

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

1st February 2011

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

S/1044/11 – GREAT EVERSDEN
10 affordable dwellings - Site known as OSP 148, Church Street
for Mr J Walton, Accent Nene Ltd

Recommendation: Refusal

Date for Determination: 22 August 2011

Members will visit the site on Tuesday 31st January 2012

This application has been reported to the Planning Committee for determination as the application is submitted on land owned by the District Council where objections on material planning grounds have been received, and the site is an exceptions site for affordable housing where the Parish Council disagrees with the District Council on material planning grounds

The proposal is a Departure application

Site and Proposal

1. The application site is an area of land situated to the east side of the village of Great Eversden, adjacent to the designated village framework. The land is currently in the ownership of South Cambridgeshire District Council, and is currently leased to two people for grazing. To the west of the site are the gardens of the properties along Chapel Road. To the north is Public Footpath No. 15 and the grade II listed village hall and its parking area. There are further orchard trees to the east, beyond which is the dwelling of the Homestead. This dwelling and its outbuilding are both grade II listed. To the southern side of Church Street are open agricultural land and the complex of buildings that form Church Farm, the main dwelling and the barn both of which are grade II listed. Further east from Church Farm is the grade II* Church of St Mary, set on the bend in Church Street. There are three trees with individual tree preservation orders set along the western boundary of the site. The frontage boundary has a good hedge running its length.
2. The application, received on 23rd May 2011, seeks the erection of an exceptions site of ten affordable houses on the site. This involves the creation of a new access from Church Street, serving five pairs of semi-detached properties. All are proposed as two-storey properties except the bungalow of plot 9. The proposal includes a community orchard along the eastern side of the plot, with a path running through this land linking the entrance of the site to the public footpath and village hall to the north. The application is accompanied by a Design and Access Statement, a Heritage Statement, a Sequential Test for affordable housing, a Surface Water Management Strategy, a Pre-development Tree Survey, and an Ecology Report.

Planning History

3. Application **S/3202/88/F** for 16 flats and garages was refused, dismissed at appeal and dismissed by the Secretary of State on the site. This was on grounds of inappropriate development in the Green Belt and the impact upon the character of the area.
4. Other applications on the site, **S/1177/74/O** for residential development, **S/1174/81/O** for residential development, **S/1657/81/O** for residential development, **S/0735/86/O** for local authority housing, and **S/1205/86** for Council housing for the elderly were all withdrawn.
5. 6 affordable dwellings were constructed at the west side of the village through application **S/0026/97/F**.
6. Application **S/0629/08/F** granted planning permission at Planning Committee for the erection of ten affordable dwellings together with a new access at land adj 52 Harlton Road in Little Eversden. This has been erected and is the Low Close development referred to in this report. Members will recall the application was referred to Planning Committee in September 2009 to vary the Section 106 Agreement to allow the dwellings to be available for residents of both Great and Little Eversden, contrary to officer advice.

Policies

7. **Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2007: ST/7** Infill Villages.
8. **Local Development Framework Development Control Policies (LDF DCP) 2007:**
DP/1 Sustainable Development, **DP2** Design of New Development, **DP/3** Development Criteria, **DP/4** Infrastructure and New Development, **DP/7** Development Frameworks, **GB/1** Development in the Green Belt, **GB/2** Mitigating the Impact of Development in the Green Belt, **HG/3** Affordable Housing, **HG/4** Affordable Housing Subsidy, **HG/5** Exceptions Sites for Affordable Housing, **SF/6** Public Art and New Development, **SF/10** Outdoor Playspace, Informal Open Space, and New Developments, **SF/11** Open Space Standards, **NE/1** Energy Efficiency, **NE/2** Renewable Energy, **NE/3** Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development, **NE/6** Biodiversity, **NE/9** Water and Drainage Infrastructure, **NE/10** Foul Drainage – Alternative Drainage Systems, **NE/11** Flood Risk, **NE/14** Lighting Proposals, **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.
9. **Open Space in New Developments SPD** – adopted January 2009, **Trees and Development Sites SPD** – adopted January 2009, **Biodiversity SPD** – adopted July 2009, **Affordable Housing SPD** – adopted March 2010, **Listed Buildings SPD** – adopted July 2009, **Landscape in New Developments SPD** – adopted March 2010 & **District Design Guide SPD** – adopted March 2010.

