

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

11 January 2012

AUTHOR/S: Executive Director (Operational Services) / Corporate Manager - Planning and New Communities

S/2183/11 - COTTENHAM

Outline application for erection of one and a half storey dwelling together with formation of new access to the existing dwelling – 88 Rampton Road, Cottenham, Cambridge for Mr & Mrs Bainbridge

Recommendation: Approval

Date for Determination: 3rd January 2012

Notes:

This Application has been reported to the Planning Committee for determination as the Officer recommendation is contrary to the response of Cottenham Parish Council, and also at the request of District Councillor Edwards

Site and Proposal

1. No.88 Rampton Road is occupied by a detached two-storey Edwardian villa comprising red brick walls under a slate roof. The property is located inside the Cottenham village framework, with the framework boundary running along the north-western edge of the site. Within the curtilage of the dwelling, and located adjacent to the south-eastern boundary, is a detached flat-roofed double garage. There is a mature tree and hedge line bordering the road. Beyond the south-eastern boundary is a further detached Edwardian villa, No.84 Rampton Road, whilst to the north-east/rear is a detached bungalow, No.1 Manse Drive. Adjacent to this property and to the rear of Nos. 82 and 84 Rampton Road is a Grade II listed water tower that has been converted to a dwelling. The application site extends to 0.07 hectares and encompasses the land on the east side of the dwelling (namely between Nos. 88 and 84 Rampton Road) as well as to the front of the existing property.
2. The outline application, registered on 8th November 2011, proposes the erection of a one-and-a-half-storey dwelling on land to the south-east side of No.88 Rampton Road, together with the formation of a new access to the existing dwelling. All matters, other than the means of access, are reserved for further consideration. The application includes illustrative layout and block plans. These indicate the dwelling would be sited gable end to the road (following the demolition of the existing garage) and set approximately 12m back from the front boundary, 2.4m from the south-eastern elevation of No.88 and 6.6m (at its nearest point) to No.84 Rampton Road. The dwelling is shown with a rectangular form (measuring 6.1m wide x 11.4m deep), with a maximum ridge height of 7m and eaves height of no more than 4.5m. The proposed dwelling would be accessed via the existing vehicular access, with the illustrative block plan indicating that parking would be provided to the south-east side of the property and turning to the front. To compensate for the loss of No.88 Rampton Road's existing access, the application proposes the formation of a new vehicular

access to serve the existing dwelling. The proposed means of access would be located to the front of the existing property, in the south-western corner of the site, and two parking spaces and a turning area provided in the front garden of No.88.

3. The application has been accompanied by a Design and Access Statement. This explains that the new dwelling would be a two or three bedroom property, and could be modelled on an Edwardian coach house. It is intended that first floor bedrooms would be built into the roof slope, and that windows to bedrooms would be built into the gable ends, with any first floor windows facing the side boundaries being positioned at a high level and serving non-habitable rooms. The suggested building materials are red brick walls, tiled roof and white painted timber joinery. The statement also recommends that solar panels be considered on the south east elevation.
4. The application is also supported by a Tree Constraints and Protection Plan. This proposes the removal of two trees (both category C trees) in order to enable the construction of the new driveway. The remaining trees along the front boundary are shown for retention and a section of the proposed new driveway would be of no-dig construction.

