

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

4 February 2015

AUTHOR/S: Planning and New Communities Director

Application Number: S/1681/14/FL

Parish(es): Fen Drayton

Proposal: Dwelling

Site address: The Cobbles, Horse and Gate Street, Fen Drayton

Applicant(s): Mr Robert Fogg

Recommendation: Approval

Key material considerations: Principle of Development
Amenity
Impact on the Conservation Area
Parking / Highway Safety

Committee Site Visit: 3 February 2015

Departure Application: No

Presenting Officer: John Koch

Application brought to Committee because: Parish Council recommendation of refusal conflicts with Officers recommendation

Date by which decision due: 7 October 2014

Planning History

1. None relevant.

Planning Policies

2. **National Planning Policy Framework**
3. **Local Development Framework Development Control Policies (Adopted July 2007)**
 - ST/2 Housing Provision
 - ST/6 Group Villages
 - SF/10 Outdoor Playspace, Informal Open Space, and New Developments
 - SF/11 Open Space Standards
 - DP/1 Sustainable Development
 - DP/2 Design of New Development

DP/3 Development Criteria
DP/4 Infrastructure and New Developments
DP/7 Development Frameworks
HG/1 Housing Density
CH/5 Conservation Areas
NE/1 Energy Efficiency
NE/6 Biodiversity
NE/12 Water Conservation
NE/15 Noise Pollution
ST/6 Group Villages (Fen Drayton)
TR/1 Planning for more Sustainable Travel
TR/2 Car and Cycle Parking Standards

4. **Local Plan (Proposed Submission Version (July 2013))**

S/3 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
S/7 Development Frameworks
S/10 Group Villages (Fen Drayton)
HQ/1 Design Principles
NH/14 Heritage Assets
TI/8 Infrastructure and New Developments

5. **Supplementary Planning Documents**

District Design Guide SPD (adopted March 2010)

Consultations

6. **Fen Drayton Parish Council** recommends refusing the amended application for the following reasons.

1. Moving the house back would impact negatively on the neighbours, as outlined in the letter sent to you by Simon Kerr. It would only gain parking for one car on the drive and visitors' cars would have to park on the road causing congestion on Church Street (see point 3).

OUR PREVIOUS COMMENTS ARE UNCHANGED:

2. The size of the proposed building reduces disproportionately the amount of open garden. There is little amenity land for the new property and the retained garden is much reduced.

3. By demolishing a double garage the amount of parking available for the retained land is also reduced, encouraging more parking in front of building line and on-street parking in Church Street, which would exacerbate traffic-related and parking problems in an already congested area.

4. The single garage and small standing area proposed is likely to be inadequate for a four- bedroom property.

5. Fen Drayton Parish Council has received six letters/emails from neighbours opposing the planning application, which have also been sent to the planning department.

Again, the parish council considers that the amended plan for the proposed dwelling is still unsuitable. The house is big for the space and would have a negative impact on neighbours, and the conservation area. The parish council does not support the application.

7. The **Local Highways Authority** has no objections subject to conditions controlling visibility splays, private water drainage, closing the existing rear access to the existing single garage, and bound materials for the proposed access drive.
8. The **Contaminated Land Officer** is satisfied that a condition relating to contaminated land investigation is not required.
9. The **Historic Buildings Advisor** has requested changes as listed: reduce glazed doors to one set; double up the porch window with the partition off the central mullion; all ground floor openings to have cambered brick arch or stone as the nearby modern development; instead of reducing the width of the stack, maintain the width throughout and increase the overall height by about 300mm; introduce planting in south east corner of site to compensate for loss of existing; windows and doors to be painted softwood not plastic; pantiles to be clay (not "Redland Norfolk Pantiles" which are not Norfolk pantiles); roof lights should be flush metal type. Conditions are recommended in respect of landscaping, boundary treatment, materials and removal of permitted development rights.

