disabled parking spaces would also be provided.
6. In order that the studios can continue to function during the demolition of the existing provision in the barns a new building is proposed at the rear of the site. Measuring 17m x 10m x 4.8m high, the building would house six studios and a gardeners' store. Essentially a metal framed agricultural building, it would be roofed in profile steel with straw bale walls rendered on the outer surfaces.
7. The outline application, also received on 3rd March 2005, is the longer term Phase 2 proposal which has yet to be worked up in detail. It would involve an additional studio block of similar dimensions to the Phase 1 building, set to the rear of the stables building and cut into the slope. The gallery would be extended to include an open access studio and an "orientation pavilion" provided to the rear of the access studio. New circulation informal paths would be created throughout the site, ie gravel or mown grass. Siting and means of access are included in the application. Design and landscaping are reserved for further consideration.
8. Amended plans, submitted on 9th May 2005 involve revisions to the siting of the car park and the enabling studios to accommodate additional boundary landscaping and include "broadbrush" landscaping proposals.
9. Accompanying the applications are **Planning and Transport Statements**.
10. The **Planning Statement** describes Wysing Arts as a thriving rural arts centre, providing a wide range of services to the local community, including the provision of artists studios, exhibitions and workshops. It has attained a regional, national and international reputation and is recognised by the Arts Council as a centre of regional importance. Construction work is necessary on the site to replace dilapidated existing buildings in order that the centre can maintain and improve its current programme.
11. A brief resume of the site's history covers its acquisition in 1988 to provide cheap artist studio space for use by individual artists principally producing arts and crafts. Wysing Arts itself opened in 1992 as an amateur organisation providing 7 artists studios and a limited summer programme. In 1994 it became a registered charity and since late 1996 it has been professionally managed year round programme. The charity is governed by a Board of Trustees that includes the original owners as well as other professional people. The company operates on a not-for-profit basis.
12. Wysing Arts core aim is to encourage new artistic work and enable the wider public to experience and participate in the visual and applied arts. This is achieved through provision of artists' studios, a programme of arts workshops, residencies, courses and exhibitions. A wide programme of activities is organised for people of all ages and levels of ability. They also design special projects which target certain sections of the community - older people, people with learning difficulties and people with mental health needs, families on low incomes and young people. Wysing Arts is the only professional arts centre in South Cambridgeshire; consequently a high proportion of visitors are from the immediate area (approx 13,000 per year). The

current total annual attendances are over 15,000 per year. In a typical year, the programme involves over 200 families, 1,500 children, 2,000 adults and 25 schools.

13. Currently facilities and programmes on site include the following:
 - 1) 25 studios.
 - 2) A year round programme of exhibitions.
 - 3) A year round programme of workshops for adults and children.
 - 4) School holiday workshops for children.
 - 5) An artist residency programme providing residencies from 2 months to 1 year.
 - 6) Public access workspace in ceramics, metalwork and sculpture.
 - 7) 11 acres of grounds which currently has 8 outdoor exhibits.
 - 8) Café.
 - 9) An outdoor ceramics area with an anagama kiln, one of only a few in Britain.
 - 10) Education and work experience for up to 16 local people with learning difficulties.
 - 11) Education for up to 10 students on an Arts reading NVQ.
 - 12) Arts workshops for local schools both on-site and in schools.
14. Wysing Arts currently employs 4 full-time and 8 part-time staff plus up to 10 volunteers.
15. With regards to the existing site, Wysing Arts holds the lease to the 3.8ha site on Fox Road, and a short lease on the neighbouring farmhouse and its land fronting Fox Road. Since acquisition 7,000 trees have been planted and hedges reinstated. To date in excess of £2million pounds of private and public money have been invested in the site. The most recent investment was the complete refurbishment of the listed farmhouse involving the removal of an inappropriate flat roofed extension.
16. The success of Wysing Arts programme has exposed deficiencies in the site and its buildings. Access for families, disabled and older people, both on-site and in some of the buildings is difficult. The two cow barns to be replaced are of particular concern as they are unheated, uninsulated, have no water supply or drainage, lack natural light and sloping floors. They are also in poor condition.
17. In 2002 Wysing successfully applied to the Arts Council National lottery funded capital programme and £905,000 was offered towards the cost of the project. South Cambs District Council has also produced financial support for the project, with an initial offer of £205,000 over a 3 year period by separate annual applications. To date £130,000 has been approved.
18. The development of the scheme has been monitored both by CABE (Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment) and the Arts Council.
19. Wysing is not planning for attendance figures to increase rapidly in the future and foresee a small increase in the numbers employed in the near future.
20. The Masterplan for the redevelopment places the new accommodation around the existing stableblock, taking advantage of the shelter provided by the rising land to the south. The new buildings are primarily concentrated in the vicinity of the existing farm buildings reducing the visual impact of the development and avoiding the use of the Greenfield part of the site. The accommodation is located so as to provide 3 distinct external courtyards. A new pedestrian circulation "axis" is created which bisects the courtyards and leads ultimately via a ramp to the open landscape beyond.

A pavilion on the axis at the upper level is proposed to provide information on the artist exhibits located within the grounds.

21. The Phase 1 works will result in slight reduction of gross internal floor area on-site (from 1754 sq m to 1692 sq m approx) because of the demolition of the two barns. The new volume will also be considerably less, reducing the apparent massing of the buildings. The proposal for phase 2 adds a further 480 sq m of accommodation, taking the total scheme to just over 25% more than the current accommodation.
22. The design of the front elevation of the studio block with its full height glazed and timber panels, employs a strong vertical emphasis which complements the timber framing of the farmhouse. Window proportions are also comparable. Ventilation is provided via hatches to avoid transoms in the windows. With regards to materials, softwood windows and panels to the north and south facades are to be stained dark brown/black. The East and West elevations are to be clad in dark brown/black resin coated ply. These materials are chosen to provide a contemporary interpretation of stained weatherboarding familiar in Cambridgeshire
23. The reception block is angled to the gallery to provide an entrance façade to visitors to allow direct circulation to and from the car park. The building has a simple barn-like quality reflecting the former agricultural use of the site. In order to harmonise with the studio block, dark brown/black timber materials are used with a black corrugated metal roof.
24. The **Transport Statement** concludes that existing traffic generated by the site is very low and the majority of all journeys to the Centre are made outside of peak hours. The various workshops for members of the public are principally held during the evenings and at weekends.
25. Although the B1046 Fox Road is rural in nature and has limited forward visibility in places due to the topography of the road, there have not been any personal injury accidents in the vicinity of the site over the last 5 years.
26. The proposed scheme is not aimed at increasing visitor levels and therefore there should not be any noticeable increase in the volume of traffic to the site following the completion of the development proposals. The proposals will not result in any changes to the type of vehicles arriving or departing from the site, as the site will continue to operate in the same manner in the future.
27. While there is no overriding safety reason to consider changes to the site entrance arrangements, the development proposals include improvements to the site access and parking areas to provide a better environment for both disabled visitors and for coaches and large vehicles.

Planning History

28. The following is a summary of the main permission granted:
 - In 1989 the substantive planning permission was granted to change the use of the site to craft and arts studios.
 - Alterations and extensions to the former agricultural buildings were granted in 1990.

- In 1995 permission was granted to change the farmhouse to self-catering residential accommodation.
- In 2001 a café was permitted retrospectively in the stables building.
- In 2002 planning permission and listed building consent were granted to extend the former farmhouse.

Planning Policy

29. The site is within the countryside and includes a listed house.
30. Structure Plan 2003 **Policy P1/2** states that development in the countryside will be restricted unless proposals can be demonstrated to be essential in a particular rural location.
31. **Policy P1/3** states that a high standard of design and sustainability will be required for all new development.
32. **Policy P2/6** states small-scale employment development in rural areas will be facilitated where it contributes to rural diversification.
33. **Policy P4/1** states new or improved recreation and leisure development should protect or improve the local economy and landscape.
34. **Policy P7/4** states development must relate sensitively to the local environment and contribute to the sense of place, identity and diversity of the distinct landscape character areas.
35. **Policy P7/6** states Local Planning Authorities will protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the historic built environment.
36. Local Plan 2004 **Policy RT1** states that in considering applications for the development of recreation facilities, the Council will resist any proposal which would, inter alia:
 - (i) By reason of its scale, form, design and material of the proposal would create an intrusive feature in the landscape or surrounding area;
 - (ii) Result in the loss of ecological, wildlife and archaeological interests;
 - (iii) Generate significant motorised traffic movements;
 - (iv) Have inadequate provision for parking and manoeuvring of cars and service vehicles;
 - (v) Not provide appropriate provision for screening and to minimise visual intrusion into the countryside.
37. **Policy SE8** states residential development outside village frameworks will not normally be permitted.
38. **Policy EN28** states the Council will resist applications which:

- (i) Would dominate the Listed Building or its curtilage buildings in scale, form, massing or appearance;
- (ii) Would damage the setting, well-being or attractiveness of a listed building;
- (iii) Would harm the visual relationship between the building and its formal or natural landscape surroundings.

Consultations

- 39. **Bourn Parish Council** approves the applications “Phase 1 involves a distinctive building which will be an improvement over what is already there. The Parish Council support village amenity, similarly, Phase 2 will be a great improvement on the existing buildings. The need for the replacement studios and gardener’s store is accepted.”
- 40. **The Local Highway Authority** requests a speed survey to assess whether the visibility splay dimensions are adequate. Preference is stated for the disabled parking spaces to be relocated within the site.
- 41. The applicant’s query the need for a speed survey given visitor numbers are unlikely to increase substantially. They are also reluctant to resite the disabled parking to a position where they will be less evident to users.
- 42. Ongoing discussions are taking place between the two parties and a verbal report will be made.
- 43. **The Environment Agency** initially objected to the applications but on the basis of additional information and calculations supplied by the Applicant’s agent approve the application subject to safeguarding conditions concerning foul and surface water drainage.
- 44. **The Conservation Manager** comments:
 - 1. The Conservation Manager and myself had a pre-application discussion on these proposals, at a relatively late stage in the preparation of the proposals, by when substantial commitment had already been given to the design approach.
 - 2. The proposal is to demolish the existing converted agricultural sheds, to replace them with a group of purpose built arts units, including a reception centre. While the existing buildings are of no architectural merit and do not particularly enhance the rural area, they do appear appropriate to the landscape by reason of their functional appearance.
 - 3. I note the support of CABI for the scheme and acknowledge that this project has the potential to create a piece of good contemporary architecture within South Cambridgeshire. My main concern is that the scheme does not fully consider the impact of a dynamic and vibrant design on the setting of the adjacent listed building.
 - 4. It is clear that the proposed arts centre development must also be able to demonstrate that it is visually appropriate to the rural, agricultural setting, including showing due architectural deference to the listed farmhouse. The siting of the proposed new unit will partially accommodate this need, but it will

also be important to carefully detail the colour, texture and rhythm of the elevations. Consequently, further details should be required for agreement prior to commencement on site.

