

## SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

---

**REPORT TO:** Planning Committee 16 August 2018  
**AUTHOR/S:** Joint Director for Planning and Economic Development

---

**Application Number:** S/1531/17/FL

**Parish:** Comberton CP

**Proposal:** Extension to link main Church building and ancillary Church Hall

**Site Address:** Comberton Baptist Church And Centre, Green End, Comberton, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire, CB23 7DY

**Applicant:** Mr Keith Tarring, Comberton Baptist Church

**Recommendation:** Delegated approval subject to conditions

**Key Material Considerations:** Development in the Green Belt  
Principle of Development  
Design and Character  
Highway Matters  
Drainage  
Heritage Assets  
Landscaping  
Residential Amenity

**Committee Site Visit:** 15 August 2018

**Departure Application:** No

**Presenting Officer:** Aaron Sands, Senior Planning Officer

**Application Brought to Committee Because:** Referred from Chairs Delegation, where it was brought at the request of the Parish Council, who are objecting to the proposal.

**Date by Which Decision Due:** 28 June 2017

### Executive Summary

1. The application proposes two single storey extensions, one to the rear of the Church Hall and another linking that building with the Church. The site is located within the Development Framework in the heart of Comberton with the rear of the site being within the Green Belt, where the westernmost extension partially encroaches.
2. There is a significant existing parking issue along Green End, generated from a number of sources in the locality and which this application cannot address. While this proposal would alter a currently informal parking layout and lose

approximately 2 to 6 parking spaces, on the whole it is considered that the improvements being made to the parking area, including the provision of cycle storage and dedicated turning space would mitigate issues of highway safety likely to arise from the site and the development such that officers do not consider there would be a materially adverse impact to the existing situation. No other matters have been identified as harmful, and as such it is recommended that planning permission is granted subject to conditions set out at the end of this report.

### **Relevant Planning History**

3. S/1845/01/F – Extension. Approved 20 November 2001.
4. S/1930/97/F – Erection of Church Centre Building. Approved. 02 March 1998.

### **Site Details**

5. The site comprises the Comberton Baptist Church and an associated Centre that provides both meeting spaces in relation to the church as well as a playgroup, activities for young people and a counselling service. The buildings within the site are located within the Development Framework, with the boundary and the Green Belt sited to the rear of the Centre building. The boundaries of the site are marked by mature planting, with a more open frontage along Green End.
6. There is currently an area of what appears to be grasscrete around the Centre, with hardstanding to the front. Parking within the site is within this area of hardstanding, but is not formalised. Green End is a road of reasonable quality, not covered by any forms of parking restrictions. There is a Grade II listed building opposite the site, No. 22 Green End.

### **Proposal**

7. This application proposes the erection of a link extension between the Church and the Centre building, including internal alterations to the layout, providing additional facilities to support the existing uses, as well as an extension to the western elevation of the existing Centre building. The proposed link extension measures approximately 18m in depth and 10m in width, with a height of 3.2 at the ridge and 2.6m at the eaves.
8. The proposed western extension measures approximately 5.3m in depth, 9.5m in width, with a height of 4.5m at the ridge and 2.9m at the eaves.
9. The application has been amended since submission to include the provision of a formalised parking area and the implementation of a parking policy that seeks to reduce private car usage within the site.

### **Relevant Policy**

#### **10. National Guidance**

National Planning Policy Framework 2018 (NPPF)  
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

#### **11. Core Strategy Policies (DPD) 2007**

ST/1 Green Belt  
ST/6 Group Villages

## **12. Development Control Policies (DPD) 2007**

DP/1 Sustainable Development  
DP/2 Design of New Development  
DP/3 Development Criteria  
DP/4 Infrastructure and New Developments  
DP/5 Cumulative Development  
DP/7 Development Frameworks  
GB/3 Mitigating the Impact of Development Adjoining the Green Belt  
SF/1 Protection of Village Services and Facilities  
NE/4 Landscape Character Areas  
NE/6 Biodiversity  
NE/9 Water and Drainage Infrastructure  
NE/11 Flood Risk  
NE/15 Noise Pollution  
CH/4 Development Within the Curtilage or Setting of a Listed Building  
TR/1 Planning for More Sustainable Travel  
TR/2 Car and Cycle Parking Standards  
TR/3 Mitigating Travel Impact  
TR/4 Non-motorised Modes