10. **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.
11. **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

12. **Eversden Parish Council** recommends approval of the application. They make comments regarding the retention and maintenance of the frontage hedge, safety considerations to the LAP, prevention of overlooking to the west, the land between the dwellings and the western boundary, access to the public space, size of the turning head, the lack of visitor parking spaces, access to the village hall, drainage details and lighting requirements. With regard to the amended plans, the recommendation remains of approval, although comments regarding visitor parking, spacing of the fruit trees and access for bin lorries are noted.
13. The Council's **Conservation Officer** has objected to the proposal given the harm to the village form if the gap between settlements is narrowed, the design of the units, and the lack of investigation into alternative sites. The reduction in the gap between the village and the earlier hamlet around the Church would weaken the historically separate characters of these settlements, emphasised by the loss of the hedge and the visibility of the development. The layout and design of the proposed group, and lack of hierarchy of the proposal contrasts with the character of other local farm groups.
14. **English Heritage** note the proximity of the proposal to the grade II* listed Parish Church of St Mary. Its relationship to the village will be changed and precedent established for building in the area. The proposal would be harmful to the significance of the church's setting due to both the development of the plot and the introduction of a modern form of estate layout not otherwise seen in this linear settlement. The amended plans were not considered to overcome their objections.
15. The **Local Highways Authority** originally objected to the plan given the lack of justification for the reduced vehicle-to-vehicle visibility splays provided. They also confirm they would not seek to adopt the road, and suggest a footpath linking the site to the rest of the village. Following the submission of drawing 1015/P/018 date stamped 11th January 2012, the vehicle-to-vehicle visibility splays are considered acceptable.
16. The Council's **Housing Development and Enabling Manager** notes the number of affordable houses provided should not be greater than the level of identified local need. The same Parish Council governs Great and Little Eversden and as such they have sought to combine the housing need of both, as done at Low Close in Little Eversden. The housing register shows the need for 6 dwellings in Great Eversden. A minimum of 50% rented

dwelling is recommended. The mix is broadly in line with the local need profile. Support is given for the scheme.

17. The Council's **Environmental Health Officer** is concerned that problems could arise from noise and therefore suggests conditions relating to the timings of use of power-operated machinery during construction, and the use of pile driven foundations. A further condition regarding the lighting of the site is suggested, along with an informative regarding bonfires and burning of waste during construction.
18. The **County Rights of Way Team** has no objection to the proposal but would point out that Public Footpath no. 15 Great Eversden is located adjacent to the northern boundary. A number of points of law are suggested to be added as informatives.
19. The **County Archaeological Team** recommend a condition regarding archaeological investigation of the site given the site's location within the medieval core of the village.
20. **Anglian Water** notes the foul drainage from the site is in the catchment of the Haslingfield Sewage Treatment Works that at present has the available capacity for these flows. A condition regarding surface water drainage is recommended, where a sustainable drainage system should be used.
21. The **Environment Agency** notes there are no Agency related issues in respect of the application. Informatives are recommended regarding drainage details.
22. The Council's **Lands Officer** notes the site has been in District Council ownership since 1948, and is leased to occupiers of two adjacent dwellings for grazing purposes, both of whom have made requests to purchase it. Previous to its current use and since acquisition, the land has been used as farmland and by a garden nursery owner for growing and storage of plants.
23. The **Police Architectural Liaison Officer** notes the site should achieve Secured by Design Part 2 principles. He notes of the reported crimes in Great Eversden, none are in the vicinity of the proposal. There have been no instances of anti-social behaviour likely to affect the site. There is a concern that the entrances to plots 1 and 2 are out of view of the other units, but balanced against the levels of crime in the area, this is not considered to be an issue.
24. The Council's **Trees Officer** has no objection to the removal of trees identified on the tree protection plan. All tree protection indicated on the plan should be provided prior to any development operations on the site.
25. The Council's **Landscape Officer** notes that the landscape detail is unacceptable in its present form. Numerous changes to the planting and hardstanding areas are proposed. The replacement frontage hedge should be more robust. The LAP should be as simple as possible, i.e. mowed grass with a bench.
26. The Council's **Ecology Officer** has assessed the site in terms of the Ecological Survey and in particular bat activity. The community orchard is of an adequate width to allow bats to continue to move through this parcel of