5. The importance of the location is such that the streetscape approach to the building group should, in my opinion, remain informal and modest. Consequently, accommodating the needs of the bus parking etc. should be minimal, together with any associated signage and planting. The character of the rural road and farmyard entrance should not be compromised by introduced *design* elements that might create comparisons with the imagery of a business park.
6. I note also that the proposals include for certain enabling works, to allow for relocating artists while the new works are undertaken. These studios are to be sited in a location some distance from the main grouping of buildings, on a slight ridge, and will therefore impact on the surrounding open landscape. These units, while perhaps innovative in structural and thermal performance will contrast with the proposed building group by their adoption of a rather functional built form. I understand that the visual impact of these units is to be tempered by landscape screening and that they are to be 'temporary' units. If the suitability of the location and form relies on the landscape screen, then details should be required prior to granting of any consent.
7. However, no indication is given in the application as to the timescale over which these temporary facilities will be required. If they are required to house artists while the main new facility is constructed then it might be appropriate to regard it as a temporary facility and give it, say, a 5 year life.
8. I would also suggest that further details are required of the integration of the car park into the landscape. The strength of the boundary treatment, particularly to the road will be essential to avoid visual domination of the site by the car park.
9. The scheme also includes schematic details of a further development to the rear, Phase II (which is subject of an outline application). I note that this element of the scheme is to be cut into the rising ground. In principle I welcome this design approach, since it will limit the sprawl of the development into the rising countryside to the rear of the arts centre, though I would suggest that the opportunity to further integrate the building into the landscape should be fully explored, possibly by grading of the roof form into the bank and the adopting a grass/green roof etc.
10. The objective should be, in my opinion, to enable the landscape to envelop the building group, rather than be merely the setting for the group. Given our reservations regarding further extension of the centre, I would suggest that the applicants are advised to further explore the architectural form of Phase II prior to any design commitment to this element.

Conclusion/Recommendation (of the Conservation Manager)

45. The concept of the development as a major new arts facility for the region is in general supported. The success of the development will of course lie in the careful attention to the details and elevation rhythms created by the use of materials, together with colours and textures, appropriate to its rural setting.

46. Consequently, whilst not wishing to oppose these proposals, I would recommend the following:
- a) Detailed conditions are applied to control the details, colours and materials for the new buildings, so that the impact on the adjacent listed building may be controlled and, if necessary, moderated.
 - b) Detailed and viable proposals for the landscaping of the 'enabling facility' are submitted and agreed with our landscape officer *prior* to any grant of consent for these units and that this element is time limited.
 - c) Details of the landscaping of the car parking and entrance are submitted and agreed with our landscape officer *prior* to the granting of any consent.
 - d) With regard to Phase II, the applicants should be advised that the indicative proposals supplied with the outline application should not be taken as the agreed form, and that the detailed design development of this part of the scheme will be expected to maximise the integration of this element into the landscape.
47. **The Landscape Officer** initially had concerns about the extent of screening proposed to Fox Road for the new car park and a similar problem at the rear of the site with the separation between the proposed budget studios and the hedge line. Following a site meeting amended plans have been submitted resiting these two elements to allow for two additional parking belts.
48. A remaining concern is the landscaping of the grass island at the front of the site, where the disabled parking is proposed. Landscaping conditions are required.
49. The **Arts Development Officer** comments:
49. "This application is part of a larger scheme to improve arts facilities for users of Wysing Arts. Plans show a detailed level of consideration both of the aesthetic and environmental impact of the improvements.
50. The organisation has been awarded £205,000 from this Council towards the development.
51. A programme of temporary and permanent artworks on the open space adjacent to the main entrance will fulfil the terms of the Council's public art policy. I look forward to receiving a programme of activity prior to commencement of works".

Representations

52. None has been received.

Planning Comments - Key Issues

53. - Impact of the new buildings and redevelopment of the site as a whole on the rural character of the area
- Impact on the setting of the listed farmhouse
 - Highway safety

54. For a number of years Wysing Arts has been in discussion with the Council, both at officer and Member level, concerning a major investment in the future of the site involving the replacement and upgrading of existing buildings and other infrastructural improvement.
55. Founded in the late 1980s and based on a farmhouse, its agricultural buildings and about 4.45ha of land, the charity has prospered, refurbishing the buildings where possible, most recently renovating the listed farmhouse. However, the inadequacies and limited lifespan of the former agricultural buildings, compounded by restricted public access to the site, is inhibiting the development of Wysing, and the decision was taken in 2002 to undertake a major redevelopment of the site.
56. Architects were appointed to carry out a feasibility study and a new design team appointed to carry the scheme forward in conjunction with CABE (Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment).
57. Funding has been secured from the Arts Council and this council and a fundraiser appointed to secure the balance.
58. Essentially the proposal is to improve facilities on the site and does not involve a large increase in the floorspace of buildings. It is not anticipated that there will be a large increase in attendance and hence traffic to the site.
59. The road frontage of the site is dominated by two utilitarian cow sheds, converted into studios, and the opportunity arises to replace these with a purpose-built 2 storey studio block set back deeper into the site to improve the relationship with, and to enhance the setting of, the adjacent listed building. The open area created in front of the new studio would be utilised for the display of artwork.
60. Much thought has been given to the design of the studio block. Wysing was keen to have a contemporary building which reflected its philosophy and the Architects have opted for a flat roofed timber clad building with full height glazing on the façade, which picks up the proportions of the timber studwork and glazing from the farmhouse. The detailing of the various timber elements will be critical to the success of the building. The Architects have a track record of award winning buildings, often in rural locations, including work for the Henry Moore Foundation in Hertfordshire. I am confident the building will be attractive in its own right, enhance the setting of the listed building and be appropriate in this rural location.
61. Included within the studio building are two live-work units. More information has been provided as to precisely what form these might take. Wysing states there is a long historical precedence for artists living in or close to their studios. This has sometimes been because of economic reasons, but it is more common for accommodation to be offered as part of a contract for an artist in residence. There are several organisations nationally offering this type of provision. The live-work artist studio is not meant to be a permanent long term place of residence, and the studios will be let on a 1 year renewable licence. It is envisaged 1 live-work studio will be designated for young and up and coming artists who want an economical place to live and work at the beginning of their careers. The second studio would be predominantly used as part of Wysing's residency programme and involves inviting up and coming or sometimes established international artists to live and work at Wysing for periods varying between 2 months and 1 year. The living accommodation is modest and subservient to the studio itself. On the basis of this elaboration of the live-work

concept I am satisfied no controlling conditions or legal agreement would be necessary.

62. Following discussions the new single storey reception building which is now more prominently sited, is shown with a pitched rather than a flat roof. Timber clad, it will be more barn-like in appearance and is considered appropriate both in scale and positioning.
63. Phase 1 will also include much needed improvements to the car park provision. The car park, as amended, will be resited further from the Fox Road tree belt enabling more landscaping and reducing the gradient of the existing precipitous access. The opportunity also arises to improve visibility to the south-west and to provide disabled parking and a designated coach drop-off point. It has been stressed by the applicants that visits by coach parties are in the request.
64. The existing stables building to the rear of the new studio block will be refurbished and reconfigured internally. A canopy is proposed externally, but essentially the building will retain its current form.
65. Phase 2, the longer term proposal for the site, is submitted in outline only, and whilst indicating further studio provision, an extension to the gallery and a small pavilion, the overall increase in floorspace is relatively modest (480sq m). Taking Phases 1 and 2 together the increase in the existing floor area of the centre is about 25%.
66. The third application is for a single storey “enabling” building housing studio space and a gardeners’ store, sited towards the rear of the site. This single storey building would have the appearance of a modern agricultural barn and is required essentially to replace the studio accommodation lost when the existing barns at the front of the site are demolished and before the new studio block is completed. An innovative straw bale technology would be used for the walls, rendered on the outside for waterproofing. Although primarily required for a temporary period, it is likely the building will have at least a 20 year life-span. Following discussions, amended plans have been submitted siting the studios further from the hedge line to allow further planting, with additional planting shown to screen the front of the building to aid the assimilation into its setting.
67. As part of the masterplan for the site pedestrian circulation has been addressed and in place of the randomly sited existing buildings, a series of potentially attractive courtyards are proposed. Wider access throughout the site will be encouraged with informal network established. Wysing has planted 7,000 trees on the site during its tenure and more recreational use can be made of the attractive undulating site.
68. The Conservation Manager does not oppose the application, requiring more details of the materials to be used for the new buildings to be agreed. Samples have now been submitted and are considered satisfactory, consisting of a palette of browns and blacks. It would not be appropriate to “time limit” the “enabling studios at the rear of the site as it has a steel frame and a long lifespan”. Instead, the existing landscaping around it has been “beefed up”. Phase 2 can be conditioned as suggested by the Conservation Manager to exclude the sketch design as this application is in outline only.
69. The Landscapes Officer has met the applicants’ agent on-site and amended plans now show enhanced planting to the site’s boundaries in the vicinity of the proposed car park and the studio/gardeners store building to the rear of the site. A remaining concern is the landscaping of the grass “island” at the front of the site, where the

disabled parking is proposed. There are complications of visibility and ownership which may take time to resolve and the standard landscape conditions will give scope for more discussion to take place.

70. The Local Highway Authority requirement for a speed survey on Fox Road seems excessive given the comprehensive Transport Statement submitted with the application, the small predicted increase in the number of visitors and improvements proposed to visibility. There are also arguments for and against resiting the disabled car parking spaces within the site and I do not envisage the prominent position chosen by the applicants to be unduly dangerous given the likely levels of traffic within the site.
71. Although the applications are technically departures from the Development Plan involving new non-agricultural buildings in the countryside, I do not consider it necessary to refer them to the Secretary of State for consideration as the site has a long established use as an Arts Centre and the substantial demolition of existing buildings is involved, reducing the net gain in floorspace.

Recommendation

i) S/0416/05/F (Phase 1)

Approval, as amended by plans (Ref: PL-S-031A, PL-S-032A, PL-S-033A) franked 9th May 2005.

1. Standard Condition A - RCA.
2. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the materials samples submitted to the Local Planning Authority on 6th April 2005. (RC5[aii])
3. Precise details of the external joinery, including windows and doors, shall be submitted for prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority. (RC To ensure the use of details appropriate to buildings affecting the setting of a listed building).
4. SC51 Landscaping (RC51).
5. SC52 Implementation of landscaping (RC52).
6. Prior to the commencement of any development, a scheme for the provision and implementation of foul water drainage shall be submitted and agreed in writing with the Local 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 prevent the increased risk of pollution to the water environment).
7. Prior to the commencement of any development, a scheme for the provision and implementation of surface water drainage shall be submitted and agreed in writing with the Local 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).