## **13. Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)**

Trees & Development Sites - adopted 15 January 2009  
Listed Buildings - adopted 2 July 2009  
District Design Guide - adopted 2 March 2010  
Landscape in New Developments - adopted 2 March 2010

## **14. Submission Local Plan 2013**

S/1 Vision  
S/2 Objectives of the Local Plan  
S/3 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development  
S/7 Development Frameworks  
S/9 Minor Rural Centres  
CC/1 Mitigation and Adaptation to Climate Change  
CC/4 Sustainable Design and Construction  
CC/6 Construction Methods  
CC/7 Water Quality  
CC/8 Sustainable Drainage Systems  
HQ/1 Design Principles  
NH/4 Biodiversity  
NH/8 Mitigating the Impact of Development in and adjoining the Green Belt  
NH/14 Heritage Assets  
SC/3 Protection of Village Services and Facilities  
SC/11 Noise Pollution  
TI/2 Planning for Sustainable Travel  
TI/3 Parking Provision  
TI/10 Broadband

## Consultations

15. **Parish Council** – Objection. In May 2017 the Parish Council Planning Committee recommended refusal on the grounds of overdevelopment, the lack of car parking, highway safety and inappropriate incursion into the Green belt. The decision on the previous application required the car parking spaces to improve but there were only 10, plus one disabled space, on this application.

Given that nothing had changed from the Parish Council's original submission, although there was a commendable Travel to Church plan, to reiterate the Council's previous objections and comments.

16. **Tree Officer** – No objections subject to a condition requiring the tree protection measures recommended in the submitted tree protection strategy shall be implemented and remain until the practical completion of the development.
17. **Highway Authority** – No objection. The proposal results in the loss of informal off street parking. The increase of on street parking that this will engender, while of potential nuisance, is unlikely to present a significant hazard for other highway users, therefore, no significant adverse effect upon the Public Highway should result from this proposal, should it gain benefit of Planning Permission.
18. **Drainage Officer** – No objection subject to conditions requiring surface and foul water drainage details to be submitted.
19. **Environmental Health** – No objections subject to conditions regarding construction hours, the burning of waste material, that details are submitted regarding driven piled foundations and that a limitation is imposed regarding outdoor and amplified sound events that they shall be only between 08:00am and 08:00pm. Recommend informatives regarding statutory noise nuisances, the requirement for a demolition notice from building control in the event of demolition, that details of lighting are agreed with the local planning authority and that extraction systems should agree noise emissions. (*Officer note; burning of waste material is covered by other legislation and is not a necessary condition to impose, noting it would duplicate existing measures.*)
20. **Councillor Tim Scott** – Recommend refusal on the basis of parking impacts which will be made worse by this proposal.

## Representations

21. Approximately 39no. representations have been received before and after the amended scheme, of which 13no. have been submitted anonymously and therefore carry little weight. The comments that were not anonymous incorporated the following summarised points;
- The proposal would reduce parking on site and there are significant parking issues at present that will be worsened unless there is appropriate mitigation in place.
  - The loss of parking spaces within the site is unacceptable.

- Welcome a contribution by the Church to better management of parking.
- Increasing the size and capacity of the site without increasing levels of parking would cause problems with parking along this road.
- Objection on the grounds of increased noise levels from additional activities within the Church.
- The applicant's have not carried out a sufficient consultation with local residents.
- The scale of the proposed development is inappropriate and would result in an overdevelopment of the site.
- The proposal would extend into the Green Belt to the west and change the character of the area.
- The proposal would reduce space within the site used for play areas and lead to children playing within the car park.
- The design of the proposal is out of keeping with the area.
- Cars are parked insensitively in the area and cause issues during the current events that will be made worse as the site is too small to cope with the increased usage proposed.
- Any increase in frequency of events held at the church will increase the noise nuisance experienced and restrictions should be strictly imposed to reduce the impacts.
- The kitchen is likely to have noisy extractor fans that are inappropriate in a residential setting.
- This proposal would make Green end gridlocked during large events.
- The higher volume of traffic and parking would increase the risk of a major accident occurring.
- Lack of access for emergency vehicles
- Together with visitors to the surgery, parked cars would gridlock the road.
- The amended plans are minor changes that do not alter previous comments.
- Insufficient pedestrian safety walking to access the surgery and beyond as vehicles will reverse in and out of the Church, where there is less visibility. *Officer note; the amended plans have provided a turning head within the site.*
- The amended plans improve the relationship somewhat with the neighbouring property of Manor Cottage.
- The link extension would remove all remaining outlook from ground floor windows of Manor Cottage.
- North facing windows would be able to see above the fence and would result in a loss of privacy to Manor Cottage. Any north facing windows should be required to be obscure glass, fixed permanently closed.
- Conditions imposed to previous applications (ref S/1930/97/F) should be applied to this application.
- It is suggested that hours of use are restricted to 10pm with a limitation on the use of amplified sound.
- Adverse impact on village character that would not accord with policy DP/3.
- The western extension appears to extend approximately 2m into the Green Belt.
- The parking layout is impractical and would not provided sufficient space to turn a car within the site.