land, and no significant impact upon bats would result. No external lighting should be provided within the scheme. Within the grassland, the species found are not scarce and the diversity was low. The retained area of grassland has much potential to be further enhanced and positively managed. Details of any frontage hedge clearance are required. The existing does contain dutch elm disease. Working areas during construction should be highlighted, and a management plan and funds for the new habitat needs to be addressed.

27. The **Campaign to Protect Rural England** has objected to the application on grounds of ten dwellings being out of keeping with the village, the field and views present quintessentially rural England, highway safety dangers, the lack of need for the dwellings, the lack of village facilities, and the potential for alternative sites to be used. The amended plans were not considered to overcome their objections.

Representations

28. A combined total of 42 letters of objection have been received from the original and amended plans, based upon the following:
- Impact upon the open and linear character of the village.
 - Impact upon the Cambridge Green Belt.
 - Lack of need for affordable units for Great Eversden and the methods to ensure they go to local people.
 - Lack of up-to-date housing data.
 - Other sites being available within the village.
 - Lack of village services, employment opportunities, and sustainability.
 - Great Eversden being an Infill-Only village.
 - Impact upon the adjacent Listed Buildings.
 - The design and layout of the proposed units.
 - Highway safety and congestion.
 - Impact upon the neighbouring properties.
 - Parking problems.
 - Pollution by future occupiers.
 - Loss of the frontage hedge.
 - Impact upon wildlife given the loss of hedges and trees.
 - The lack of a bat survey.
 - The sewage capacity of the village.
 - The lack of an archaeological report.
 - South Cambridgeshire District Council as the landowners.
29. A combined total of 19 letters of support have been received from the original and amended plans, based upon the following:
- Local need and the ability to be near family.
 - Good design.
 - Introduction of community spirit.
 - The success of the Low Close scheme in Little Eversden.
 - The site always being meant for housing.
 - Support to existing village facilities.
30. **Cllr Heazell**, the Local Member for Great Eversden, has written in support of the scheme. The land was original bought by the District Council for housing, and forms part of a two-phase plan with Little Eversden. No other offers of

land have been made to the Parish Council. The scheme is well-spaced and includes a community orchard.

31. **Cllr Howell**, the Housing Portfolio Holder, has written in support of the application. The importance of meeting high housing demand and effective use of land assets is noted. Since 2007, 370 new affordable homes have been developed on exceptions sites. The Low Close scheme in Little Eversden has been well received, and the same selection criteria for both villages should be used. Given the size of Great Eversden, it is in serious risk of no affordable dwellings being built if the needs of other Parishes cannot be accommodated.

Planning Comments

32. The key issues for the determination of this application are Green Belt principles, the principle for an exceptions site, impact upon the adjacent heritage assets and the character of the village, highway safety and parking provision, impact upon the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings, landscape and ecology concerns, impact upon the adjacent public footpath, and contributions and the Section 106 package.