Planning History

5. S/1418/11 – A full application for the erection of a dwelling and formation of new access to the existing dwelling was withdrawn. Officers had intended to refuse the application on the basis that it failed to address and overcome the reasons for refusal of application reference S/0998/10/F (see paragraph 7 below for further details).
6. S/1767/10 – Application for a dwelling withdrawn prior to validation.
7. S0998/10/F – A full application for the erection of a dwelling on land to the south-east of 88 Rampton Road and a new access to the existing dwelling was refused at Planning Committee in September 2010, against Officer recommendation, for the following reasons:
 1. The proposed dwelling, by virtue of its height, mass and proximity to the southeast side boundary, was considered to appear unduly dominant and overbearing in the outlook from, and to adversely affect daylight to, a large kitchen window of the neighbouring property, No.84 Rampton Road. The unacceptable adverse impact on the residential amenities of No.84 was deemed to be contrary to Policy DP/3.
 2. Properties in the locality have the character of 19th century farmhouses or villas. The proposed dwelling, by virtue of its unsympathetic fenestration design on the front elevation, was not considered to respect the strong characteristic of the villa type buildings in Cottenham and to be visually unattractive in the street scene. The harmful impact on the character of the area was considered to be contrary to Policies DP/2 and DP/3, to the District Design Guide, and to the Cottenham Village Design Statement.
8. S/2367/01/O – Outline application for a dwelling, with all matters reserved, was approved subject to a number of conditions, including a requirement for a maximum height of 7m, and for obscure glazed first floor windows in the north-east elevation.
9. S/1132/92/F – Extension to No.88 – approved.
10. S/0091/90/F – Full planning application for a dwelling – approved.

11. S/0356/88/O – Outline application for a dwelling – approved.
12. S/0343/79/O – Outline application for a dwelling – refused.

Planning Policy

13. South Cambridgeshire LDF Core Strategy DPD, 2007:
ST/5: Minor Rural Centres
14. South Cambridgeshire LDF 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/6: Construction Methods
DP/7: Development Frameworks
HG/1: Density
SF/10: Outdoor Playspace, Informal Open Space and New Developments
SF/11: Open Space Standards
NE/1: Energy Efficiency
NE/6: Biodiversity
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
15. South Cambridgeshire LDF Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):
Cottenham Village Design Statement -Adopted November 2007
Open Space in New Developments – Adopted January 2009
Trees and Development Sites – Adopted January 2009
Biodiversity – Adopted July 2009
Landscape in New Developments – Adopted March 2010
District Design Guide – Adopted March 2010
16. Circular 11/95 (The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions) - Advises that conditions should be necessary, relevant to planning, relevant to the development permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects.
17. Circular 05/2005 (Planning Obligations) - Advises that planning obligations must be relevant to planning, necessary, directly related to the proposed development, fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind and reasonable in all other respect.

Consultations

18. **Cottenham Parish Council** – Recommends refusal. It quotes the reasons for refusal of application reference S/0998/10, and comments as follows:

“A further application S/1418/11 was withdrawn, no doubt due to the fact that this application had not fully addressed the reasons for refusal for application S/0998/10. Cottenham Parish Council recommended Refusal for application S/1418/11 on the following grounds:

1. Whilst this application has tried to abide by advice given by planning officers Cottenham Parish Council does not believe that significant changes have been made to the previous application, S/0998/10. The proposed reduction in height of the proposed dwelling and the introduction of a hip roof are insufficient to overcome the reasons for refusal made on the previous application.
2. This application may well see the proposed dwelling located further away from the boundary but any gain from this move has been negated as the proposed dwelling is now located nearer to the property at 84 Rampton Road leading to a direct loss of light for this property.
3. In addition this proposed dwelling would lead to a loss of light and privacy for 1 Manse Drive, the overbearing mass of the proposed dwelling would also adversely affect the amenity of this single storey building.
4. In view of the 2011 amendment to PPS3, and the exclusion of gardens from the previous definition of 'brown land', CPC believes it would be prudent of SCDC to give greater weight to the following sub-clauses (of its/general local planning authorities policy) hitherto hampered by the brown-land definition. Therefore applications should be rejected if they:
 - a) have a significant adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties through loss of privacy, loss of light, an overbearing sense of enclosure and the generation of unreasonable levels of traffic or noise nuisance;
 - b) provide inadequate amenity space, or vehicular access arrangements and parking spaces for the proposed and existing properties;
 - c) detract from the prevailing character and appearance of the area;
 - d) adversely affect the setting of Listed Buildings, or buildings or gardens of local interest within or close to the site;
 - e) adversely affect trees, wildlife features or architectural features of local importance located within or close to the site; and
 - f) prejudice the comprehensive development of the wider area of which the site forms part.