- There is insufficient parking within Green End, despite the statements in the submission.
- In the event of an approval, a condition should be imposed requiring the implemental of a parking control scheme.
- The proposal should reduce in scale and instead refurbish within the existing footprint.
- There would be an increase in noise, smell and fumes from people and traffic.
- Concerns that the site would be rented out for events that could be substantial in light of the scale of the building.
- Enlargement of the kitchen to allow hot food to be produced on site will lead to generation of smells in the area.
- Cumulative impacts from planning permissions approved in the area would result in harm to the character and amenity of no. 31 Green End.
- The parking on site would not meet the requirements of policy TR/2.
- Disturbance from vehicle movements and parked cars would impact the residential amenity of no. 31.
- Several organisations currently use Green End for parking purposes including the village hall, nursery school, motor garage and health centre.
- The character of Green End as a rural land would be harmed by parked cars impacting the grass verges through parking and due to the narrow width of the road.
- There is difficulty in accessing and leaving properties due to parked cars creating visibility issues.
- There is no need identified for the proposed increase to the facility.

22. In addition, a submission was made providing 35no. survey responses, as well 4no. additional comments. The summary sheet of those representations has been provided in Appendix A, which provides the number of responses to each category. The full survey is available online and any points raised in the “*comments*” section of that survey have been included in the summarised list in paragraphs 18 or 20 as relevant.

23. The following matters have been raised that are not material to the determination of this application. Comments have been *italicised* at each point for explanation

- The intention to rent out spaces will have a financial effect on the Village Hall and potentiall require a change of use. *Competition between existing businesses is not a material planning consideration. The site appears to have a lawful D1 Use Class and uses within that Class, including ancillary uses, would not require an application for a Change of Use.*
- There is no gap for maintenance of the northern boundary. *This would be a civil matter between the relevant parties and is not a material planning consideration.*
- There is an existing Village Hall that provides a facility for community events and another is not needed. *That there is an existing alternative facility does not preclude any other propsals coming forward, which must be assessed and determined on its own merits.*
- Concern that the Surgery may open on a Sunday, if required by the Government, that would result in further traffic and on-street parking. *There is no indication that Surgeries will be required to open. Out of*

*hours services are likely to be in existence in the event of an emergency. Theoretical circumstances are not material to an application, which must be considered in light of current or likely circumstances.*

- *The proposal would be visually intrusive from Manor Barn. While overbearing impacts are material considerations, loss or alteration of a private view is not a material planning consideration.*
- *Objections to commercialisation of the Church. That the church intends to rent rooms out is not a material planning consideration as they would be bound by the existing D1 Use Class. Any use within that Class could occupy the site and the existing buildings could be rented out without requiring planning permission provided they did not undertake unauthorised development.*
- *The parking spaces required by historic permissions (S/1930/97/F) were not provided and the site is in breach of that consent. This appears to have long passed the 10 year point by which enforcement action could be taken and as such the starting point must therefore be the existing situation. This application must be assessed on its own merits, and while previous applications are material to the decision they are not preventative of any application that may be proposed, which supersedes historic applications where it would alter those previous arrangements.*
- *The site might hold weddings and other party events. Use as a Wedding Venue would require a planning application for a Change of Use. Based on the information submitted as part of the application it appears that lawful use of the site is a D1. Community centres or similar gathering places would fall within Use Class D2 and planning permission would be required to change to that use. Some ancillary or non-material use changes may be present, for example use as a polling station or incidental office use serving the site, which would not be a material change of use.*
- *Only a minority of the congregation live in Comberton. This is not material to the determination as to whether the proposal is acceptable on its merits. The Church provides a community facility, but that does not limit the community to Comberton only.*
- *The intentions of the applicant. A developer's intentions are not material considerations*

24. A number of comments note that they had not received formal notification of the amended plans. It appears that some letters did arrive, and the rest appear to have been lost in transit. Consequently an additional consultation was carried out on the 25 June 2018 to provide additional 14 days to ensure all relevant parties were notified.