Green Belt Principles

33. The application site is located within the Cambridge Green Belt. Paragraph 3.4 of Planning Policy Guidance 2 (Green Belts) provides a list of potential developments that are considered appropriate by definition within such areas, and this includes "limited affordable housing for local community needs". The proposal seeks ten affordable units, and this is consistent with previous exceptions sites to Infill-Only Villages within the District (please see further justification in "principles for an exceptions site"). The proposal is considered to be appropriate development within the Green Belt.
34. Planning Policy HG/5 of the LDF DCP requires the Council to be assured that no alternative sites are available before granting permission for rural exception sites in the Green Belt. Paragraph 6.10 of the Affordable Housing SPD states applicants must demonstrate that no alternative appropriate sites can be found outside the Green Belt before permission is granted. The applicant has completed a Sequential test to assess other potential sites around the village boundary. Great Eversden is completely surrounded by the Green Belt, and there are no pockets of "white land" around the village. Any exceptions site for the village would therefore be located within the Green Belt, and as a result, such a study is not required in this instance.

The Principle for an Exceptions Site

35. Policy HG/5 of the LDF DCP states that exceptions sites outside the designated village framework may be granted for schemes designed to meet identified local housing needs on small sites within or adjoining villages. Great Eversden is classified as an Infill-Only village, and any residential development within the village framework would usually total two dwellings, as these villages are amongst the smallest in the District, usually with a poor range of services and facilities. There is no definition of the phrase "small", although the Affordable Housing SPD notes that a "small site" would typically range between 6 and 20 dwellings. Schemes of ten dwellings are considered

to be acceptable for Infill-Only villages. The Low Close site in Little Eversden is adjacent an Infill-Only village, whilst Members have recently approved a scheme for 12 dwellings in Shepreth (S/0506/11/F), another Infill-Only village. The proposal is considered to represent a small site.

36. Policy HG/5 provides a number of other criteria that need to be met for exceptions sites to be considered. Criterion a. relates to a scheme for the affordable units to be secured in perpetuity. Whilst no draft Section 106 Agreement or Heads of Terms has been submitted with the application, the applicant is aware of the need for a legal agreement to secure this housing. If approved, this would form part of a planning condition.
37. Criterion b. relates to the number, size, mix and tenure of the dwellings being confined to and appropriate to the strict extent of the identified local need. It is this aspect that has been the subject of numerous objections and queries from the public. The Housing Register on 13th January 2012 shows there is a demand for 6 units for people with a local connection with Great Eversden. This consists of 1x1 bed unit, 4x2 bed units and 1x3 bed unit. The proposal for ten dwellings therefore exceeds the need for the village of Great Eversden.
38. Numerous meetings have taken place at pre-application stage and during the course of the application to discuss this matter. The application approved at Low Close in Little Eversden had its original Section 106 Agreement varied to allow equal availability between people with a local connection to both Little and Great Eversden. Meetings including the Affordable Housing Corporate Manager and the then Head of Planning agreed that the same principle could be applied to this application. The idea being that a scheme to meet Great Eversdens demand only is unlikely to come forward due to the economies of scale working against smaller schemes. The village would face the prospect of no future affordable housing as a result.
39. The Housing Register on 13th January 2012 shows there is a demand for 19 units for people with a connection with Little Eversden. This consists of 4x1 bed units, 13x2 bed units and 2x3 bed units. From the combined village need, the demand would exceed the supply from the site. Any Section 106 Agreement would need to include a more specific cascade system that people with a local connection with Great Eversden get priority, then it is cascaded directly to Little Eversden, before cascading out further in the usual manner. The local concern shows that the Low Close site struggled to attract people with a local connection to the Eversden and the dwellings were cascaded out to people with connections to other villages. However, the Housing Register does provide guidance as to the demand, which in theory could be met by the Eversdens alone, and this is the basis for the determination of this application.
40. Both Little and Great Eversden are covered by the same Parish Council. Whilst the method of meeting need is unorthodox, it has been agreed before by Members in relation to the Eversdens. As a result, the proposal would be a Departure from the Local Development Framework, and it has been advertised accordingly.
41. There was significant local objection regarding the need for affordable units at the site, with particular reference to the time frame of the last Housing Needs Survey. This survey was dated May 2005, and formed the basis for the early

investigations on the site. It did show a greater need for people with a local connection with Great Eversden, with nine units needed. The date of the survey is noted, and the above information is therefore made using the up-to-date Housing Register information.