Cottenham Parish Council believes that this proposed development would be in direct contradiction to these amendments, in particular points a, b, c, d and e.
5. Cottenham Parish Council would also state that this proposed application is contrary to Policy DP/3 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies Development Plan Document as due to its height, mass and proximity to the southeast boundary, it is of an overbearing, dominant nature which adversely affects the daylight for the neighbouring properties, 84 Rampton Road and 1 Manse Drive, it would equally adversely affect the property at 88 Rampton Road. It would also be contrary to Policy DP/2 which requires a high standard of design which responds to the local character of the built environment for all new developments, the proposed dwelling does not reflect the neighbouring properties and therefore would be visually unattractive in the street scene, indeed Policy DP/3 states that there should be resistance to any proposed dwelling that would have an adverse impact upon village character.

Cottenham Parish Council consider that these reasons still stand for any application for outline planning permission, indeed they highlight the very real concerns that Cottenham Parish Council have in regard to this new application. An outline planning application, by its very nature, does not require any details on height/mass or proximity to neighbouring properties, nor does it require any details of the design of the proposed development. The very fact that this development has not been able to

obtain full planning permission for development is that these details could not be amended sufficiently to meet the requirements of the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies Development Plan Document 2007. Indeed concerns have been raised that the size of the plot for which permission is being sought is too small to adequately contain any dwelling of any size that would not have some adverse affect on the amenity of neighbouring properties.

To give this application permission for outline planning would, in the opinion of the Parish Council, be a retrospective step. The applicant has tried to obtain full permission and has failed to do so any further applications should only be for full planning permission with all the required information submitted for consideration.

In conclusion Cottenham Parish Council would ask that if planning officers were minded to approve this application that this application is put before the Planning Committee for consideration.”

19. **The Trees Officer** – States that the trees are not afforded any statutory protection. However, their retention is desirable due to the screening effect and their setting within the street scene. No objections providing the trees are protected in accordance with the submitted details.
20. **The Landscape Design Officer** – Raises no objections, stating that this is a better design than those previously proposed as it leaves more breathing space between the new dwelling and No.84. The boundary hedge and trees in the front garden to be retained should be protected during construction given their importance on the street frontage. No further landscaping details are required providing the planting areas shown around the house are confirmed to have a soil depth of at least 450mm. Details of the no dig gravel should be supplied.
21. **The Conservation Manager** – Has not been consulted on the current proposal. In response to application reference S/0998/10/F, the Conservation Manager advised that the only designated historic environment near the site is Tower Mill, a Grade II listed converted windmill, a tall dominant structure, more independent of its setting than normal for a historic building. The proposal was considered to have little impact on its setting and, whilst the effect of that design on the Edwardian villas south of and including No.88 was considered to be regrettable, there were deemed to be insufficient grounds to justify a refusal in Conservation terms.
22. **The Ecology Officer** - Has not been consulted on the current application, but previously commented, in response to application reference S/0998/10/F that, following an inspection of the inside and outside of the garage, bats were not believed to be present. As such, it was concluded that no further information would be required to support the application in relation to bats.
23. **The Environmental Health Officer** – Expresses concern that problems could arise from noise during the construction period, and suggests that conditions controlling the hours of use of power operated machinery during the construction period, and requiring details of any driven pile foundations, be added to any planning permission.
24. **The Local Highways Authority** – No response received to date. Raised no, in principle, objections to the previous applications subject to the provision of 2m x 2m visibility splays, adequate on-site turning for the new dwelling, removal of permitted development rights for gates, construction of new access before occupation of the new dwelling, construction of new access with adequate drainage, and no unbound material to be used within 6m of highway boundary.