8. Prior to the commencement of any development, a scheme for the provision and implementation of pollution control to the water environment shall be submitted and agreed in writing with the Local 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 prevent the increased risk of pollution to the water environment).

Reasons for Approval

1. Although the proposal involves the erection of non-agricultural buildings in the countryside, they are considered to be essential in this particular location to support the long established use as an Arts Centre. Therefore the development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:

- **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003:**
 - P1/2** - Environmental Restrictions on Development
 - P1/3** - Sustainable Design in Built Development
 - P2/6** - Rural Economy
 - P4/1** - Tourism, Recreation and Leisure Strategy
 - P7/4** - Landscape
 - P7/6** - Historic Built Environment
- **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:**
 - RT1** - Recreation and Tourism Development
 - SE8** - Village Frameworks
 - EN28** - Development within the Curtilage or Setting of a Listed Building

2. The proposal is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations which have been raised during the consultation exercise:

- Impact of the new buildings and redevelopment of the site as a whole on the rural character of the area
- Impact on the setting of the Listed farmhouse
- Highway safety

Informatives

The Environment Agency comments:

Surface Water Drainage:

All surface water from roofs shall be piped direct to an approved surface water system using sealed downpipes. Open gullies should not be used.

Full details of final surface water drainage scheme will be required.

Where soakaways are proposed for the disposal of uncontaminated surface water, percolation tests should be undertaken, and soakaways designed and constructed in accordance with BRE Digest 365 (or CIRIA Report 156), and to the satisfaction of the

Local Authority. The maximum acceptable depth for soakaways is 2 metres below existing ground level. If, after tests, it is found that soakaways do not work satisfactorily, alternative proposals must be submitted.

Only clean, uncontaminated surface water should be discharged to any soakaway, watercourse or surface water sewer.

Any culverting or works affecting the flow of a watercourse requires the prior written Consent of the Environment Agency under the terms of the Land Drainage Act 1991/Water Resources Act 1991. The Environment Agency seeks to avoid culverting, and its Consent for such works will not normally be granted except as a means of access.

The granting of planning approval must not be taken to imply that consent has been given in respect of the above.

Foul Water Drainage:

An acceptable method of foul sewage treatment may be the provision of a private sewage treatment plant.

A Consent under Schedule 10 of the Water Resources Act 1991 will be required for each individual sewage treatment plant.

The applicant is advised of his responsibility to ensure that sufficient residual capacity exists within any recipient watercourse to accept a discharge from the proposed treatment plant without either causing or exacerbating flooding.

The granting of planning approval must not be taken to imply that consent has been given in respect of the above.

Pollution Control:

Permeable parking areas and roads do not generally require pollution prevention measures.

Surface water from roads and impermeable vehicle parking areas shall be discharged via trapped gullies.

Prior to being discharged into any watercourse, surface water sewer or soakaway system, all surface water drainage from lorry parks and/or parking areas for fifty car park spaces or more and hardstandings should be passed through an oil interceptor designed compatible with the site being drained. Roof water shall not pass through the interceptor.

Notwithstanding the provision of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 1995 (or any order revoking or re-enacting that Order), any oil storage tank shall be sited on an impervious base and surrounded by oil tight bunded walls with a capacity of 110% of the storage tank, to enclose all filling, drawing and overflow pipes.

Site operators should ensure that there is no possibility of contaminated water entering and polluting surface or underground waters.

ii) S/0417/05/0 (Phase 2)

Approval, as amended by plans (Ref PL-S0003A) franked 9th May 2005.

1. Standard Condition B - RCB
2. No development shall commence until full details of the following reserved matters have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:
 - a) design and external appearance of buildings;
 - b) the landscaping of the site.

(RC1)
3. Notwithstanding the above, the design and cross section of the proposed studio block shown on Drawing no HB710 PL-S-012 is specifically excluded from this permission. (RC Further discussion is required on the necessity to set the building further into the sloping site to reduce its visual impact.
4. Prior to the commencement of any development, a scheme for the provision and implementation of foul water drainage shall be submitted and agreed in writing with the Local 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 prevent the increased risk of pollution to the water environment.)
5. Prior to the commencement of any development, a scheme for the provision and implementation of surface water drainage shall be submitted and agreed in writing with the Local 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.)
6. Prior to the commencement of any development, a scheme for the provision and implementation of pollution control to the water environment shall be submitted and agreed in writing with the Local 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 prevent the increased risk of pollution to the water environment.)

Reasons for Approval

1. Although the proposal involves the erection of non-agricultural buildings in the countryside, they are considered to be essential in this particular location to support the long established use as an Arts Centre. Therefore the development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:
 - **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003**
 - P1/2** - Environmental Restrictions on Development
 - P1/3** - Sustainable Design in Built Development
 - P2/6** - Rural Economy
 - P4/1** - Tourism, Recreation and Leisure Strategy

P7/4 - Landscape
P7/6 - Historic Built Environment

- **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004**
RT1 - Recreation and Tourism Development
SE8 - Village Frameworks
EN28 - Development within the Curtilage or Setting of a Listed Building

2. The proposal is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations, which have been raised during the consultation exercise:

- Impact of the new buildings and redevelopment of the site as a whole on the rural character of the area
- Impact on the setting of the Listed farmhouse
- Highway safety

Informatives

The Environment Agency comments:

Surface Water Drainage:

All surface water from roofs shall be piped direct to an approved surface water system using sealed downpipes. Open gullies should not be used.

Full details of final surface water drainage scheme will be required.

Where soakaways are proposed for the disposal of uncontaminated surface water, percolation tests should be undertaken, and soakaways designed and constructed in accordance with BRE Digest 365 (or CIRIA Report 156), and to the satisfaction of the Local Authority. The maximum acceptable depth for soakaways is 2 metres below existing ground level. If, after tests, it is found that soakaways do not work satisfactorily, alternative proposals must be submitted.

Only clean, uncontaminated surface water, should be discharged to any soakaway, watercourse or surface water sewer.

Any culverting or works affecting the flow of a watercourse requires the prior written Consent of the Environment Agency under the terms of the Land Drainage Act 1991/Water Resources Act 1991. The Environment Agency seeks to avoid culverting, and its Consent for such works will not normally be granted except as a means of access.

The granting of planning approval must not be taken to imply that consent has been given in respect of the above.

Foul Water Drainage:

An acceptable method of foul sewage treatment may be the provision of a private sewage treatment plant.

A Consent under Schedule 10 of the Water Resources Act 1991 will be required for each individual sewage treatment plant.

The applicant is advised of his responsibility to ensure that sufficient residual capacity exists within any recipient watercourse to accept a discharge from the proposed treatment plant without either causing or exacerbating flooding.

The granting of planning approval must not be taken to imply that consent has been given in respect of the above.

Pollution Control:

Permeable parking areas and roads do not generally require pollution prevention measures.

Surface water from roads and impermeable vehicle parking areas shall be discharged via trapped gullies.

Prior to being discharged into any watercourse, surface water sewer or soakaway system, all surface water drainage from lorry parks and/or parking areas for fifty car park spaces or more and hardstandings should be passed through an oil interceptor designed compatible with the site being drained. Roof water shall not pass through the interceptor.

Notwithstanding the provision of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 1995 (or any order revoking or re-enacting that Order), any oil storage tank shall be sited on an impervious base and surrounded by oil tight bunded walls with a capacity of 110% of the storage tank, to enclose all filling, drawing and overflow pipes.

Site operators should ensure that there is no possibility of contaminated water entering and polluting surface or underground waters.

iii) (S/0418/05/F (Artists' studios and gardeners' store))

Approval, as amended by plans (Ref PL-S0003A) franked 9th May 2005.

1. Standard Condition A - RCA
2. No development shall commence until details of the colour of the rendering to be used for the external walls and roofing material 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. (RC5 a)ii))
3. SC51 Landscaping (RC51)
4. SC52 Implementation of Landscaping (RC52)
5. Prior to the commencement of any development, a scheme for the provision and implementation of foul water drainage shall be submitted and agreed in writing with the Local 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 prevent the increased risk of pollution to the water environment.)
6. Prior to the commencement of any development, a scheme for the provision and implementation of surface water drainage shall be submitted and agreed

in writing with the Local 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.)

7. Prior to the commencement of any development, a scheme for the provision and implementation of pollution control to the water environment shall be submitted and agreed in writing with the Local 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 prevent the increased risk of pollution to the water environment.)

Reasons for Approval

1. Although the proposal involves the erection of non-agricultural buildings in the countryside, they are considered to be essential in this particular location to support the long established use as an Arts Centre. Therefore the development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:
 - **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003**
 - P1/2** - Environmental Restrictions on Development
 - P1/3** - Sustainable Design in Built Development
 - P2/6** - Rural Economy
 - P4/1** - Tourism, Recreation and Leisure Strategy
 - P7/4** - Landscape
 - P7/6** - Historic Built Environment
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004**
 - RT1** - Recreation and Tourism Development
 - SE8** - Village Frameworks
 - EN28** - Development within the Curtilage or Setting of a Listed Building
2. The proposal is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations, which have been raised during the consultation exercise:
 - Impact of the new buildings and redevelopment of the site as a whole on the rural character of the area

Informatives

The Environment Agency comments:

The Environment Agency will be pleased to assist in the assessment of proposals submitted by the applicant to meet these conditions.

Surface Water Drainage:

All surface water from roofs shall be piped direct to an approved surface water system using sealed downpipes. Open gullies should not be used.

Full details of final surface water drainage scheme will be required.

Where soakaways are proposed for the disposal of uncontaminated surface water, percolation tests should be undertaken, and soakaways designed and constructed in accordance with BRE Digest 365 (or CIRIA Report 156), and to the satisfaction of the Local Authority. The maximum acceptable depth for soakaways is 2 metres below existing ground level. If, after tests, it is found that soakaways do not work satisfactorily, alternative proposals must be submitted.

Only clean, uncontaminated surface water, should be discharged to any soakaway, watercourse or surface water sewer.

Any culverting or works affecting the flow of a watercourse requires the prior written Consent of the Environment Agency under the terms of the Land Drainage Act 1991/Water Resources Act 1991. The Environment Agency seeks to avoid culverting, and its Consent for such works will not normally be granted except as a means of access.

The granting of planning approval must not be taken to imply that consent has been given in respect of the above.

Foul Water Drainage:

An acceptable method of foul sewage treatment may be the provision of a private sewage treatment plant.

A Consent under Schedule 10 of the Water Resources Act 1991 will be required for each individual sewage treatment plant.

The applicant is advised of his responsibility to ensure that sufficient residual capacity exists within any recipient watercourse to accept a discharge from the proposed treatment plant without either causing or exacerbating flooding.