42. Criterion c. relates to the relationship of an exceptions site to the built-up area of a village, with the scale being in size and character. The latter aspect has been dealt with above. With regard to the relationship with Great Eversden, it is located adjacent to the village framework, and is considered to be an acceptable distance from the existing built part of the village.
43. Criterion d. relates to the relationship with facilities and services within the village. There are very limited existing services and facilities within the village. Of those, the village restaurant is located within 85m of the site, with the village hall within 35m and the Church is within 90m. From the facilities that do exist, the proposal does have a good relationship.
44. There is significant local objection to the proposal given the lack of facilities within Great Eversden. There is no school, very limited employment opportunities, and limited bus services to the village (two services a day to Cambridge, and one service a day to Gamlingay and Croydon). There will be reliance on the car for future occupiers, similar to the reliance from existing villagers. Infill-Only villages, by their very nature, are short on facilities and often do not include a school. Whilst the local concern is noted, an exceptions site of this scale is considered acceptable in this instance.
45. Criterion e. relates to the damage any development would cause to the character of the village and the rural landscape, and this is covered in the next chapter.

Impact upon the Adjacent Heritage Assets and Character of the Village

46. The application site is located directly adjacent to the designated Great Eversden village framework. It is a pleasant grazing area and adds to the rural character of Church Street on the entrance to the village from the east. In refusing the planning appeal for application S/3202/88/F, the Planning Inspector stated the description of the site as one of the “guardian fields”, which form the entrances to the village from east and west and provide its setting. This signifies its importance in this respect.
47. The Planning Inspector noted above stated that the application would “irrevocably change the nature of the village”. Members should be aware that planning policy has changed since the decision was made in 1991 (Planning Policy Guidance Note 2 Green Belts itself was published in 1995), and the site is now formally within the Green Belt.
48. The Planning Inspector did note “there would be a significant extension of its (the village’s) built area from the linking of the now isolated group of buildings around the church with the main body of village development. This would be obvious from High Street, the main road into and through the village”. This is the basis of the objections from the Council’s Conservation Officer and English Heritage. Of the adjacent heritage assets, there are five listed buildings that form the cluster of development around the bend in the Church Street. English Heritage were consulted given the Church being grade II* listed, and their objection relates specifically to the setting of the Church. The

Conservation Officer's comments relate to reduction in the gap between the group of buildings to the east and the built-up part of the village.

49. Comments from both consultees are noted. Exceptions sites by their very nature will change the character of an area given their usual location on the edge of a village. The varying factor of this application is the presence of the listed buildings and their grouping. English Heritage note the Church's setting is achieved by its open surroundings, and this character would be seriously harmed by development of the plot and the modern form of estate layout not otherwise seen in the linear village. As a result, it is considered contrary to the aims and guidance of Planning Policy Statement 5 (Planning and the Historic Environment).
50. The applicant has submitted a design rationale within the Design and Access Statement looking at groupings of buildings within the village, and attempting to respect that in the layout of the site. However, the Conservation Officer notes that the proposed layout and its lack of hierarchy would contrast with the character of the other building groups it is intended to reflect. As a result, the proposal would weaken the historically separate characters of the settlements. The Conservation Officer also notes concerns regarding the proposed use of materials on the site. This matter could be dealt with through an appropriately worded planning condition.