25. ***The Cottenham Village Design Group*** – Raises no objections, stating that it has previously commented on a number of proposals for this site, and that the last comments made are still applicable. In these comments, the Design Group stated that the design of the dwelling and materials proposed are far from typical of Cottenham in general. However, they do echo the design of the buildings in the immediate vicinity and the proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable. The proposed retention of the majority of the hedge and tree boundary to the road is also supported.
26. ***The Old West Internal Drainage Board*** – Raises no objections

Representations

27. Letters of objection have been received from residents of Nos.82 and 84 Rampton Road, No.1 Manse Drive, 10A Telegraph Street and 15B Lyles Road. The main points raised are:
- It is unacceptable for an outline application to be submitted without all Reserved Matters being determined at the same time. Any application should provide enough detail to demonstrate how the principle of development can be achieved and, due to the size of the plot and proximity to neighbouring properties, this can only be judged if all reserved matters are considered as part of the application.
 - There is a recent history of unsuccessful full planning applications (S/0998/10/F, S/1767/10 and S/1418/11) that have not been able to demonstrate the principle of development on this plot. The first application quoted was unanimously declined by the Planning Committee, the second withdrawn as insufficient details were provided and the third withdrawn after the planning department has advised the applicants they were minded to decline without a substantial re-design.
 - The previously proposed designs were considered to be out of keeping with adjacent properties due to their style and cramped location.
 - There is a legal right for planning authorities to request information on Reserved Matters within Article 4(2) of the Development Management Procedure Order 2010. The Development Control Practice guide states information on Reserved Matters should be sought when such information is deemed necessary to determine the application. In practice, such circumstance have normally been where a development is proposed in a visually sensitive or physically restricted situation where there is room for doubt that a development can be designed that would be acceptable. The earlier applications demonstrate that the site is visually sensitive and physically restricted.
 - The proposed plot is not considered to be large enough to accommodate a new dwelling without resulting in a cramped form of development that would spoil the character of the area and the currently open setting of the adjacent Edwardian villas.
 - The submitted illustrative information fails to address the reasons for refusal, and intended reasons for refusal, of application references S/0998/10/F and S/1418/11 respectively.
 - The illustrative layout indicates there would be an entrance door and two windows in the side facing No.84, resulting in a loss of privacy due to overlooking

of a habitable room in the side elevation of No.84. This would be contrary to para. 6.68 of the District Design Guide.

- The proposed first floor rear windows indicated in the illustrative plans would overlook the main living areas and garden of No.1 Manse Drive.
- The dwelling location shown in the illustrative plans would result in a loss of amenity to No.88 Rampton Road. It would be overbearing in the outlook from windows in the adjacent single-storey room and result in a loss of sunlight from the south-east.
- As the siting is not proposed at this stage, it is not possible to assess the loss of light to No.84.
- It is doubtful as to whether all cars would be able to enter and leave the site in forward gear.
- There is no indication of how the development could fit in the street scene. Turning the development 90 degrees to the road would be out of keeping with adjacent forward facing properties and would not match the style of the pair of adjacent detached Edwardian villas.
- Applications approved in 1990 and 2001 are old, have expired and are of no value. The plot has since become narrower through the addition of a side extension to No.88.
- The proposed means of access does not relate to the new development and it is therefore questioned whether this is valid or appropriate to the application.
- The proposed new entrance would be near to a curve in the road, and result in highway safety problems.
- The development would result in the loss of trees to the detriment of the character of the area.
- Garden grabbing – there is a growing body of cases, following the revision to PPS3 and downgrading of garden land from brown field status, where appeal inspectors have declined applications to build on garden land where there is: a significant adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties; or an adverse impact on the character of the area. This includes:
 - a) A site in Wellingborough that had a lapsed outline permission for a dwelling, with the appeal being dismissed as the appeal site comprised garden land that there is no longer a priority to develop.
 - b) A site in Barking was dismissed at appeal as a parcel of backland garden was deemed to be worthy of retention in its own right, in the interests of the character and appearance of the area and amenities of adjoining residents.
 - c) A proposed plot in Gloucester where development of a garden was considered to harm the suburban garden character of the immediate locality.
 - d) Proposed residential development of backland gardens in Redhill dismissed at appeal due to the impact on the character of the area. The Inspector referred to the revisions to PPS3, stating they did not preclude development of garden land, but represented a change of emphasis in national policy, by giving local