The granting of planning approval must not be taken to imply that consent has been given in respect of the above.

Pollution Control:

Permeable parking areas and roads do not generally require pollution prevention measures.

Surface water from roads and impermeable vehicle parking areas shall be discharged via trapped gullies.

Prior to being discharged into any watercourse, surface water sewer or soakaway system, all surface water drainage from lorry parks and/or parking areas for fifty car park spaces or more and hardstandings should be passed through an oil interceptor designed compatible with the site being drained. Roof water shall not pass through the interceptor.

Notwithstanding the provision of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 1995 (or any order revoking or re-enacting that Order), any oil storage tank shall be sited on an impervious base and surrounded by oil tight bunded walls with a capacity of 110% of the storage tank, to enclose all filling, drawing and overflow pipes.

Site operators should ensure that there is no possibility of contaminated water entering and polluting surface or underground waters.

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/0416/05/F, S/0417/05/0, S/0418/05/F

Contact Officer: Bob Morgan - Senior Planning Officer
Telephone: (01223) 713395

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation Control Committee 1st June 2005
AUTHOR/S: Director of Development Services

S/6292/05/F - Cambourne**Change of Use from Residential to Mixed Use as Dental Practice and Flat and Construction of Access at Monkfield House, Monkfield Lane, Cambourne**

Recommendation: Approval
Date for Determination: 10th June 2005

Site and Proposal

1. The house is an undistinguished building of the 19th century with various additions. It is located west of the village green, north of the Village Green car park and southeast of Monkfield Cottage, another 19th C farm building. There are new houses to the southwest, accessed by the shared drive alongside the Monkfield House boundary. There are 6ft fences along the side and rear boundaries. There is hardstanding on each side of the house, except under the willow in the east corner. The evergreens to be removed do not contribute significantly to wider amenity.
2. The application, received on 15th April 2005, proposes to reuse the ground floor as a dental practice in a similar arrangement as the previous temporary use as doctors' surgery but to use the first floor as a separate flat. The accommodation comprises 2 surgeries, waiting reception and staff room on the ground floor. The first floor flat would have 2 bedrooms, bathroom, living room with steps down to kitchen, and an office/study.
3. The entrance with ramped access for the disabled is on the northeast side of the property. A separate private access to the first floor flat would be used on the southwest side facing the car park. In order to accommodate sufficient turning space for clients' cars, the derelict low planters adjacent to the house would be removed. A new dropped kerb on the north side would give access to a further parking area, which is likely to be for use in connection with the flat. In the first instance the dentist intends to occupy the flat herself.
4. Because of the poor state of repair of the building, a small toilet extension on the west side is to be removed, and the facilities provided in the main building. Underpinning of the other two extensions is to be undertaken, and, if necessary, associated works to the trees will be done; i.e. removal of the northeast boundary conifers, removal of two small yews adjacent to the south extension and minor surgery to the willow on the east boundary.

Planning History

5. In 1999 the premises were brought into temporary use as the Cambourne school (S/6028/99/F) and thereafter as a doctors' surgery (S/6075/00/F) which was subsequently extended with portacabins and the permissions renewed. The property has been vacant since the Doctor's surgery moved to Sackville House.

Planning Policy

6. **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:**
Cambourne 1 – Development in accordance with Cambourne Masterplan
Cambourne 2 – Development in accordance with Cambourne Design Guide
SE2 - List of Rural Growth Settlements
SE7 – Development in accordance with Cambourne Masterplan and Design Guide
TP1 – Planning for more Sustainable Travel & Appendix 7/1 Standards for Car Parking Provision.
EN5 - The Landscaping of New Development

Consultation

7. **Cambourne Parish Council** approves in principle but concerns were raised about access to the site; there should be one vehicular access to the site from Monkfield Lane, the remaining access should be pedestrian only with bollards as required. The existing willow and 2 yew trees should be protected. The necessity of lopping/pollarding the willow was questioned and a report should be provided to justify or an alternative approach should be considered. Concern was also raised about the lack of landscaping plan and detail of boundary fencing.
8. **The Local Highway Authority** No comment, other than to draw attention to the lamp column adjacent to the new access.
9. **Chief Environmental Health Officer** No reply.
10. **David Chare, Cambourne Developers Project Director** No reply
11. The comments of the **Trees and Landscape Officer** have been sought.

Representations

12. 6 letters with no objection to the dental surgery use but objecting to the proposed works to trees on the site, seeking further details of proposed boundary treatment and querying the adequacy of parking provision

Planning Comments – Key Issues

13. The main issues are:
 - the suitability of the ground floor for the use as a dental surgery,
 - the adequacy of the access and parking,
 - residential amenity at adjacent properties,
 - residential amenity in the flat
 - visual and environment impact (trees, boundaries, hardstanding, lighting etc)
14. The ground floor has ramped access to the main entrance, and room for a disabled toilet in the hall area. The waiting room is as set up for the doctor, but will be divided to provide a reception desk, staff room and staff toilet. One surgery will lead directly off the waiting room, and the second is reached by a corridor. An X-ray room is also proposed in the east extension. This accommodation is suitable for the proposed use, providing adequate facilities for clients and staff. The property is not indicated for any particular use in the Cambourne Master Plan and Design Guide or briefing plans.

15. The south, existing, access served the doctor's car park and has good visibility onto Monkfield Lane. The proposed north access would emerge close to a lamp-post, but also has good visibility and allows for turning on-site. The parking standard for clinics would require 1 space per 2 staff, and 2 spaces per consulting room (total 6 required). The residential use requires a further space for visitors. 4 secure cycle spaces should be provided to comply with Policy TP1 of the local plan. The layout is adequate to make this provision, and details should be required by condition.
16. The level of use proposed would not create disturbance at neighbouring residential properties, and the parking and manoeuvring of cars would be contained within the site. The type and scale of use is considered suitable for a residential area.
17. The first floor flat would be provided with access from the lobby separated off from the corridor. It would provide a good standard of residential accommodation, and opportunity for outdoor amenity space to the rear of the property. Dedicated parking is proposed on the north side.
18. The renovation of the property, both outside and inside, would improve the street scene and character of the area. The yews adjacent to the south side are small and insignificant in the street scene because of their extreme proximity to the building, which would be improved by their removal. The conifers on the north boundary are tall and form a feature in the street, but have less merit than the willow which they obscure. Their retention adjacent to a residential property could not be justified, and they are not worthy of a tree preservation order. The mature willow tree is a striking feature of the area, being visible from all directions in the street and open space. The minimum necessary work should be undertaken to secure its long term health and compatibility with the building. The areas of hardstanding would not be increased, only rationalised in layout to allow for ease of manoeuvring and to provide landscaping space. The boundary fences are adequate for screening the premises. Details of all these matters should be required by condition.

Recommendation

Approve subject to the following conditions

1. Standard Condition A – Time limited permission (Reason A);
2. Before the development, hereby permitted, commences details of the siting and layout of the space to be provided on the site for the parking of 7 cars and 4 secure cycle spaces shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority; the parking space shall be provided in accordance with the agreed details before the use, hereby permitted commences, and that area shall not thereafter be used for any purpose other than the parking of vehicles. (Reason - To ensure adequate space is provided and thereafter maintained on site for the parking and turning of vehicles in the interests of highway safety and in accordance with Policy TP1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004)
3. No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a scheme of landscaping and boundary treatment, 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. (Reason – Because insufficient information was submitted with the application, and to enhance the quality of the development in accordance with policies EN5 and Cambourne 2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004)

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 buildings 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 in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with policies EN5 and Cambourne 2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004)
5. Details of the treatment of the site boundaries shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the work completed in accordance with the approved details before the building is occupied or the use commences, whichever is the sooner. (Reason - To ensure that the appearance of the site does not detract from the character of the area and in the interests of residential amenity at adjacent properties in accordance with Policy Cambourne 2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004)

Reasons for Approval

1. The development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004: SE2** (Development in Rural Growth Settlements),
Cambourne 1 – Development in accordance with Cambourne Masterplan
Cambourne 2 – Development in accordance with Cambourne Design Guide
SE7 – Development in accordance with Cambourne Masterplan and Design Guide
TP1 – Planning for more Sustainable Travel & Appendix 7/1 Standards for Car Parking Provision.
EN5 - The landscaping of new development
2. The development is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations which have been raised during the consultation exercise:
 - Residential amenity including disturbance and parking issues
 - Highway safety
 - Visual impact on the locality
 - Impact upon trees at the site

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

- **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004**
- Planning file reference S/6292/05/F

Contact Officer: Pam Thornton – Senior Planning Assistant
Telephone: (01954) 713099

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation Control Committee 1st June 2005
AUTHOR/S: Director of Development Services

S/0817/05/O - Oakington
Erection of Bungalow on land rear of 43 Cambridge Road, for Mr and Mrs D Salter

Recommendation: Refusal
Date for Determination: 16th June 2005

Site and Proposal

1. No 43 Cambridge Road is a modest sized detached bungalow sited within a ribbon of development which runs in a south-eastern direction towards the neighbouring village of Girton. No 43 has been extended to the side and rear at single storey level and has a driveway which runs along the south-eastern boundary of the site providing access to a detached garage and parking area sited to the rear of the dwelling. Whilst the properties sited along Cambridge Road vary in size and design, each property is characterised by its long, rear garden.
2. The 0.12 hectare application site which measures 65 metres in length and 15.7 metres in width currently forms part of the 106 metre long rear garden of No 43 Cambridge Road. The site is bound on three sides by a low fence lined with hedging. The village framework boundary of Oakington runs along the north-eastern boundary of the site with land beyond designated as Green Belt. The application site is located within Flood Zone 3, a high flood risk area,
3. This outline application received on the 21st April 2005 seeks consent for the principle of erecting a bungalow on the site. Whilst all matters are reserved, the illustrative drawings submitted show a widened shared driveway accessed off Cambridge Road which runs along the southeastern boundary of the site. The 4.5 metre wide drive will provide access to an enlarged parking area sited to the rear of No 43 and will then reduce to a 2.4 metre wide drive which runs along the length of No 43's shortened rear garden. To accommodate the widened drive the illustrative plans show the partial demotion of the existing single storey side extension of No 43.
4. The illustrative details submitted show a 3 bedroom bungalow with integral garage sited 31 metres from the village framework boundary. A small garden and parking area is shown between the bungalow and the site boundary shared with No 43 Cambridge Road.
5. The proposed development equates to a density of 8.3 dwellings per hectare.

Planning History

6. None relevant, although the dwelling at No 47a Cambridge Road, referred to below, was granted planning permission in 1962.