### **Planning Assessment**

25. The key considerations in determining this application are;
- Development in the Green Belt
  - Principle of Development
  - Design and Character
  - Highway Safety and Parking
  - Drainage
  - Heritage Assets
  - Residential Amenity

- Landscaping
- Other Matters

#### *Development in the Green Belt*

26. The proposed western extension to the rear of the site appears to be partially located within the Green Belt by approximately 2m. Paragraph 145 of the NPPF states that new buildings in the Green Belt are inappropriate unless it comprises an extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. Of particular note is that this restriction only applies to development in the Green Belt. While the extensions taken together amount to a substantial level of development, in considering paragraph 145 this would only relate to the western extension to the rear of the site.
27. The consideration is therefore whether this would be a disproportionate addition over the size of the existing building. In reviewing the original permission (ref S/1930/97/F) the building appears to be as it was approved then. The rear extension would amount to approximately 48m<sup>2</sup> of additional floor space, in comparison to approximately 150m<sup>2</sup> of existing building.
28. While this would amount to an approximate 32% increase in floor space the building appears subservient by virtue of the reduce ridge and flat roof element such that, read as a whole, it would not represent such an increase in the overall volume of the building and would appear as an extension that is not disproportionate in the context of the existing building. Officers therefore consider the proposal is not inappropriate development by definition.

#### *Principle of Development*

29. The majority of the site is within the Development Framework, where the development and redevelopment of unallocated land and buildings are considered acceptable in principle, subject to impacts on character or sensitive receptors and subject to sufficient infrastructure to support that proposal. Areas within the Development Framework are considered to be sustainable in a locational sense. These matters are assessed in their relevant sections below in detail but it is concluded that they are acceptable. Notwithstanding that, the assessment has been made on the basis of what is proposed, and it is considered that an extension of some form is wholly achievable. Therefore, the principle of development is considered to be acceptable and the proposal would accord with policies DP/7 and S/7.

#### *Design and Character*

30. The area is predominantly residential, but this site sits as a clear departure in its own right, notably appearing as a more public building, with the church building along the site frontage. The extensions as a whole are sizeable. They provide a notably level of subservience through reduced ridge heights, and, in the case of the glazed link extension, through the large area of glazing and the area of flat roof and short length of pitched roof. The overall effect of the link extension is that it provides a good relationship between the Church and the Church Hall.
31. The buildings utilise materials to match the Church Hall, and such materials are reflective of more ancillary, smaller scale buildings. The glazed link

extension would be of limited visibility from a public view points outside the site, limited to glimpse views from the street scene of the end of link, towards the Church Hall. The westernmost extension is unlikely to be readily identifiable in the context of the area, screened by the existing built form. There is a reasonably large area of external space left within the site and the provision of the grasscrete area around the Church Hall better reflects the more rural character of the locality along Green End. The Church itself appears as a notable landmark along the road, and the proposals would retain that strong visual way marker in the area, retaining the visual relationship that building has in the context of the Street Scene.

32. On the whole, the proposal is considered of a design and form to preserve the character of the site and its position within the area, noting that it sits distinct in the context of the more residential elements of Green End. The proposal is therefore considered to accord with policies DP/2 and HQ/1.