Representations

10. The owners of Croston, Church Street have an objection concerning the proximity of the proposed dwelling to the west which would lead to deprivation of natural light to west facing windows, loss of privacy and overlooking, noise and disturbance. Concern is raised in respect of vehicle access, overdevelopment, impact on the character of the conservation area, and feeling intimidated and dominated by the overbearing side of a house.
11. The owner of The Cottage, Church Street has objected to the proposed development with concerns that it is misplaced, out of proportion to the available space, very close to the road and well forward of the building line, also concerns with regard to congestion and risks to vehicles and pedestrians.
12. The owners of Thorn House, Church Street have objected on grounds that the building is in front of the building line and close to the road, Church Street is a narrow street, the proposal would have an impact on privacy, lack of parking, and affect on their bed and breakfast business, particularly during construction. No objection if sufficient parking space was provided on the driveway.
13. The owner of Birches, Church Street has concerns that the dwelling would be accessed via Church Street and not Horse and Gate Street as the application implies, Church Street is a narrow road, and the proposal would have a detrimental impact on highway safety and parking.
14. The owners of Stone Court, Church Street have concerns relating to impact of the development on the conservation area and neighbouring properties, the fact that the building does not follow the existing building line, parking and traffic, no footpath along Church Street, loss of light, and emergency vehicle access.
15. The owners of Mill View, Horse and Gate Street have concerns relating to the proximity of the proposed dwelling to adjacent properties, impact on the conservation area, overdevelopment of the site, impact on light and the view of the church, and traffic / parking.

16. The owner of Linden Cottage, Church Street has concerns with the access via Church Street and road safety.
17. The owners of Cornerstone, Church Street have objected with concerns relating to the vehicle access directly opposite their driveway, visibility and congestion, and that the existing single garage is used for storage purposes only.

Planning Comments

18. The site is located within the village development framework and the conservation area. The application site comprises 0.65 hectares of land between Horse and Gate Street and Church Street and includes the dwelling and garden land of The Cobbles.
19. The Cobbles is currently accessed via Horse and Gate Street with off road parking and turning to the front of the dwelling. A detached single flat roof garage is located within the rear garden of the property accessed via Church Street. Surrounding properties comprise a mix of modern and historic dwellings and include 2 and 1½ storey properties. Immediately to the west of the site are detached 2 storey dwellings, one of which is access via Horse and Gate Street and the other Church Street. To the east of site is the house and garden of a relatively modern two storey detached property accessed via Church Street. On the opposite side of Church Street are residential properties including Thorn House where a Bed and Breakfast business is run and further up the church of St Mary which is Grade II listed. The building line along Church Street is not strongly defined but staggered with detached garages located to the front of dwellings adjacent to the highway. The Cobbles itself is a 1½ storey dwelling.
20. The application, amended by drawings received on 22 January 2014, seeks planning permission for the demolition of the single garage and the erection of a 1½ storey detached dwelling with an integral garage. The application was subject to pre-application advice ref: PRE/0157/14 and changes have been made in response to this.
21. The proposed dwelling would be located within the rear garden of the existing dwelling. With a footprint of approximately 85sqm, the proposal would comprise a modest three bedroom dwelling with a pitch roof to a maximum height of 7.2m and height to the eaves of 3.6m. Downstairs accommodation would include a lounge, dining room, kitchen and a study. The dwelling would be set back approximately 5m from the Church Street boundary with a driveway and garden located to the front of the property. The rear garden of the proposed dwelling would be approximately 85sqm and that of the existing dwelling 120sqm. The distance between the proposed dwelling and properties to either side would be approximately 3.5m.
22. The rear elevation provides roof lights to first floor accommodation and obscured glazing to the en-suite bathroom, patio doors and a single doorway are proposed on the ground floor. The front elevation which fronts Church Street would comprise three pent dormer, windows garage doors and ground floor windows. Details of materials would be secure via planning condition.

Principle of Development

23. The NPPF advises that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Additionally the Development Plan (Core Strategy Development Plan Document adopted January 2007 and Development Control Policies Development Plan adopted January 2007) identifies

Fen Drayton as a 'Group Village' where the construction of new residential dwellings within the framework is supported.

24. The application site falls within the development framework for the village where the principle of residential development is generally accepted provided the retention of the site does not form an essential part of the local character and that the development is sensitive to local character and amenities of neighbours. The application site comprises a plot that is considered able to accommodate a proposed dwelling without detriment to neighbour amenity or the character of the area. It is considered therefore to accord with Policy DP/7 'Development Framework' of the Development Control Policies DPD, 2007. In terms of density the proposals meets the requirements of policy which requires a density of at least 30 dwellings per hectare.
25. A Section 106 Agreement would secure contributions in terms of community facilities, open space, and waste receptacles to meet the infrastructure demands arising from the proposal.