Planning Policy

7. **Policy P1/3 ‘Sustainable Design in Built Development’** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003, (“The Structure Plan”) states that a high standard of design and sustainability should be adopted for all new forms of development.
8. **Policy P6/3 ‘Flood Defence’** of ‘The Structure Plan’ states that if development is permitted in areas where flood protection is required, adequate flood protection measures must be secured.
9. **Policy SE4 ‘Group Villages’** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004, (“The Local Plan”) defines Oakington as a Group Village within which residential development will be permitted within the village framework, (up to 8 dwellings) providing the development respects the character of the village, local features of landscape or ecological importance and the amenities of neighbours.
10. **Policy HG11 ‘Backland Development’** of ‘The Local Plan’ sets out the criteria against which proposals to develop to the rear of existing properties must be assessed. This Policy, in part, makes reference to the character and pattern of development of the area, potential noise and disturbance caused by the use of the access drive and the relationship between the proposed dwelling and neighbouring properties.
11. **Policy SE9 ‘ Village Edges’** of ‘The Local Plan’ states that development on the edges of villages should be sympathetically designed and landscaped to minimise any impact on the surrounding countryside.
12. **Policy CS5 ‘ Flood Protection’** of ‘The Local Plan’ sets out the criteria against which development in areas liable to flooding are to be assessed.

Consultations

13. **Oakington Parish Council** – Approves
14. **The Environment Agency** – The application site falls within Flood Zone 3 and therefore a Flood Risk Assessment must be submitted to the Environment Agency.

Representations

15. A supporting statement has been submitted by the agent listing the merits of this proposal. Specific reference is made to the Village Framework boundary, limited public views of the site and the relationship with neighbouring properties.
16. No other comments had been received at the time of writing the report. The consultation period however does not expire until 24th May 2005

Planning Comments – Key Issues

17. The main issues to consider in this case are the impact of the development on the amenities of neighbours, character and appearance of the area and flooding.

Amenities of neighbours

18. Having regard to the illustrative drawings submitted the proposed dwelling will be sited 85 metres back from the highway verge. More than 56 metres separation will be provided to the rear elevation of No 43 while the proposed bungalow will be sited more than 60 metres away from the two adjacent properties, Nos 41 and 45 Cambridge Road.

19. Given the level of separation likely to be provided the proposed siting of a bungalow will not impinge on the amenities of neighbours. The outlook from ground floor windows can be adequately screened by suitable boundary treatment while the height and bulk of a single storey dwelling will not adversely affect the more private garden space of the adjacent properties.
20. A detached garage and parking area are currently provided to the rear of the No 43. To gain access to the rear of the site, the driveway runs between the blank flank wall of the adjacent property, No 45 Cambridge Road, built directly along the common boundary of the site, and the single storey side extension of No 43. The indicative drawings submitted show the access drive is to be increased in width to 4.5 metres. To accommodate this wider shared drive 1.8 metres of the existing single storey extension of No 43 is to be demolished. If approved, the access drive serving two properties will be sited directly adjacent to the living room and kitchen of No 45 and the bedroom study and utility room of No 43. Given the resultant increase in the use of the access this relationship is considered poor and in the opinion of Officers will be the cause of an unreasonable degree of noise and disturbance to the habitable room space of Nos 43 and 45 Cambridge Road.
21. Given the siting of No 45, directly adjacent to the site boundary, it is also considered that the use of the access drive, which as shown on the indicative drawings runs directly adjacent to the neighbours private garden, will cause a unreasonable degree of noise and disturbance to the private amenity space of No 45.
22. Where access to a back land plot works, adequate separation is required to both adjoining properties to ensure cars do not pass directly adjacent to the flank walls of either dwelling, especially where adjacent to habitable rooms. Where roadways then run directly adjacent to private garden space, sufficient separation is required to provide some form of noise buffer either a wall, significant area of landscaping or preferably both. Given the narrow width of the site it would appear that such separation cannot be provided without unreasonably impacting on the enjoyment of No 43 and/or No 45's rear garden.
23. Notwithstanding the objections to the use of the proposed shared access drive, the siting of the access and visibility provided are both considered acceptable.

Character and appearance of the area

24. The properties sited along Cambridge Road form a strong ribbon of development, characterised by long rear gardens. Whilst a number of modest sized outbuildings are sited to the rear of these properties, these long gardens form a sympathetic backdrop to the village edge. While the dimensions of the application site are sufficient to accommodate a modest bungalow without unduly impinging on the appearance of the adjoining Green Belt, with the exception of 47a Cambridge Road, back land development is not in keeping with the local pattern of development. Given the form of this strong ribbon of development it is the opinion of Officers that the erection of a bungalow in this location would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area.
25. Whilst No 47a is sited to the rear of 49 and 51 Cambridge Road, this property is sited just 60 metres back from the highway verge and 32 metres from the rear elevation of No 49. This structure is therefore better related to this strong ribbon of development. Furthermore this dwelling is viewed against the small agglomeration of buildings that form Mansel Farm, and is therefore not viewed as a stand-alone structure. This

dwelling therefore does not have the same harmful impact on the pattern of development of the area.

Flooding

26. The application site is located within Flood Zone 3. Despite informing the agent of this constraint, no Flood Risk Assessment has been submitted. In the absence of a Flood Risk Assessment and appropriate mitigation measures, it is probable that the proposed development would be subject to potential flooding whilst also increasing the potential of flood risk to existing properties.

Recommendation

Refusal

The proposed bungalow is to be sited on land to the rear of 43 Cambridge Road, a detached bungalow with a long rear garden sited within a strong ribbon of development. The Village Framework Boundary runs along the northeastern boundary of the site with land beyond designated as Green Belt.

- 1) Despite these properties having very long rear gardens, back land development is not a common design feature of the area and the erection of a dwelling sited between 65 and 85 metres back from the highway verge will fail to respect the pattern of development of the area. Although No. 47a lies to the rear of Nos 49 and 51 Cambridge Road, this property is more closely related to this ribbon of development and is viewed in the context of a small agglomeration of buildings that form Mansel Farm. It is therefore considered, irrespective of this previous approval, that the proposed development will form an alien feature within the local landscape and would fail to respect the established pattern of development within the vicinity of the site.

This proposal is therefore considered contrary to Policy P1/3 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 and Policies SE4 and HG11 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.

- 2) The proposed access drive, which will serve the existing and proposed property, will run directly adjacent to the habitable room space of both 43 and 45 Cambridge Road. The indicative drawings show that a proportion of the existing single storey side extension of No 43 is to be demolished to accommodate the widened driveway. Given the close proximity of both adjacent properties, the use of the adjoining rooms, and the siting of the access drive in relation to the private rear garden area of No 45, it is considered that the use of the access will result in an unacceptable level of noise and disturbance that will detrimentally affect the residential amenities of both adjacent dwellings, Nos 43 and 45 Cambridge Road.

This proposal is therefore considered contrary to Policies SE4 and HG11 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.

- 3) The application site is located with Flood Zone 3, an area affected by poor drainage and localised flooding. In the absence of a flood risk assessment and appropriate mitigation measures it is considered probable that the proposed development of the site for a bungalow would subject the property to the potential of flooding and increase the flood risk for existing properties in the neighbourhood. As such it would be contrary to Policy P6/3 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 and Policy CS5 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.

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

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- Planning file Ref S/0817/05/O

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

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation Control Committee 1st June 2005
AUTHOR/S: Director of Development Services

S/0756/05/PNA - Girton
Erection of General Purpose Agricultural Building, Manor Farm, for Mr and Mrs K Dawson

Recommendation: No objection
Date for Determination: 10th June 2005

Site and Proposal

1. The application site measures 1.2 hectares, (3 acres) in area, and is an owner occupied area of land that forms part of Mr and Mrs Dawson larger agricultural holding. Manor Farm and its small agglomeration of buildings are sited approximately 80 metres south of the site with Girton Cottage, a privately owned residential dwelling located in between, 22 metres south of the site boundary. There is a public footpath along the south east boundary.
2. The application site is bound on all sides by an established hedge. The southwest facing boundary which abuts Girton Cottage is slightly higher and is more dense.
3. This Prior Notification of Agricultural Permitted Development, received on the 15th April 2005 seeks approval for the siting and appearance of a general-purpose agricultural building. The barn is to be used for the storage of hay and straw and some farmyard equipment/machinery. The barn which measures 18.29 metres in length, 9.14 metres in width and 4.88 metres in height is to be sited adjacent to the south west boundary of the site, set 40 metres back from the field access, due north of Girton Cottage.

Planning History

4. A Prior Notification of Agricultural Development application, (reference **S/2144/04/PNA**), received on the 20th October 2004 sought consent for the same general purpose agricultural building sited on the same parcel of land. The barn was again to be sited adjacent to the southwestern boundary of the site albeit 8 metres closer to the field access. At the December 2004 meeting of the Development and Conservation Control Committee (item 19), objections were raised to the siting and appearance of the barn due to the relationship with Girton Cottage and the resultant overbearing affect.

Planning Policy

5. The site is located within the Green Belt. **Planning Policy Guidance Note 2** (Green Belts), **Policy P9/2a** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003, ('Structure Plan') and **Policy GB2** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004, ('Local Plan') seeks to restrict inappropriate forms of development within the Green Belt. The siting of agricultural buildings is considered appropriate providing the openness of the Green Belt is maintained.

6. **Policy P1/3** of the Structure Plan states that a high standard of design and sustainability should be adopted for all new forms of development.

Consultation

7. **Girton Parish Council** – Refuse. Concerns raised regarding the right of access to the field and the impact of the barn on Girton Cottage
8. **County Council Countryside Services Team** – No response received at the time of writing this report. Consultation period does not expire until 2nd June 2005. Any comments received will be reported verbally to Committee.
9. **Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum** - No response received at the time of writing this report. Consultation period does not expire until 2nd June 2005. Any comments received will be reported verbally to Committee.

Representations

10. None received at the time of writing this report. Notification by way of site notice only. 21 day consultation period does not expire until 20th May 2005. Any comments received will be reported verbally to Members.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

11. As this is a Prior Notification of Agricultural Development, only the siting and appearance of the barn are to be considered. The key issues are the design of the barn and the impact of the proposed structure on the openness of the Green Belt and residential amenities of Girton Cottage. Firstly however the relationship of the application site to Mr and Mrs Dawson's agricultural holding must be considered.