#### *Highway Safety and Parking*

33. A significant level of local objection has been received to the proposal and its implications in highway safety terms. It is recognised that there are existing parking issues within the area, particularly on weekends when the Church will hold its congregation, but also from other uses, such as the nursery and village hall located closer to the cross roads. These are existing issues, and the test is therefore whether this proposal will make those issues materially worse in the context of the area.
34. It is noted that the original planning permission that allowed the Church Hall building was approved subject to a condition requiring 16no. formalised parking spaces to be provided to an approved layout, and that was not implemented. It appears that at least 10 years have passed since that condition was not complied with, and therefore that non-compliance is immune from enforcement action.
35. The existing arrangement is an informal parking area which includes a section of grasscrete between the Church and Church Hall and hardstanding to the immediate south of the Church, totalling an approximate 12 parking spaces, or 16 parking spaces if parked such that there was no turning space. The application proposes the formalisation of the parking area, creating 10no. total spaces, 1no. disabled space, and an addition of 10no. cycle storage spaces, as well as the creation of a turning head in the site to enable exiting in a forward gear. In addition, a parking policy has been implemented to promote alternative modes of transport than private car, and direct visitors to the site to avoid parking in such a manner that might block access along the road or to driveways.
36. The parking spaces indicated adjacent to the church are noted as being approximately 0.3m below the depth of the standard requirement of 5m. These spaces would be able to accommodate most smaller cars, and while they have previously been informal, this area is an existing parking area. There remains 3m of space between the southern boundary and the edges of those parking spaces, which would be a sizeable area to accommodate both passing vehicles and the parked cars, including some additional room that could facilitate a larger vehicle. Those spaces to be provided within the grasscrete area are tandem parking spaces. While not ideal, the manoeuvring room immediately adjacent would enable cars within these areas to exchange

places so that all parking spaces are accessible and could be exited in a forward gear.

37. Green End is an unrestricted road and parking is available there. The quality of the road is variable, but it is reasonably straight and a substantial portion meets the adopted standards of 5m in width, sufficient for 2 cars to pass comfortably. As stated, the road is used by other sites, such as the surgery, in the vicinity. There would be an element of variation in operational times, whereas other sites may not be open on Sunday, which is likely to be one of the busiest times for the Church.
38. The application documents indicate that there is an existing high level of use by the Church and Church Hall, and that there is a difficulty with space in the site that means elements of the activities are constrained. Some of the activities, such as counselling services, are likely to be less parking intensive than a full church service. On the whole, it is reasonable to conclude that periods of greatest activity are likely to be limited, including at times where there would be notably less conflict with other parking intensive services in the locality, and that existing activity levels appear unlikely to result in a significant increase that could not be accommodated by the site.
39. The proposal formalises parking spaces, provides a dedicated turning area, provision and promotion of alternative modes of transport and there is a strong possibility that elements of its operation, including the most intensive periods of activity, would occur outside of the operational hours of other services in the vicinity. Overall, while the proposal would not accord with the adopted or emerging parking standards in policies TR/2 and TI/3, it is not considered that the proposal would result in a materially adverse impact to highway safety and parking over and above the existing situation in the locality.

#### *Drainage*

40. To the south of the site is an area of identified surface water drainage. The application proposes to dispose of surface water by soakaway, but no details have been provided as to the precise location not calculations as to the extent of that soakaway. Noting the identified areas in the vicinity of the site and that the proposal involves a reasonably large area of additional footprint within the site on permeable surfaces it is considered that an appropriate form of drainage is necessary to ensure surface water does not result in an adverse impact the locality, or increase run off onto the adopted highway.
41. There appears to be a large area within the site surrounding the proposed extensions that would be a suitable area for a soakaway. The Drainage Officer has recommended a condition that surface water drainage calculations and precise details of soakaways and SUDS are submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement. It is considered that, as there appears to be adequate space within the site to accommodate an appropriate soakaway, officers consider the condition would be appropriate to ensure that drainage is not materially impacted.
42. It is also noted that the Drainage Officer has recommended a condition in respect of foul water drainage. However, the application form indicates that this would be to mains drainage, and that would be regulated by Anglian

Water. It is therefore considered that a condition requiring foul water drainage is not necessary in this instance and would be duplicating other controls in place.

43. Subject to a condition in respect of surface water drainage it is considered that the proposal would accord with policies NE/9, CC/7 and CC/8.

#### *Heritage Assets*

44. Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special regard is had to preserving the special character of listed buildings, their setting and their features of special architectural or historic interest.
45. No. 22, opposite the site, is a Grade II listed building. There is a physical detachment between the two properties, screening along that boundary and the intervening development in the form of the Church itself that provides a notable divorce from the listed building, both physically and functionally such that it is not considered the proposal would otherwise alter the experience of the listed building or adversely impact its setting. The proposal is therefore considered to accord with policies CH/4 and NH/14.