authorities the freedom to prevent overdevelopment of neighbourhoods and garden grabbing.

28. District Councillor Edwards requests that the application be referred to the Planning Committee for determination, stating:

“There are serious questions regarding the principle of development on this site, and I am particularly concerned about site access, and the impact on the surrounding area in terms of the nature of development. I think that the detrimental impact on the amenity of the neighbouring properties and the overall impact on the aspect of Rampton Road merits this going to Planning Committee.”

Planning Comments

Principle of the development

29. Cottenham is identified within Policy ST/5 of the Core Strategy as a Minor Rural Centre. In such settlements, development and redevelopment, up to a maximum scheme size of 30 dwellings, is acceptable in principle on sites within village frameworks.
30. The proposed development equates to a density of approximately 25 dwellings per hectare. Policy HG/1 of the Local Development Framework requires new residential developments to achieve a minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare, unless material considerations indicate a different density of development would be more appropriate. This wording reflects the change in emphasis following the revisions to PPS3 and the removal of garden land from the definition of ‘brownfield’ land. Policy HG/1 used to only permit lower densities of development if there was exceptional justification for such an approach, but the word ‘exceptional’ has since been removed from the policy wording.
31. In the representations received, concern has been expressed that the proposed development represents ‘garden grabbing’, and that this has been dismissed at appeal on numerous occasions. In one of the decisions quoted, an Inspector specifically notes that the changes to PPS3 do not preclude the principle of development of garden land. This is an important point and it must be stressed that the revisions to PPS3 were designed to ensure authorities did not feel compelled to approve schemes, in the interests of making the best use of land, that would otherwise be considered unacceptable when judged against material planning criteria. This case, as well as the other appeal decisions referred to, were dismissed due to the harm to the character and residential amenities of the area and it is against these criteria (as well as other material planning considerations) that the current application must be judged.

Impact on the character of the area

32. Application reference S/0998/10/F, which proposed the erection of a detached dwelling on the site, was refused due to its impact on the character of the area and upon the amenities of No.84 Rampton Road, whilst a subsequent revised scheme was withdrawn following Officers intent to refuse the scheme on the same grounds. The current application is in outline form, with only details of the means of access provided, and all other matters (namely siting, design, external appearance and landscaping) reserved for further consideration.