Agricultural holding

12. When the previous application was submitted, (reference S/2144/04/PNA), Mr and Mrs Dawson occupied Manor Farm and the associated land under a Agricultural Holdings Act Tenancy. The combined area of Manor Farm and the applicants owner occupied parcel of land, (the application site) formed an agricultural holding measuring 47.35 hectares in area.
13. It is now understood that the applicants tenancy has expired and the adjoining land known as Manor Farm, no longer forms part of their holding. Whilst the agent has stated that the applicant still has a agricultural holding of 5.39 hectares, (including the application site), a plan confirming the extent and siting of this additional land had not, at the time of writing this report, been received by the Council. The awaited plan will be presented at the Committee Meeting.
14. Having spoken with the County Farms Manager it is his understanding that Mr Dawson has surrendered his Tenancy agreement for the 46 hectare holding. Mr Dawson now only leases Manor Farm House, (no other buildings) and a 3.106 hectare field, (7.67 acre) adjacent to Manor Farm, under a Farm Business Tenancy until 2015. It is the County Farm Managers understanding that this 3.106 hectare field is the extent of the applicants' agricultural holding.
15. Providing the area of the applicants holding exceeds 5 hectares and the land identified is for the purpose of Class A, Part 6 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, considered to form an "Agricultural Holding", this proposal can still be considered under this Prior Notification of

Agricultural Development. If the applicants Agricultural Holding does not exceed 5 hectares not only will a full planning application be required to erect the proposed barn but the need to erect such a large structure, within the Green Belt, serving such a small holding, would be questioned.

16. This issue will be discussed in more detail at the Committee Meeting when further details from the agent have been submitted. For the remainder of this report this proposal will be assessed on the basis of the information contained within the application form which states that the applicants agricultural holding exceeds 5 hectares.

Green Belt

17. To avoid unnecessary intrusion in the Green Belt and open countryside, additional agricultural buildings are ideally grouped together. In this instance the proposed barn is to be sited on a separate parcel of land, 80 metres north of Manor Farm.
18. Whilst the barn is not incorporated within the built up farmyard, it is the opinion of Officers that the proposed structure will not adversely affect the openness of the Green Belt. The majority of the structure will be well screened by the boundary planting. Being sited adjacent to existing buildings, (Girton Cottage and Manor Farm) the proposed barn will also not be viewed as a stand-alone structure.

Impact on Girton Cottage

19. The proposed barn is to be sited to the north of Girton Cottage and will be located on the opposite side of a dense hedge, 26 metres+ from the rear most point of the adjacent dwelling. Whilst the proposed barn measures 18.29 metres in length and 4.88 metres in height, the barn has been re-sited further away from the field access to improve the relationship with Girton Cottage.
20. Following objections being raised to the previous application, the applicant has considered, at length, the potential to re-site the barn further away from Girton Cottage. Overhead power lines cross the centre of the site running diagonally in a southwest–northeast direction. EDF Energy has advised that for safety reasons the barn must not be sited within 18 metres of the lowest conductor on the 132kV steel tower line which crosses the site. The proposed barn abuts this defined safety zone and therefore the maximum clearance to Girton Cottage has been provided.
21. The proposed barn is to be used for the storage of hay, straw and some equipment and machinery. Whilst, due to seasonal changes the contents of the barn will vary, the barn will not be used to accommodate livestock. Given the revised location and proposed use, the siting of the barn, with regards to Girton Cottage, is considered acceptable.

Design of Barn

22. The proposed barn is a standard design. Given its sympathetic location it is my view that the proposed structure will not appear intrusive. The proposed wall and roof sheeting of the barn is to be painted green ensuring the building does not appear incongruous within the rural landscape.

Other issues

23. The Parish Council has raised concerns regarding the access to the field. These concerns were raised in the previous application and the agent then stated that access to the barn is provided across the applicant's legal right of way leading from Manor Farm Road, along the track adjacent to Girton Cottage. At this time, the

applicant still leased the surrounding land. As this lease has now expired, further confirmation of the access arrangements have again been sought. A plan showing the legal right of access is to be submitted.

24. As the access to the site passes over a public right of way the views of Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum and the Countryside Services Team have been sought. Any comments raised will be reported verbally to the Committee

Recommendation

25. No objection subject to the submission of a satisfactory plan showing the precise siting of Mr and Mrs Dawson's 5.39 hectare Agricultural Holding

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

- Planning Policy Guidance Note 2 (Green Belts)
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- Planning files S/2144/04/PNA and S/0756/05/PNA

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

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/1425/04/F	T Mendham Adj 9 Six Mile Bottom Road West Wrattling House (Officer Recommendation to Refuse)	Allowed 14/04/2005
S/1484/04/F	P Mullins 2 Cody Road Waterbeach Dwelling (Delegated Refusal)	Allowed 14/04/2005
S/1302/04/F	Merton College Land south of Station Road Gamlingay Variation of condition 1 of planning permission S1737/01/O to allow a further period of 3 years for the submission of reserved matters (Officer Recommendation to Approve)	Allowed 14/04/2005
S/1254/04/F	Mrs E Farrow R/o 44-50 High Street Landbeach Bungalow (Delegated Refusal)	Dismissed 15/04/2005
S/1394/04/F	Mrs A Gawthrop 1 Moores Court Cottenham Conservatory (Delegated Refusal)	Dismissed 15/04/2005
S/1729/04/F	Mr & Mrs Jackson 16 Burrough Field Impington Extension (Delegated Refusal)	Allowed 15/04/2005

S/1066/04/F	R Hinde 4 Magdalene Close Longstanton Erection of fence and gate and change of use of land to domestic Garden (Officer Recommendation to Approve)	Allowed 18/04/2005
S/1614/04/O	Mr & Mrs Baker 36 Station Road Over Erection of 5 dwellings following demolition of existing dwelling and outbuildings (Delegated Refusal)	Dismissed 18/04/2005
S/1430/04/F	Mr & Mrs McKensie 2 The Hemlocks Haslingfield Raising roof height and addition of dormer window. (Officer Recommendation to Approve)	Allowed 22/04/2005
S/1117/04/O	T Pavey 41 St Neots Road Hardwick Dwelling (Delegated Refusal)	Dismissed 22/04/2005
S/0797/04/F	Mr S Godsell 110 Watermead Bar Hill Extensions and change of use (Officer Recommendation to Refuse)	Dismissed 25/04/2005
S/0922/04/F	Ms A Engleman Grantchester Road Barton Formation of golf driving range, five hole golf course, range building, clubhouse and store (Delegated Refusal)	Dismissed 25/04/2005
S/0578/04/F	Upware Marina 15 High Street Shepreth Erection of house and garage following demolition of existing Bungalow (Officer Recommendation to Refuse)	Allowed 28/04/2005
S/1223/04/F	Mr J Mannion Magnolia House, Linton Road Horseheath Extension (Delegated Refusal)	Dismissed 28/04/2005

S/1050/04/F	Mr J O'Farrell R/o 11/13 Fishers Lane Orwell Dwelling (Delegated Refusal)	Allowed 29/04/2005
S/1392/04/F	Amanda Philips Scotts Gardens Whittlesford Dwelling (Delegated Refusal)	Allowed 04/05/2005
S/1007/04/O	Executors of P E Q Francis Land adj 77 Station Road Stow-cum-Quy 2 houses renewal of time limited permission S/0411/01/O (Delegated Refusal)	Dismissed 10/05/2005

2. Summaries of recent decisions of interest

P Mansfield – Demolition of garage, erection of side extension and new front bay window – 29 Worcester Avenue, Hardwick – Appeal allowed

The main issue was the effect of the new side extension on the character and appearance of the area. The appeal was considered by way of a hearing. The appellants made an application for costs.

The property is a semi-detached chalet style dwelling on the corner with Pippin Walk. Land to the front and side of the property is mainly grassed and enclosed by a coniferous hedge. Pippin walk is a pedestrian route only and the adjoining front gardens are largely open and undeveloped. The inspector accepted that collectively the front gardens form one of several green corridors in the locality and these soften the generally developed character of the surrounding estate.

To his mind, the character of Pippin Walk would be unharmed by the size and siting of the proposed “substantial” extension. It would still leave an undeveloped area between it and the footpath and would not intrude into the undeveloped green corridor to such an extent that it would be visually intrusive. The location of the property suggests that a comparable proposal would be unlikely elsewhere and approval would not set a precedent.

Permission was granted subject to the submission of details regarding materials.

The appellants applied for costs on the grounds the Council's refusal was unreasonable. The case advanced for the Council was particularly weak and not expanded on at the hearing. A reference to the site as having open/amenity value was untrue. There was no evidence that the extension would be out of place. The Council's proof of evidence was not to the standard that was acceptable.

The Council responded that the reasons for refusal detailed its perception of the site and its contribution to the character and appearance of the area. They were precise, specific and relevant to the application and based on relevant development plan

policies, taking into account government advice. This was a case where the issues were finely balanced. Decisions relating to visual amenity are often subjective. The alleged harm had been substantiated in the hearing statement and in evidence given at the hearing.

In refusing the application for costs, the inspector agreed that the reason for refusal was complete, precise, specific and relevant to the application. The Council's hearing statement had set out its assessment of the character of the area in terms of the relevant development plan policies. This was explained further at the hearing. The Council did not behave unreasonably in the quality of its evidence.

Dr & Mrs N Coleman – House and garage – 33 Mill Hill, Weston Colville – Appeal dismissed

This appeal, and the two that follow are all concerned with the provision of affordable housing.

This appeal was concerned solely with the provision of affordable housing. It was considered by way of a hearing and was attended by a representative of the Parish Council.

The site forms part of larger site, which had previously been granted planning permission for one dwelling. The appellant sought to split the site into two and erect a second dwelling on the newly created site. Although the proposal was therefore for one dwelling, the Council considered that it should be considered with the permitted scheme as one site for two houses. In the light of this, the new house should be an affordable unit in line with Local Plan Policy HG7. The appellant considered this approach was untenable.

The inspector considered that to assess whether the two plots should be regarded as parts of a larger site, certain factors needed to be taken into account. These were single ownership, whether they comprised a single site for planning purposes and whether they constituted a single development. In this case they were in the one ownership, they appeared as part of the garden of the existing property, would share the same driveway and a new sewer. They effectively comprised a single plot for planning purposes. Although the two dwellings were of similar design, this was not conclusive of them comprising a single scheme. Any marketing strategy was irrelevant.

The first dwelling was approved before the existing Local Plan came into effect, and before any requirement to provide affordable housing on a site such as this. Nonetheless, the existing local plan was relevant and the inspector had judged that this was effectively one site. The local plan could be applied to the whole development. The appellant suggested that with such a restriction, the house would not be built and the land retained and developed at a later date when there was no affordable housing requirement. The inspector was not persuaded that this was a convincing argument to ignore the policy requirement.

A village housing needs survey was published in 2003. The inspector was satisfied that this adequately demonstrated a need for affordable housing. While he was disappointed that the Council had not sought to negotiate before the application was refused, this did not undermine its approach to the consideration of need.

As the proposal did not meet part of the defined need as set out in Policy HG7, the appeal was dismissed.

Mr K Dyer – Pair of semi-detached houses - Land adj to 72 Kingsway, Heathfield, Duxford – Appeal dismissed

In this appeal by written representations, the site adjoined the Green Belt. The inspector agreed with the Council that the proposed houses would be very conspicuous from the Green Belt and that they would be out of character with their surroundings. The proposal would amount to an overdevelopment of the site and should be resisted on this issue.