Highway Safety and Parking Provision

51. The Local Highways Authority originally had concerns regarding the visibility of the site, and this view is echoed by a number of local residents. The objections referred to the lack of visibility given Church Street is a 40mph road, with a tight bend eastwards from the site. The visibility splays were originally shown to be part over third party land, and also had an incorrectly drawn vehicle-to-vehicle visibility splay. Negotiations have taken place directly between the applicant and the Local Highways Authority, which has resulted in the submission of drawing 1015/P/018 date stamped 11th January 2012. The Local Highways Authority has confirmed the splays are considered acceptable, and they are all on controllable land. Subject to a condition ensuring the vehicle-to-vehicle visibility splays are laid out as shown on the plan, no highway safety issues should result from the proposal.
52. Local residents and the Parish Council also note concerns regarding the parking provision on site. Each dwelling is shown to have two allocated off-street parking spaces, totalling 20 parking spaces for the site. The Council's maximum parking standards seek an average of 1.5 spaces per dwelling (rising to two spaces for three bed units in poorly accessible areas) plus provision for short-term parking generated by service vehicles. Given these a maximum standards, 20 parking spaces on the site would be satisfactory in line with the standards. It is noted that there are no designated visitor parking spaces. However, visitors should be able either park at the plot they are visiting, and there would appear space for short-term on-street parking.

Impact upon the Amenity of the Occupiers of Neighbouring Properties

53. To the western boundary of the site are two residential properties. Plot 1 would be located 5.2m from the shared boundary with Walnut Tree Cottage. The proposed dwelling is two-storey in height, with heights of 5.1m and 8m to the eaves and roof ridge respectively. The facing gable is blank and therefore

no overlooking would result. Some views from the front and rear windows would create angled views into sections of the rear garden, although these are not considered to cause any serious loss of privacy. Given the size of the garden area to the adjacent property, and the narrow width of the facing gable, no serious loss of amenity is considered to result. A condition would require no windows to be added to the west elevation at first floor level.

54. Plots 6 and 7 would measure 8m and 10.2m at their nearest point to the shared boundary with Willow Lodge. Both facing elevations are blank. Again, some views from the front and rear windows would create angled views into sections of the rear garden, although these are not considered to cause any serious loss of privacy. Given the relationship between the proposals and the garden area and the narrow width of the gable ends, no serious loss of amenity is considered to result. A condition would again be required to ensure no windows are added to the west elevations of both plots at first floor level.
55. The plots along the east side of the site have a separation distance of 27m at the closest point between the rear garden boundaries and the east boundary. This distance is considered acceptable. The community orchard is a publically accessible area, and therefore people can be expected in this area. However, there is sufficient separation between this area and the dwelling of the Homestead to ensure no loss of amenity to the occupiers of this property.

Landscape and Ecology Concerns

56. The key issue of concern from objectors to the scheme is the removal of the frontage hedge. This hedge does contribute towards the character of the village as it provides a green gateway into Great Eversden. Its removal is necessary in order to achieve the required vehicle-to-vehicle visibility splays. It is not immediately clear whether the entire hedge should be removed or whether some can remain. The comments from the Ecology Officer are noted. He states that parts of the hedge are diseased, and its long-term future would be compromised as a result. Replacement planting would allow a greater diversity of species within the frontage hedge while still retaining the habitat value. Whilst the loss of the existing hedge is unfortunate, the scheme allows the potential for a more diverse replacement subject to a landscaping condition.
57. A key part of the development is the introduction of a community orchard to the eastern side of the plot, a habitat encouraged by the District Council. This would create a biodiversity enhancement for the site. In line with Council objectives, the orchard is supported and would create a pleasant village area.
58. The application was supported by a landscape plan and comments were received from the Landscape officer in direct response. There were numerous points of concern, and these have been passed back to the applicant. Should the application be approved, landscape and implementation conditions will be required.
59. Local objections regarding the impact upon bats are noted. The Ecology Officer has commented that the open space area would retain a flight path through the site, following consultation with the local bat group. No serious harm should result to local bat populations. The plans also show bat and bird boxes to be placed around the site, and a condition can ensure these are in suitable locations.

60. The comments from the Council's Trees Officer are noted. The tree protection details should be put in place prior to the commencement of development, especially given the three trees covered by individual Tree Preservation Orders. A condition can ensure this takes place.