33. Strong concerns have been raised by the Parish Council and local residents regarding the appropriateness of an outline application in this instance, bearing in mind the recent planning history relating to the site. The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2010 states that, if a planning authority is of the opinion that an application ought not to be considered separately from all or any of the reserved matters, they must notify the applicant of the additional details required within one month. The relevant circular requires applications to include, as a minimum, information relating to the use, amount of development, indicative layout, scale parameters, indicative access points, and a Design and Access Statement. This required information has been provided in this instance. The guidance makes it clear that it is only in particularly visually sensitive locations, such as within the Conservation Area or setting of a Listed Building, where outline applications will not normally be appropriate. This site is not subject to such designations and, whilst recent applications have failed to find an acceptable solution to the development of the land, this does not automatically imply a need to provide full details in order to establish whether the principle of development is acceptable. It should be stressed that an outline application is the first part of a two-stage process in obtaining planning permission, with the detail not included at outline stage having to form part of a subsequent application (the reserved matters).
34. As referred to within the planning history section of this report, the principle of erecting a dwelling on this site has previously been accepted, through the granting of outline permission reference S/2367/01/O. The single storey extension on the south-east side of No.88 had previously been approved under a 1992 consent and, according to the drawing submitted with application reference S/2367/01/O, existed at the time this application was approved. The approved outline site was therefore the same size as that proposed in the current application. Whilst the Local Development Framework 2007 has been adopted in the meantime, there has been no significant change in the policy status or criteria affecting the site. The land lies inside the village framework and is not located within the village Conservation Area, both of which were applicable at the time of the 2002 outline approval.
35. In September 2010, a full application for the erection of a detached dwelling on this site was refused at Planning Committee. This application proposed a 7m high chalet-style house with a hipped roof front projection, low eaves, and sloping roofs to the front and rear, a design virtually identical in appearance to the dwelling at No.82 Rampton Road. One of the reasons for refusal related to the fact that the design and detailing of the dwelling was deemed to be unsympathetic to the character of the area. However, this proposal was not refused on the grounds that the principle of developing the plot was considered to be unacceptable, rather it was the specific design put forward that was deemed to be harmful.
36. The proposed plot of land measures approximately 37 metres in depth x 12 metres in width. No.84 occupies a plot measuring approximately 45m x 20m, whilst No.82 sits on a small tapering plot that measures around 38m in depth x 6m at the frontage and increasing in width to around 14m at the rear. Nos. 80-84 Rampton Road represent quite a cramped form of development, with limited gaps to either side of No.82, whilst development at the rear is characterised by large bungalows within small plots. The subdivision of the existing site to create a building plot would result in both the proposed site, and the remaining land at No.88, being comparable in size to plots in the immediate vicinity of the site.
37. Whilst all matters other than access are reserved for further consideration, the application does include an illustrative layout plan that indicates how a dwelling may be accommodated on the site. Both Nos. 84 and 88 are set back from the road

frontage. The illustrative block plan shows a proposed dwelling sited around 12 metres back from the front of the plot, to achieve a gentle stagger in the building line between the two adjacent dwellings, with a gap of 2.5m to the adjacent single-storey element of No.88, approximately 7m to the flank two-storey wall of No.84, and a rear garden depth of 14-16 metres. The illustrative block plan demonstrates that it would be possible to erect a modest dwelling on the site whilst maintaining gaps to both sides in order to ensure development would not appear overly cramped within the street scene.

38. Under application reference S1418/11, the revisions made to the design of the dwelling were considered too minor to overcome the previous reasons for refusal. At the time, Officers suggested that a more appropriate form of development could be designed to look like a traditional outbuilding/Edwardian coach house, with a narrow span, sited near to the boundary with No.88, and possibly extending along the bend in the site. The submitted illustrative layout accords with this advice. As pointed out within responses received, this layout indicates that the dwelling would be sited gable end to the road, with its principal elevation facing towards No.84. There is a wide variety of building heights, styles and forms in the immediate area, and there are some instances, including on the opposite side of the road to the site, where gables face the road. This design approach is not therefore considered to result in incongruous form of development. However, dwellings in the area do front the street and it would be important that any property on this site also does the same, which may mean needing to add more presence to the appearance of the front gable. This is a detailed design matter that could be addressed at the reserved matters stage.
39. The Old Water Tower is a Grade II Listed Building sited around 15m away from the rear boundary of the site. The Conservation Manager has previously commented that development of this site would not affect the setting of this building.