#### *Residential Amenity & Noise*

46. The physical elements of the proposal are located closest to the northern boundary. It is considered that other residential properties in the area are sufficiently distant that they would not be adversely impacted by overbearing or overshadowing effects.
47. The proposal would be located in close proximity to the boundary with Manor Cottage, with the link extension and a small section of the western extension running along the boundary. The link extension is approximately 2.6m at the eaves, which would be closest to the boundary, approximately 0.6m above a fence that could be erected using permitted development rights. That link extension also utilises a large portion of flat roof in order to keep the ridge level lower, result in an overall lower level building in close proximity to the boundary. The proposal may be visible above any boundary treatment along that boundary, but on the whole, it is considered that the link would not result in a material impact by loss of light or overshadowing.
48. The western most extension is of a significantly shorter projection along the boundary. It would sit behind the Church Hall, and while the extension would sit closer to the boundary it would retain the existing eaves height and, at approximately closer to the boundary, it is considered likely that any impacts of overbearing or overshadowing would be in effect from the Church Hall already and would not be materially altered. The extension westwards would sit close to the rear of the Garden, and the height at eaves and ridge is considered sufficient to mitigate impacts to residential amenity of Manor Cottage, though in any event it would be somewhat limited in the overall scope of the garden area. It is noted that a number of rooflights appear to be sited facing towards Manor Cottage. However, these appear to be at a sufficient height that they would not afford any view of neighbouring property.
49. To the south sits no. 31 Green End. The boundary of the property sits approximately 10m from the proposed extensions and at the time of the

officers visit it appeared that there was an existing boundary fence that appeared to be approximately 1.8m in height. While there is a large area of glazing in the link extension the existing boundary treatments are considered sufficient to provide protection from overlooking such that it is not considered there would be an adverse impact to residential amenity of no. 31 in that regard.

50. It is noted that a number of concerns have been raised in respect of increase levels of noise. In terms of vehicle movements within the site the proposed development, noting the level of parking within the site, is not considered likely to materially alter those level. It has been recommended by the Environmental Health Officer that the proposal be subject to a time limitation on noisier activities, and in light of the increased space it is considered this is a necessary condition to protect long term residential amenity from noise.
51. Overall, it is therefore considered that the proposal would not result in a materially adverse impact to residential amenity of surrounding properties and would accord with policies DP/3 and HQ/1 in that respect.

#### *Landscaping*

52. The existing site is currently reasonably well screened to the rear, with a tree belt that runs along the western boundary. In addition, there appears to be some well established vegetation in the neighbouring properties that would also provide some level of screening and provide some additional mitigation for noise impacts, and which sits in neighbouring control, though it is noted that there are identifiable gaps within the boundary. There is limited space within the site that might accommodate further landscaping without loss of, but the existing vegetation is considered to be suitable in order to protect the wider Green Belt. As such, it is considered that a condition requiring additional landscaping measure is not necessary, also noting that hard landscaping has been detailed on the proposed block plan.
53. The application has been accompanied by a tree protection plan, and it is recommended that that is conditioned to be implemented in order to ensure the trees on site would be retained. Subject to those conditions, the proposal is considered to accord with policies DP/2, GB/2, GB/3, HQ/1 and NH/8.

#### *Other Matters*

54. It is noted that a number of concerns have been raised in respect of renting out the hall and the potential for other uses. From the information received the site appears to have a lawful D1 use, potentially with some ancillary D2 use, although this does not appear to be is predominant function. Any material change of use of the site would require planning permission, notwithstanding any provisions that may be afforded by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015. That said, ancillary uses are not necessarily a material change of use and so existing uses that may not normally fall within the D1 use class may not mean the site has a mixed used that would enable any and all other uses to utilise the Church and Church Hall, if that result in an overall level of use that was materially different from the existing established use at present.
55. As noted above, it is considered that the proposal would not lead to such a significant increase in overall activity within the site that it the site could not

accommodate this. For that reason and noting that there is a promotion of alternative modes of transport to reduce dependence on private car, it is considered that the proposal would not result in an adverse impact to air quality.