Impact upon the Adjacent Public Footpath

61. A public footpath runs to the north of the site, linking Chapel Road to Little Eversden. The County Rights of Way Team note that the footpath should be unaffected by the proposal, although numerous informatives are recommended informing the applicant of their obligations in regard to this footpath, especially during the construction phase.

Contributions and Section 106 Package

62. Members will be updated on matters regarding contributions and the Section 106 package.

Other Matters

63. Concern is noted regarding the Council's position as both landowner and determining authority. The Council's delegation procedure states that where objections are received on material planning grounds for applications on Council land, the application should be heard at Planning Committee. This ensures a transparent approach to the determination of the application. The application is to be determined on its own merits.
64. Local concern regarding the lack of an archaeological report is noted. The County Archaeological Team has requested a condition regarding investigation, and this can be added to any consent.
65. The comments from the Environmental Health Officer are noted, and the relevant conditions and informatives can be added to any consent.
66. Anglian Water has also confirmed that Haslingfield Sewage Treatment Works has an adequate sewage capacity for the proposed development. The recommended surface water drainage condition can ensure an adequate system, ideally a sustainable urban system, is used.

Summary

67. To briefly summarise the above, Members must balance the harm caused to the heritage assets in the local vicinity and local character against the benefit of securing affordable housing for the village. The officer recommendation is that the need does not outweigh the harm in this instance. The application seeks ten affordable units for a village with a need of only six units. Given the close links between Great and Little Eversden, a Section 106 Agreement can ensure that people with close connections to Great and then Little Eversden come first on the cascade system. Whilst not a common method of working, this is considered appropriate in this instance as it was for the Low Close development.

Recommendation

68. Recommend refusal (as amended by dwgs 1015/P/015, 1015/P/016, 1015/P/030, 1015/P/031, 1015/P/032, 1015/P/033, and 1015/P/034 date stamped 14th October 2012, and dwg 1015/P/018 date stamped 11th January 2012), for the following reasons:

The application site lies adjacent to the designated Great Eversden village framework, and is a field currently used for grazing. To the east of the site are a cluster of buildings including the grade II* listed Church of St Mary. The dwelling of the Homestead and its outbuilding, and Church Farm and its barn are all grade II listed. The separation between these buildings from the main part of Great Eversden is significant in the setting of these listed buildings, and the field plays a large role in this separation. The proposed layout shows a cul-de-sac of development that lacks the hierarchy of the other building groupings in the local vicinity and is contrary to the linear nature of the existing village. The location and layout therefore closes the gap between the cluster of buildings around the church and the main village and is contrary to groupings in the local vicinity, to the detriment of the setting of all the Listed Buildings within this cluster.

The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CH/4 of the Local Development Framework Development Control Policies (LDF DCP) 2007 which states planning permission will not be granted for development which would adversely affect the curtilage or wider setting of a Listed Building; Policy DP/2 of the LDF DCP 2007 which states all new development must be high quality design and as appropriate to the scale and nature of the development, should preserve or enhance the character of the local area; Policy DP/3 of the LDF DCP 2007 which states planning permission will not be granted where the proposed development would have an unacceptable adverse impact on village character; and paragraph HE9.4 of Policy HE9 and Policy HE10 of Planning Policy Statement 5 (Planning and the Historic Environment).

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

- Local Development Framework Development Control Policies 2007.
- Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2007.
- Open Space in New Developments SPD – adopted January 2009, Trees and Development Sites SPD – adopted January 2009, Biodiversity SPD – adopted July 2009, Affordable Housing SPD – adopted March 2010, Listed Buildings SPD – adopted July 2009, Landscape in New Developments SPD – adopted March 2010 & District Design Guide SPD – adopted March 2010.
- Circular 11/95 – The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions.
- Circular 05/2005 - Planning Obligations.
- Planning File ref: S/3202/88/F, S/1177/74/O, S/1174/81/O, S/1657/81/O, S/0735/86/O, S/1205/86, S/0026/97/F and S/0629/08/F.

Contact Officer: Paul Derry – Senior Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713159