Residential amenity issues

40. Application reference S/0998/10/F was partly refused due to the harmful impact upon the amenities of No.84 Rampton Road. No.84 has a ground floor kitchen window in its side elevation and the application proposed to construct a 7m high dwelling in a position just 2m away from this window. Following a site visit by Members, the kitchen served by this window was considered to constitute a habitable room and the impact of the proposed dwelling deemed unacceptable by reason of its dominant and overbearing nature, and loss of daylight to the affected window.
41. The illustrative drawings submitted with the current application indicate a dwelling with a maximum 7m ridge height and with low, maximum 4.5m high, eaves, set in a position around 7m away from No.84's kitchen window. As the ridge line is indicated as running parallel to the side boundaries, the highest element would therefore be some 10m away from No.84's kitchen window. Guidance issued by the Building Research Establishment in 1992 stipulates that development should not encroach into a 25-degree line drawn from a height of 2 metres from an affected window. Using these criteria, it is apparent that it would be possible to erect a one-and-a-half-storey dwelling on this site whilst ensuring that the amenities of occupants of No.84 would not be seriously compromised by reason of a loss of light or outlook.
42. Concerns have been raised regarding the impact of the dwelling shown in the illustrative plans upon the existing property at No.88. The nearest part of No.88 is a single-storey element that comprises a study served by window openings to the front and rear. The dwelling in the illustrative layout would not encroach into a 45-degree angle drawn from the centre point of both windows. It is therefore considered that

there is sufficient space to accommodate a dwelling on this site in principle without compromising the amenities of occupiers of the existing house.

43. Objections have also been raised on the basis that the illustrative drawings show a bedroom window in the rear elevation, which would result in an unacceptable loss of amenity to No.1 Manse Drive to the rear, by reason of overlooking. The nearest part of this adjoining property, as shown on the block plan, is sited around 16m away from the indicative rear elevation. However, this is a blank gable wall. No.1 Manse Drive is an L-shaped property with its principal windows being sited 11.4m from the boundary. As such, providing any first floor windows would be positioned at least 14 metres away from the rear boundary of the site, the plot could comfortably accommodate a one-and-a-half-storey property without resulting in an unacceptable level of overlooking of the adjacent property to the rear.
44. If any dwelling on this site was designed with a front/rear aspect, any first floor windows in the side elevation could be fixed shut and obscure glazed, or high level openings (as indicated in the supporting Design and Access Statement), in order to prevent overlooking of Nos. 84 and 88. Concerns regarding the impact of ground floor openings could be resolved through the construction of appropriate boundary treatments.
45. With regards to the amenities that would be enjoyed by future occupiers of the proposed dwelling, the adopted District Design Guide recommends a two-bedroom house in a rural setting to have a private garden space of 50m², whilst 80m² is recommended for three-bedroom properties. The rear garden size indicated in the illustrative drawings extends to more than 150m², a figure that far exceeds the recommended guidelines.
46. The Environmental Health Officer has recommended that conditions be added to any consent to protect residents from noise during the construction period. Controlling hours of use of power-operated machinery is a standard requirement and it is recommended that this condition be imposed. However, the requirement for driven pile foundations is more appropriately covered through an informative of any planning consent.

Highway safety

47. Rampton Road is a classified road that is subject to a 30mph speed limit. It is proposed that the existing access would be used by the new dwelling. To compensate for this, a new means of vehicular access would be provided to the front of the existing dwelling. Whilst the Highways Authority has not responded to date, it has previously indicated that it has no objections to the proposal subject to 2m x 2m visibility splays being provided on each side of the new access (these are shown on the submitted drawing) and to sufficient space being provided within the curtilage of each property for parking and turning. A condition should be added to any consent requiring the provision of the new access (including visibility splays), parking and turning areas for the existing property prior to occupation of the new dwelling. Conditions relating to parking and turning for the proposed new dwelling are matters that relate to the layout of the site and should therefore be imposed at the reserved matters stage.

Ecology and landscape issues

48. The proposal would involve the demolition of the existing garage. The Council's Ecology Officer has previously visited the site and found no evidence of the presence

of bats. The development is not therefore considered to have significant impacts upon ecology and wildlife interests.

49. The new access would involve the removal of a section of existing hedgerow along the front boundary. The loss of a part of the front boundary hedge is not considered to cause significant harm to the character of the area whilst the Trees Officer is satisfied that the development can be accommodated on site without comprising existing trees.

Infrastructure

50. The proposal would result in the need for financial contributions towards the provision and maintenance of open space, towards indoor community facilities and household waste receptacles in accordance with the requirements of Policies DP/4, SF/10 and SF/11 of the Local Development Framework. The level of contribution would depend upon the number of bedrooms proposed and could not therefore be calculated until the submission of a reserved matters application. However, a condition to secure such contributions would be necessary as part of any outline permission. The applicants' agent has confirmed, in writing, the clients' agreement to such payments.

Recommendation

51. Approval:
1. Approval of the details of the layout of the site, the scale and appearance of the dwelling, and the landscaping (hereinafter called the "reserved matters") shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority in writing before any development is commenced.
(Reason – This application is in outline only.)
 2. Application for the approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
(Reason – The application is in outline only).
 3. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than the expiration of two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.
(Reason – The application is in outline only.)
 4. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 369/7A (the means of access, parking and turning areas to the front of the new dwelling only) and Tree Constraints and Protection Plan dated Oct 2011.
(Reason - To facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.)
 5. The layout, block plan and floor plan details of the new dwelling indicated on drawing number 369/7A are for illustrative purposes only.
(Reason – The application is in outline only).
 6. The proposed new access shall be constructed using a 'no-dig' method, in accordance with the details shown within the Tree Constraints and Protection Plan' dated Oct 2011.

(Reason - To protect the hedge and trees which are to be retained in order to preserve the visual amenities of the area in accordance with Policy DP/2 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

7. The existing hedge on the front boundary of the site and trees identified for retention within the Tree Constraints and Protection Plan dated Oct 2011 shall be retained except at the point of access; and any trees or shrubs 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.

(Reason - To protect the hedge and trees which are to be retained in order to preserve the visual amenities of the area in accordance with Policy DP/2 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

8. No development shall commence until a scheme for the protection of the front boundary hedge and trees during the construction period has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

(Reason - To protect the hedge and trees which are to be retained in order to preserve the visual amenities of the area in accordance with Policy DP/2 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

9. No development shall begin until details of a scheme for the provision of recreational, community facilities, and household waste receptacles infrastructure, to meet the needs of the development in accordance with adopted Local Development Framework Policies DP/4, SF/10 and SF/11 have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include a timetable for the provision to be made and shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

(Reason - To ensure adequate infrastructure is available to support the development in accordance with Policies DP/4, SF/10 and SF/11 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007 and to the Supplementary Planning Document, Open Space in New Developments, adopted January 2009)

10. Visibility splays shall be provided on both sides of the proposed new access and shall be maintained free from any obstruction over a height of 600mm within an area of 2m x 2m measured from and along respectively the highway boundary.

(Reason - In the interest of highway safety in accordance with Policy DP/3 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

11. The new dwelling, hereby permitted, shall not be occupied until the proposed new vehicular access, and parking and turning areas for the existing dwelling, have been provided in accordance with the details shown within drawing number 369/7A. The access, parking and turning areas shall thereafter be retained in accordance with the approved details.

(Reason - In the interest of highway safety in accordance with Policy DP/3 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

12. No gates shall be erected across the new vehicular access and existing access.
- (Reason – In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy DP/3 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

13. During the period of demolition and construction, no power operated machinery shall be operated on the site before 0800 hours and after 1800 hours on

weekdays and 1300 hours on Saturdays, nor at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays, unless otherwise previously agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

(Reason – To minimise noise disturbance to adjoining residents in accordance with Policy NE/15 of the Local Development Framework 2007.)

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

South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework (LDF) 2007

Circular 05/2005 – Planning Obligations

Circular 11/95 – The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions

Planning application references: 2183/11, 1767/11, 0998/10/F, S/2367/01/O, S/1132/92/F, S/0091/90/F, S/0356/88/O, S/0343/79/O.

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