### **Recommendation**

56. **Approval** subject to;

#### **Conditions and Informatives**

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 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. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:  
Location Plan – Drawing No. 0385 002  
Site Plan – Proposed – Drawing No. 0385 101 rev b  
Parking Plan – Drawing No. 0385 161 rev a  
Roof Plan - Proposed – Drawing No. 0385 113 rev b  
Ground Floor Plan - Proposed – Drawing No. 0385 111 rev f  
Elevations – Proposed – Drawing No. 0385 121 rev F  
(Reason - To facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.)
3. No development shall occur until the tree protection measures recommended in the tree protection measures detailed in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment, dated 21 April 2017, reference 1169/CJO/2104 have been erected in full. They shall remain in position until substantial completion of the implementation of the development.  
(Reason - To ensure the retention of trees that provide a contribution to the character of the area in accordance with policies DP/2 and the adopted Local Development Framework and HQ/1 of the emerging Submission Local Plan 2013).
4. No building hereby permitted shall be occupied until surface water drainage works have been implemented in accordance with details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Before these details are submitted an assessment shall be carried out of the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system in accordance with the principles set out in The National Planning Policy Framework and associated Guidance, and the results of the assessment provided to the local planning authority. The system should be designed such that there is no surcharging for a 1 in 30 year event and no internal property flooding for a 1 in 100 year event + 40% allowance for climate change. The submitted details shall:
  - a) provide information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters; and
  - b) provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by

any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime; and

- c) the surface water drainage scheme shall be managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the agreed details and management and maintenance plan.

(Reason - To ensure satisfactory surface water drainage measures are implemented to be able to accommodate the additional physical development noting nearby areas of identifies surface water issues, in accordance with policies NE/9 of the Local Development Framework 2007 and CC/8 of the emerging Submission Local Plan 2013.)

5. No construction site machinery or plant shall be operated, no noisy works shall be carried out and no construction related deliveries taken at or despatched from the site except between the hours of 0800-1800 Monday to Friday, 0800-1300 Saturday and not at any time on Sundays or Bank or Public holidays.

(Reason - To protect the amenity of the locality, especially for people living and/or working nearby, in accordance with policies DP/3 of the Local Development Framework 2007 and HQ/1 of the emerging Submission Local Plan 2013.)

6. Pile driven foundations shall not be utilised unless a statement of the method for construction of these foundations has first been submitted to and approved in writing with the Local Planning Authority detailing the methods of control in relation to noise and vibration. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with those approved details.

(Reason - To protect the amenity of the locality, especially for people living and/or working nearby, in accordance with policies DP/3 of the Local Development Framework 2007 and HQ/1 of the emerging Submission Local Plan 2013.)

7. Outdoor events and amplified sound shall not occur at any time except between the hours of 08:00am to 20:00pm.

(Reason - To protect the amenity of the locality, especially for people living and/or working nearby, in accordance with policies DP/3 of the Local Development Framework 2007 and HQ/1 of the emerging Submission Local Plan 2013.)

8. No external plant and machinery, including any extraction or ventilation serving any kitchen shall be installed unless specifications, details of the precise siting and noise and smell mitigation measures have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local planning Authority. Plant and machinery shall thereafter be installed in accordance with the approved details and retained thereafter in that form.

(Reason - To protect the amenity of the locality, especially for people living and/or working nearby, in accordance with policies DP/3 of the Local Development Framework 2007 and HQ/1 of the emerging Submission Local Plan 2013.)

9. No external lighting shall be installed unless details have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The lighting shall be installed in accordance with the approved details and thereafter retained.

(Reason - To protect the amenity of the locality, especially for people living and/or working nearby, in accordance with policies DP/3 of the Local

Development Framework 2007 and HQ/1 of the emerging Submission Local Plan 2013.)

10. The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until the parking, cycling and manoeuvring areas have been provided in accordance with plan ref 0385 161 rev A. They shall thereafter be retained in their approved form.

(Reason - To ensure satisfactory levels of parking are provided and retained in the long term within the site to mitigate for adverse impacts of the development, in accordance with policies TR/2 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007 and TI/3 of the emerging Submission Local Plan 2013.)

**Background Papers:**

The following list contains links to the documents on the Council's website and/or an indication as to where hard copies can be inspected.

[South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy \(adopted January 2007\)](#)

[South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies DPD \(adopted July 2007\)](#)

[Submission Local Plan 2013](#)

[Planning File Ref: S/1531/17/FL](#)

**Contact Officer:** Aaron Sands - Senior Planning Officer  
01954 713237