The Council argued that if allowed, one of the houses should be an affordable unit. The circumstances were the same as for the above appeal in Weston Colville in that both settlements are classed as infill-only villages, have limited services and there is an extant housing needs survey which provides a demonstrable need for affordable housing.

In this case, however, the inspector placed greater emphasis on the low level of facilities and services. As the development was for a pair of small (three-bedroom) semi-detached dwellings, he found the "... practicality and relevance of the Policy (HG7) in this case to be somewhat limited." Had the appeal been acceptable in other respects, no requirement for an affordable unit would have been necessary.

Executors of P E Francis – Outline application for two houses – 77 Station Road, Stow-cum-Quy – Appeal dismissed

In this third case, the appellant sought to renew an outline planning permission previously granted in 2001. The renewal of permission was refused on the grounds that the Council sought a more efficient use of the site and that 50% of the total number of houses should be affordable. As with two other cases, Stow-cum-Quy is an infill village with limited services and facilities.

The site is constrained by a tree preservation order covering six trees and lies in an area of low density housing close to a listed building. All of these factors led the inspector to conclude that a development of just two dwellings is the most appropriate for the site.

On the question of affordable housing, the inspector noted the latest district housing needs survey and the local housing needs survey for the village. The appellants did not dispute that there should be a requirement for affordable housing, but argued this was not an appropriate site. This argument was based on likely development costs and that this is a scarce, prime site with enviable views over the countryside.

The inspector did not consider that these arguments would prevent a unit of affordable housing being provided. There was no evidence that this would make the development of the site unviable.

The appellant proposed to address the issue by offering a commuted sum (£35,000) to be paid to the Council in lieu of on-site provision. The Council rejected this on the grounds that it would not address the perceived shortfall of accommodation in the village and was not consistent with adopted policy. The inspector agreed. He accepted the argument that RSL's will take on single-dwelling developments. He noted that a site in Main Street may bring forward an element of affordable housing, but that this would not meet all of the locally identified need. The Council had resolved to accept a commuted payment for a site in Caldecote, but in that case the Parish Council did not want any more affordable housing in the village. That is not the case in Stow-cum-Quy. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

Comment: These three decisions involve villages of similar size and scale yet highlight some inconsistency in the reasoning of different inspectors. The two dismissed appeals show that Policy HG7 is standing up to closer scrutiny and that even in our smaller villages a demand for affordable housing should be met. The decision for Heathfield is the first of some half a dozen decisions where the inspector has decided that the policy should not be applied. He appears to be saying that a three-bedroom property is, by definition, more affordable. If the appeal had been allowed, it would have prompted the question whether permission should have been conditioned to prevent increasing the size of the property to ensure that it remained “affordable” to as many people as possible.

Dr & Mrs Mackenzie – New pitched roof and rear dormer - 2 The Hemlocks, Haslingfield – Appeal allowed

This application was refused by the Committee on the grounds of harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area and to the amenities of the neighbouring residential property.

The alterations involved raising the roof ridge by about 1.1m. The conservation area boundary passes through the site and the area comprises an assortment of buildings of various ages and architectural styles. The inspector found that taken together, the buildings make a pleasant and varied mixture and this helps to make the area attractive.

In his judgement, the increase in roof height would make the appeal property more, not less, in keeping with the street scene. He noted that the conservation officer had held a similar view. The added height would not make the building intrusive or harmful to the street scene. It would be taller than its neighbours, but there is already a variation in roof heights and the increase would not appear incongruous. The proposal would at least preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The proposed dormer would light a shower room. It could be obscure glazed and non-opening. The sill of a proposed rooflight could have a minimum height. Subject to these measures, there would be no overlooking of the neighbour’s garden. No weight should be given to the “perceived overlooking” as this would be into their garden and not into the house itself.

The appeal was allowed subject to the prevention of additional openings in the first floor elevations facing neighbouring properties, details of materials, confirmation of the sill height of the rooflight and openings being obscure glazed and maintained as fixed and non-opening.

Merton College – Appeal against condition requiring the submission of reserved matters within one year (and not the normal three) – Land south of Station Road, Gamlingay – Appeal allowed

This appeal arose following the Committee’s decision to encourage the early submission of details for industrial development on the site. Outline permission had originally been granted in 1996 following an allocation in the 1993 Local Plan. The reason for the condition was to ensure that the consideration of any future application would not be prejudiced by any permission that has not been acted upon.

While some time had elapsed since the original grant of permission, the appellant indicated he had been actively marketing the site. This had entailed the need to provide a number of smaller, serviced plots on the site. The inspector found this to be an entirely rational approach. A planning application made in 1997 involved the use of land for recreational purposes. This was subject to a legal agreement that was not completed until 2002. This delay necessitated successive renewals of the outline planning permission. There was no evidence that the alleged unreasonably high price for the site had deterred interest from companies. In short, there was no convincing argument that the appellant does not intend to implement the planning permission.

There was no dispute over the cost of the associated roads and infrastructure works and end-users were unlikely to be attracted until these works are in place, or underway. Insistence on condition 1 would be counter-productive. Neither was there any evidence that the development of suitable alternative sites is being prejudiced.

Allowing a period of three years for the submission of reserved matters would encourage further investment by the appellant and increase the likelihood of the scheme coming to fruition.

Upware Marina – Demolition of bungalow and erection of house – 15 High Street, Shepreth – Appeal allowed.

The main issue in this written representations appeal was the likely impact on the privacy and outlook of adjoining residents. The inspector noted that the house at 9 Huttles Green was 30m away at its nearest point and would not suffer any adverse overlooking of its rear garden. No. 8 Huttles Green is some 16m away at its closest point. The potential to overlook its south facing rear garden had been reduced by the deletion of a bedroom window. The new house would be well designed with a domestic scale appropriate to its surroundings. As such, it would not be overbearing in views from either adjoining property.

Planning permission was granted subject to conditions re materials, the prevention of additional openings in the first floor elevations facing neighbouring properties and the protection of trees during construction.

R Hinde – Erection of fence and gate change of use of land to domestic garden – 4 Magdalene Close, Longstanton – Appeal allowed

This application was refused because of the perceived harm to the character and appearance of the area. The fence and gate had since been erected.

The inspector noted that the Council had granted planning permission for a similar alteration to the boundary fence between nos 13 and 14 in June 2004. That development has been implemented. He found it has no material impact on visual amenity. A small amount of community space had been lost, but this is insignificant in the context of the extensive tract of land available for that purpose. The proposed development was not significantly different. It was therefore unreasonable and inconsistent to refuse planning permission for this similar development

The fence and gate could remain subject to it matching the existing fence and gate on the site

Comment: Had this appeal been considered at a hearing, the appellant could have made an application for costs. These could well have been granted on the basis that the Council's decision was considered unreasonable in the light of its earlier decision.

3. Appeals received

Ref. No.	Details	Date
S/1207/04/F	Mr & Mrs Allen R/o 32 Fen End Willingham Dwelling and garage (Delegated Refusal)	15/04/2005
S/2446/04/O	Mr T Day R/o 97 New Road Haslingfield Dwelling (Delegated Refusal)	18/04/2005
S/1137/04/F	Optima (Cambridge) Ltd Croydon House Farm Croydon Conversion of agricultural buildings to 4 home/work dwellings (mixed use classes C3 & B1) car parking and alterations to access (Officer Recommendation to Approve)	22/04/2005
S/0179/05/F	Mr Crickmore The Barn, Chesterton Fen Road Milton Conversion of barn/stable into dwelling (Delegated Refusal)	28/04/2005
S/0343/05/PNT	Hutchison 3G Uk Ltd London Road/Church Street Stapleford 12 meter high telecommunications monopole and associated development (Delegated Refusal)	03/05/2005
S/0166/05/F	Hutchison 3G Uk Ltd North East Farm, Cambridge Road Eltisley 20M Telecommunications tower and associated development (Officer Recommendation to Approve)	03/05/2005

S/0446/05/A	Marshall Mitsubishi 699 Newmarket Road, Cambridge Fen Ditton Signs (Delegated Refusal)	10/05/2005
S/1951/04/LB	Mr R Poulter Golden Gables, Sanders Lane Fulbourn Total demolition of listed, thatched barn (Officer Recommendation to Approve)	09/05/2005

4. Local Inquiry and Informal Hearing dates scheduled before the next meeting on 6th July 2005

Ref. No.	Details	Date/Time/Venue
E483C & D	Mr & Mrs Ryan 15 Angle End Great Wilbraham Enforcement against the erection of a single storey, flat roofed extension to form a lobby at the rear of the building. (Hearing)	14/06/2005 10.00am Monkfield Room
E493	Miss Lovitt & Mr Scrafton 6 Honey Hill Gamlingay Enforcement for removal of 5-bar gate and gate posts (Hearing)	30/06/2005 10.00am Monkfield Room

5. Appeals withdrawn or postponed - None

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

Ref. No.	Details	Date
S/0246/04/RM	Cofton Ltd., Peter Stroude, George Wimpey East Anglia, Kings Phase 2, Home Farm Confirmed Longstanton Erection of 200 dwellings and ancillary works (Local Inquiry)	07/07/2005

S/0761/04/F	B Gemmil, A Sheridan, E Sheridan & K Sheridan Plots 1-11 Victoria View, off Orchard Drive Confirmed Cottenham Use of land for gypsy caravan site, (11 pitches) part Retrospective (Local Inquiry)	12/07/2005
S/1569/04/F	Mr M Hegerty Land off Victoria View, Smithy Fen Confirmed Cottenham Siting of 4 gypsy caravans (Local Inquiry)	12/07/2005
S/1589/04/F	M Quilligan Land off Water Lane, Smithy Fen Confirmed Cottenham Siting of 2 gypsy caravans (Local Inquiry)	12/07/2005
E353	Mr P McCarthy Plot 2 & R/o 2 Setchel Drove Confirmed Cottenham Enforcement against change of use of site to use as a residential Caravan site (Re-Determination following High Court Challenge) (Local Inquiry)	12/07/2005
S/1020/03/F	Mr P McCarthy R/o 2 Setchel Drove Confirmed Cottenham Siting of 2 gypsy caravans and shower block (Re-Determination following High Court Challenge) (Local Inquiry)	12/07/2005
S/0682/95/O	Peter L Stroude Land West of Longstanton (Home Farm) Offered/ Longstanton Increase number of dwellings from 500 to 630 (Local Inquiry)	27/07/2005
S/0629/04/F	Mr and Mrs Noyes 22 North Brook End Confirmed Steeple Morden Extension	04/10/2005

S/0628/04/LB	Mr and Mrs Noyes 22 North Brook End	04/10/2005 Confirmed
	Steeple Morden Internal and external alterations including conversion of bathroom to utility room and two ground floor bedrooms to study and garden room (Hearing)	
S/1109/04/F	Beaugrove Ltd. Crail, High Street Croydon Erection of two houses following demolition of existing house (Hearing)	11/10/2005 Confirmed
S/0592/04/F	R W S Arnold Bennell Farm, West Street (Comberton) Toft Erection of B1 offices (Hearing)	09/11/2005 Confirmed
S/2062/04/F	R W S Arnold Bennell Farm, West Street (Comberton) Toft Erection of B1 offices (Hearing)	09/11/2005 confirmed
S/6258/04/RM	MCA Developments Land South of Great Cambourne Cambourne Alterations in land form (dispersion of soil from building works.) (Local Inquiry)	14/03/2006 Offered/

This page is intentionally left blank

PERFORMANCE CRITERIA

Quarterly Statistics

In the fourth quarter of 2004, the number of applications received by South Cambridgeshire increased by 3.7% over the corresponding period in 2003. In England there was a 3% increase.

