

## SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

---

**REPORT TO:** Development and Conservation  
Control Committee

2<sup>nd</sup> June 2004

**AUTHOR/S:** Director of Development Services

---

### **S/0679/04/F – Great Shelford**

#### **House – land off the Hectare for David Reed Homes Ltd**

#### **Recommendation: Delegated Approval**

Members of Committee will visit the site on Tuesday 1<sup>st</sup> June 2004.

#### **Site and Proposal**

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

#### **Planning History**

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

#### **Planning Policy**

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

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

### **Consultation**

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

### **Representations**

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

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

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

- Parking and highway safety issues

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

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

14. ***Residential amenity***

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

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

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

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

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

### **Recommendations**

20. Subject to the receipt of amended plans substituting the 2 rear dormer windows with rooflights, delegated powers are sought to approve the application subject to the following conditions:
1. Standard Condition A – Time limited permission (Reason A);
  2. Sc5a – Details and samples of materials for external walls and roofs (Rc5aii);
  3. Sc51 – Landscaping (Rc51);
  4. Sc52 – Implementation of landscaping (Rc52);
  5. Sc60 – Details of boundary treatment (Rc60);
  6. Sc21 – Withdrawal of permitted development rights – Part 1, Classes A, B and C (Rc21c.....overdevelop the site or cause harm to adjoining residents by reason of overlooking);
  7. Sc22 – No windows at first floor level in the north-east (side), south-west (side) and north-west (rear) elevations of the development (Rc22);
  8. Sc23 – First floor window in the north-east and south-west elevations to be fitted and permanently maintained with obscure glass (Rc23);
  9. During the period of construction no power operated machinery shall be operated on the premises before 08.00 hours on weekdays and 08.00 hours on Saturdays nor after 18.00 hours on weekdays and 13.00 hours on Saturdays (nor at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays) unless otherwise previously agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority in accordance with any agreed noise restrictions (Rc26);

### **Informatives**

### **Reasons for Approval**

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

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

### **General**

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

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

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