Amenity

26. The proposed dwelling would have three adjacent neighbours, the host dwelling to the north and detached dwellings to the east (Croston) and the west (Stone Court). The dwelling sits forward of both properties and is on a plot a little narrower than its neighbours. However, it has relatively modest proportions with its upper floor windows set within the roofspace. It is sited off both side property boundaries and is not considered to be overbearing or an overdevelopment of the site given its overall context.
27. Whilst it is noted that the proposal is likely to have some impact upon light for the dwelling to the east of the application site and to some extent the west, this is not thought likely to be detrimental or to lead to an unacceptable amount of harm given the small scale nature of the proposal where the overall bulk is kept to a minimum with accommodation provided within the roof space.
28. The proposal is thought unlikely to have a significant impact upon privacy for the host property to the north as the amended scheme includes roof lights and obscured glazing in this direction. In terms of impact on the amenity of the neighbouring properties it is not considered that the proposed development would lead to a detrimental impact with regard to overlooking or loss of privacy. The main aspect of the dwelling is toward Church Street with limited window openings on side elevations. The proposed dwelling would be located more than 12m from properties on the opposite side of Church Street, as such, it is thought unlikely to adversely impact upon light amenity or privacy for these neighbours.
29. The proposed garden sizes for both the existing and proposed dwelling comply with standards set out in the District Design Guide.

Impact on the Conservation Area

30. The proposal includes the erection of a 1½ storey detached dwelling with an integral garage to provide a three bedroom dwelling. In terms of design and impact on the conservation area it is considered the proposed development to provide a new dwelling is acceptable in this location. The historic buildings advisor has requested some amendments in respect of the detail design of the proposed dwelling. These amendments have been received. There are no issues regarding views of the church

that warrant refusal. Conditions re materials are recommended by the historic buildings advisor which would be attached to the planning permission.

31. It is also appropriate to restrict permitted development rights both in the interests of the conservation area and also to protect neighbours from what might otherwise be inappropriate alterations and extensions .
32. The proposal would thus preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposed development is therefore in accordance with the Development Control Policies DPD, 2007 CH/5 Conservation Areas; and Policy NH/14 Heritage Assets of the Local Plan Proposed Submission 2013.

Parking / Highway Safety

33. The neighbour objections mentioned above raise issues in relation to parking and the impact of the proposal on Church Street. The application proposes a total of two off road car parking spaces, one in front of the proposed dwelling and the single integral garage providing another. In terms of parking this meets adopted standards and is considered acceptable by the Highway Authority in terms of the impact on highway safety. Church Street itself is a quiet residential road with informal parking taking place along it. The Highways Authority has raised no objection to the proposal provided conditions are attached relating to visibility, levels, driveway construction, and closure of the existing access. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable with regard to parking and highway safety.

Conclusion

34. Any adverse impacts of the development are not considered to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the material considerations set out in this report, and the proposed development remains acceptable. As such it is recommended that permission be granted for officers to approve the scheme subject to the completion of a S106 legal agreement securing contributions towards open space, community facilities, waste receptacles and monitoring and legal fees, and the conditions outlined below.

Recommendation

35. Delegated approval subject to:

S106 requirements

36. A scheme for contributions towards community facilities, open space and waste receptacles will need to be agreed prior to issuing a decision notice.

Conditions

- (a) Approved Plans
- (b) Timescale
- (c) Materials
- (d) Landscape Scheme
- (e) Landscape Implementation
- (f) Boundary details
- (g) Use of power operated machinery during construction

- (h) Highways - visibility splays, private water drainage, closing the existing rear access to the existing single garage, and bound materials for the proposed access drive.
- (i) Removal of householder permitted development rights regarding classes, A, B, C, D & E.

Background Papers

Where [the Local Authorities \(Executive Arrangements\) \(Meetings and Access to Information\) \(England\) Regulations 2012](#) require documents to be open to inspection by members of the public, they must be available for inspection: -

- (a) at all reasonable hours at the offices of South Cambridgeshire District Council;
- (b) on the Council's website; and
- (c) in the case of documents to be available for inspection pursuant to regulation 15, on payment of a reasonable fee required by the Council by the person seeking to inspect the documents at the offices of South Cambridgeshire District Council.

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.

- Nation Planning Policy Framework
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policyframework--2>
- Local Development Framework, Development Control Policies, Adopted July 2007
<http://www.scambs.gov.uk/content/local-development-framework>
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, Proposed Submission July 2013
<http://www.scambs.gov.uk/localplan>

Report Author: John Koch – Team Leader (West)
Telephone: (01954) 713268