The percentage of all decisions taken within the eight week period in the District was 74% compared with 77% in England. The equivalent figure for householder development was 83.6% compared with the national figure of 86%.

The percentage of decisions delegated to officers in this quarter was 89%. There is no equivalent national figure, but in Cambridgeshire the average figure was 91%. The Government has set a target of 90%.

The new Government targets are included in the Statistical Release. On the "excluding major and minor applications" where the Government target is 80% in eight weeks, the Council achieved 81% whilst on the "minor" category where we are urged to decide 65% in eight weeks the Council achieved 63%. The more difficult target is the Government's 60% in thirteen weeks for major applications ie things like the Wellcome Trust or the Northern Fringe! Here the Council achieved 35%.

The graphs, which accompany this report, illustrate the picture in Cambridgeshire for each of these development types during the year ending 31st December 2004 and the quarter October to December 2004.

Retrospective Applications

In response to a recommendation from Scrutiny Committee (17th April 2003), the number of retrospective applications are to be recorded.

Thus in the fourth quarter of 2004, the number of retrospective applications submitted was 21. This represented 3.5% of all applications submitted during that quarter. Of the 16 retrospective applications which have been determined, (five are still in progress) 81% have been approved and 19% refused. During the quarter 84% of all applications were approved.

Enforcement Statistics (Quarter ending December 2004)

Statistics for the previous quarter are in brackets.

Enforcement Notices	7	(4)
Stop Notices	1	(1)
Planning Contravention Notices	11	(10)
Breach of Condition Notices	2	(0)
Amenity Notices	1	(0)
Number of Complaints	69	(78)
Prosecutions	0	(0)
Injunctions	0	(1)

Trees and Landscaping Statistics (Quarter ending December 2004)

Statistics for the previous quarter are in brackets.

Applications for work on Statutorily Protected Trees

(Tree Preservation Orders and Conservation Areas)

Number of applications – Received	149	(140)
-----------------------------------	-----	-------

Landscaping

Number of landscaping conditions received from DC	86	(96)
Number of weekly actions	423	(852)
Number of schemes submitted	91	(92)
Number of schemes finalised and approved	22	(36)
Number of landscaping conditions currently active (excluding Cambourne work)	784	(832)
Number of breach of condition notices requested	2	(3)

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1986

Background papers in respect of this report for the purposes of the above Act are available for inspections in accordance with the provision of that Act:

- a) Any planning application, including plans and any accompanying letter or document from the applicant.
- b) Any letter or representation received in connection with a matter reported.
- c) Any Structure Plan, Local Plan or Policy Document referred to in a report.
- d) Any agenda, report or minutes of a meeting of the Council referred to in a report.
- e) Any other publication, document or report referred to in the report.

Files on individual items on the agenda are available as required from the following individuals:

Mr J Belcham	(01954) 713252
Mr A Moffat	(01954) 713169
Mr S Anderson	(01954) 713165
Mr D Rush	(01954) 713153
Mr P Sexton	(01954) 713255

D B Hussell
Development Services Director

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation
Control Committee

1st June 2005

AUTHOR/S: Finance and Resources Director

Tree Preservation Order – Longstanton

Recommendation: To confirm without modification

Purpose

1. To review Tree Preservation Order no.05/05/SC, made under delegated powers at Woodside, Longstanton..

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

3. Once made, Tree Preservation Orders remain in force for a provisional period of six months, but can be confirmed at any time.

Considerations

4. Tree Preservation Order 05/05/SC was made on 28th February 2005. The Schedule of trees is attached at **Appendix 1** and the Plan at **Appendix 2**.
5. The Council made the Tree Preservation Order because the woodland is of visual importance to the local landscape and has been a specific consideration in the current assessment of the Conservation Area review
6. The statutory period for the registering of objections to the Order ended on 4th April 2005.. The two letters of objection are attached at **Appendix 3**. A site visit took place on 17th May 2005, at which the Committee Chairman and Vice-Chairman were present together with the Trees and Landscape Officer.

Options

7. 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 27th August 2005.. By confirming it now, the Council will ensure that the Tree Preservation Order remains in force beyond that date. The Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Development and Conservation Control Committee agreed with the Trees and Landscape Officer that the Order should be confirmed without modification.

Recommendations

13. It is **recommended** that Tree Preservation Order 05/05/SC in Longstanton be confirmed without modification..

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

- Tree Preservation Order no. 05/05/SC In Longstanton and the relevant file maintained by the Trees and Landscape Section
- Letter dated 3rd March 2005 from Mr and Mrs J Waters
- Letter dated 25th March 2005 from the Trustees of Mrs AM Parker (dec'd)

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

First Schedule
Woodside, Longstanton

<u>N° on Map</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Situation</u>
<u>Woodland</u> (Within a solid black line on the map)		
W1	Woodland mainly comprising of a mix of Pine, Ash, Silver Birch, Maple	Located behind N° 61-65a Woodside, Longstanton

Individual Trees
(Circled in black on the map)

NONE

Areas of Trees
(Within a dotted black line on the map)

NONE

Groups of Trees
(Within a broken black line on the map)

NONE

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

At a meeting of the Development and Conservation Control Sub-Committee held on
Tuesday, 10 May 2005 at 1.30 p.m.

PRESENT: Councillor Dr DR Bard – Chairman

Councillors:	Mrs J Dixon	SM Edwards
	Dr JPR Orme	Mrs DP Roberts
	Mrs DSK Spink MBE	NIC Wright

Councillors SGM Kindersley, R Summerfield and Dr SEK van de Ven were in attendance, by invitation.

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for Absence were received from Councillor TJ Wotherspoon (a local Member for Cottenham) and Mr JS Ballantyne (Chief Executive).

2. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Councillor Mrs J Dixon declared a personal interest as a resident of Smithy Fen, Cottenham.

3. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

Councillor Mrs DP Roberts proposed, Councillor Mrs DSK Spink seconded, and it was **RESOLVED** that the Press and Public be excluded during the consideration of the following items in accordance with Section 100(A) (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that, if present, there would be disclosure to them of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 10, 11 and 13 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Those present authorised the Chairman to sign, as correct records, the Minutes of the meetings held on 10th November 2004 and 6th December 2004, subject to the addition of Councillor Dr JPR Orme to the list of those attending the meeting on 10th November.

It was noted that Councillor Dr S van de Ven was not actually a Member of the Sub-Committee.

5. APPROACH TO POSSIBLE PLANNING ENFORCEMENT AT PINE VIEW, SMITHY FEN

Those present considered a report updating them on the options available to the Council in relation to the unauthorised traveller plots at Pine View, Smithy Fen, and the next steps in the process. A further report, prepared by external legal advisers, was circulated at the meeting.

The Deputy Prime Minister's decision

Officers highlighted the significance of 11th June 2005, being the date by which travellers at Pine View, Smithy Fen had to leave the site. Officers said that, while no enforcement decisions could be made until after that date, there was nothing to stop the Council from

making appropriate preparations in the meantime.

In response to a Member's question, it was reported that current enforcement orders had been obtained in respect of both named individuals and persons unknown.

Negotiations with travellers at Pine View, Smithy Fen

Officers reported on a meeting with a traveller. Members noted the comments of the Planning Inspector (that enforcement action did not violate any rights to education) and expressed caution that the Council's resolve should not be deflected by arguments that travellers' children were now established at local schools. Legal advice was received.

Members discussed the following points:

- Suggestions made by the traveller at the meeting with officers.
- The affordability of alternative plots
- The need to progress the Council's approach, and to present this approach in more definite and assertive terms.
- Procedure in establishing the Council's next moves
- Compulsory Purchase

In response to a Member's question, the external legal adviser highlighted the need for the Council to re-evaluate compliance with the Human Rights checklist at each step.

In response to another Member's question about working in partnership with outside agencies, Members were advised that it was very important to be able to demonstrate fairness at every stage.

It was agreed that confirmation of further negotiations with travellers and contact with the the Commission for Racial Equality must be put in writing.

All ongoing negotiations should be conducted on a 'without prejudice' basis.

Legal options

The external legal adviser strongly advised those present to do nothing that might be perceived as prejudging the issue. Preferred options were sufficient at this stage. Further legal advice was received in relation to injunctive action.

Officers said that it was essential that the Council should be seen to be doing something, but that it was equally important that its actions were reasonable.

Members discussed the options of taking a two-pronged approach (based on enforcement and injunctions) and possible ways of recovering costs from the unauthorised travellers.

Liaison with the local community

Members discussed the proposal that a letter be written to a range of partner agencies serving Cottenham, as well as local community groups, to seek their views on the way forward.

The Development and Conservation Control Sub-Committee **RECOMMENDED** that the Development and Conservation Control Committee endorse the Sub-Committee's preferred approach of embracing the use of legal injunctions, coupled with other action, in the event of non-compliance with enforcement notices;

The Development and Conservation Control Sub-Committee **RESOLVED**

- (1) That the Council should respond, in writing, to the suggestions arising from discussions with the unauthorised traveller at Pine View, Smithy Fen, reaffirming its preferred approach and rejecting the proposals as inappropriate in the circumstances;
- (2) That liaison should continue with Cottenham Parish Council and that the Council should continue to communicate the message to the local community that a land clearance operation at Pine View could not immediately follow any non-compliance by the travellers with the 11 June deadline;
- (3) That a letter be sent to partner agencies serving Cottenham and local community groups, seeking their views on the way forward;
- (4) That the Sub-Committee meet again as soon as possible after the expiry of the three-month deadline for vacating the site at Pine View, Smithy Fen; and
- (5) That copies of reports to (and minutes of) the Development and Conservation Control Sub-Committee be made available to any Member of the Council who asks to see them.

The Meeting ended at 3.40 p.m.

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 10, 11, 12, 13 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank